UNIVERSIDAD SAN FRANCISCO DE QUITO USFQ

Colegio de Posgrados

Evaluating the Native-Speaker Bias in ESL in Ecuador

Mecanismo de Titulación: Proyecto de Investigación y Desarrollo

Pablo Armando Armas Gómez

Troy E. Spier, PhD
Director de Trabajo de Titulación

Trabajo de titulación de posgrado presentado como requisito
para la obtención del título de:
Magíster en Enseñanza de Inglés como Segundo Idioma

Quito, 28 de noviembre de 2021.

UNIVERSIDAD SAN FRANCISCO DE QUITO USFQ

COLEGIO DE POSGRADOS

HOJA DE APROBACIÓN DE TRABAJO DE TITULACIÓN

Evaluating the Native-Speaker Bias in ESL in Ecuador

Pablo A. Armas Gómez

Scott T. Gibson
PhD in English   _____
Director del programa de Maestría en
Enseñanza de Inglés como Segunda Lengua

Cristen Dávalos O'Neill
PhD in Research in Geography   _____
Decano del Colegio de Ciencias Sociales
y Humanidades COCISOH

Hugo Burgos Yánez
PhD in Media Studies   _____
Decano del Colegio de Posgrados

Quito, noviembre de 2021.

© DERECHOS DE AUTOR

Nombre del estudiante: Pablo Armando Armas Gómez

Código de estudiante: 00215425

C.I.:   1757611429

Lugar y fecha: Quito, 28 de noviembre de 2021.

ACLARACIÓN PARA PUBLICACIÓN

Nota: El presente trabajo, en su totalidad o cualquiera de sus partes, no debe ser considerado como una publicación, incluso a pesar de estar disponible sin restricciones a través de un repositorio institucional. Esta declaración se alinea con las prácticas y recomendaciones presentadas por el Committee on Publication Ethics COPE descritas por Barbour et al. (2017) Discussion document on best practice for issues around theses publishing, disponible en http://bit.ly/COPETheses.

UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENT

Note: The following graduation project is available through Universidad San Francisco de Quito USFQ institutional repository. Nonetheless, this project – in whole or in part – should not be considered a publication. This statement follows the recommendations presented by the Committee on Publication Ethics COPE described by Barbour et al. (2017) Discussion document on best practice for issues around theses publishing available on http://bit.ly/COPETheses.

DEDICATORIA

A Ana y a mi familia que siempre me han dado apoyo y demostrado su afecto con gestos aparentemente pequeños, pero de gran valía.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

RESUMEN

El *native speakerism* o nativohablantismo ha sido un término utilizado para referirse a la preferencia que existe hacia hablantes nativos del inglés en la enseñanza dicha lengua. Este término fue introducido por Adrián Holliday (2005) para referirse a un fenómeno que ha ocurrido en el mundo de la enseñanza del inglés como lengua extranjera y como segunda lengua.

La presente investigación tiene como objetivo evaluar los sesgos que reclutadores o directivos, profesores y estudiantes en Ecuador tienen hacia los profesores hablantes nativos del inglés y profesores hablantes no nativos. Para la investigación se utilizaron encuestas para consultar coordinadores o directores académicos, profesores y estudiantes de inglés. Cada uno de los participantes evaluó dos sets de seis (6) resúmenes curriculares que incluían profesores hablantes nativos, profesores extranjeros no nativos y profesores locales no nativos. Los participantes debían escoger tres perfiles por set en orden de aptitud y justificar sus escogencias en un hipotético caso de contratación. Los resultados del estudio demuestran que, aunque la preferencia hacia profesores hablantes nativos del inglés no es generalizable en Ecuador sí existe y es más común en los estudiantes que en profesores o directivos. Dentro de las conclusiones también se evidenció que hay una preferencia hacia profesores que demuestren un dominio alto en más de un idioma y que cuando se parte del punto de que los profesores tienen el mismo nivel de dominio del inglés, la experiencia y los grados académicos son más determinantes para escoger a quien contratar. Este estudio permitirá una discusión más abierta sobre el impacto del native speakerism en los procesos de reclutamiento en Ecuador y otros países donde esté presente este fenómeno.

Palabras clave: native speakerism, nativohablantismo, sesgos, inglés como segunda lengua, inglés como lengua extranjera, hablante nativo, hablante no nativo, enseñanza del inglés.

ABSTRACT

The term *native speakerism* refers to the bias towards native speakers of English when teaching the language. This term has been used by Adrian Holliday (2005) to identify a phenomenon that has taken place in the teaching of English as a foreign and second language.

The main aim of this study was to evaluate the bias that ESL recruiters or directors, teachers and students in Ecuador had towards teachers who are native speakers or non-native speakers of English. In this study, ESL directors, teachers and students were provided with a survey. The surveys included two sets of six CVs each, which included native English speakers, non-native foreign teachers, and non-native local teachers. Participants were asked to rank the top three profiles in each set and justify their choices based on information found on the CVs if there were vacancies in the place where they work or study. The results show that while the native-speaker bias is not prevalent, it does indeed exist in Ecuador, especially among students. As for the conclusions, two key points are that there is a preference for teachers who are proficient in more than one language, and provided that teachers are proficient in English, then experience and qualifications become the key recruiting factors. This study will allow for a more open discussion on the role that *native speakerism* in hiring processes in Ecuador and other countries where this phenomenon is also present.

Key words: native speakerism, bias, ESL (English as a Second Language), EFL (English as a Foreign Language), native speaker, non-native speaker, English language teaching

Tabla de contenido

1. INTRODUCTION

There are many factors that affect how an English language teacher is perceived by recruiters, colleagues, and students. Among these factors, we can find the native speaker and non-native speaker one. Several authors have addressed this issue including Ma (2012) who carried out research where she interviewed students attending secondary school in Hong Kong. Students were asked questions about their experience with non-native speakers and native speakers working at their schools. The questions aimed to find what perceptions students had of these two groups of teachers. Findings showed that learners were able to see positive and negative elements in both. The non-native teachers, who were Hong Kongers, had as advantages the fact that they could better understand the needs of their students, they also were able to understand their learners L1 which students considered positive, and they were easier to communicate with. In the case of the native speakers, participants stated that their teaching style was different and less textbook-based, they were more accurate in grammar and pronunciation and classes with native speakers provided more opportunities to use English since they could not use Cantonese and were forced to interact in English only.

Other authors have studied what makes students classify teachers as native. Creese, Blackledge, and Takhi (2014) conducted an ethnographic study in Panjabi complementary schools in the UK in which two Panjab-born instructors worked, Herma and Narinder. One as a senior teacher (Herma) and the other as a teaching assistant (Narinder). The former had been living in the UK for 16 years before the study took place, and the latter had arrived a year before. The findings showed that whereas both teachers occasionally used non-standard English, Herma was considered a native granted that her dialect was Birmingham Asian Vernacular English, which students in that class have been exposed to. Therefore, although not using one of the dominant British dialects, Herma was closer to the ideal native speaker because she was considered authentic. On the other hand, Narinder's authenticity was judged based on

the fact that her English dialect did not sound like other dialects used in the UK and due to the fact that there were more interactions in Panjabi with this teacher.

Ruecker and Ives (2015) dealt with this issue in the recruitment process. Nonetheless, they did not explicitly ask students, teachers, or recruiters. Instead, they analyzed the discourse and images used on websites in China, Japan, Korea, Taiwan and Thailand. They concluded that those schools were looking for candidates who were young, white and coming from specific English-speaking countries: the US, the UK, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland and South Africa. The researchers noted that South Africa was not always included but that India was never included. The inclusion or exclusion of speakers as native or nonnative is another aspect that makes this topic more complex and interesting.

The studies mentioned above show that different approaches can be taken and that whether you are a native or not matters to some extent to many people in the ESL community. With a growing demand for English across the globe and more people getting qualified and teaching English, this debate does not seem to be near the end. There have been claims that native speakers of English are preferred even when they are less qualified than their non-native counterparts. An example of this is Tatar's study (2019) of hiring criteria in Turkey in which some of the school administrators who were surveyed reported having waived the minimum requirements when hiring expatriate teachers.

However, this issue is more complex than it seems when we see that some teachers whose countries have English as an official language are not included as native speakers, teachers who are Caucasian are hired as natives even if that is not the official nor the main language spoken, and teachers who have been born and raised in English-speaking countries, but have a non-native sounding name or do not fit the stereotype of a native are not considered ideal profiles. Kachru's concentric circle model (1992) can help the understanding of who qualifies as a native English speaker. In his model, he divides English or 'World Englishes' in

three: the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and the Expanding Circle. The Inner Circle refers to countries where English is considered the mother tongue, and countries in this list are: the US, the UK, Australia, Canada, and Ireland. The Outer Circle labels countries who have English as an official language even if it is not the predominant language. In this list we can find countries such as Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, the Philippines, Singapore, Malaysia, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. In these countries, there is a high number of speakers who speak English fluently. Finally, the Expanding Circle includes all the countries where English is used as a foreign language.

The biases that the aforementioned authors have studied and discussed is something that I have personally experienced. A few years ago, I was asked to cover for a fellow teacher who was supposed to lead an exam preparation session for teachers who worked at a school. The coordinator of the school inquired why my company had not sent 'the native' teacher. The 'native' was a less experienced and less qualified teacher from Germany. At that moment, I realized that the 'native speaker' label was more flexible and at the same time complex than I had previously thought. What made this teacher a native? What made me a non-native? Was it based on our appearance? Was it our names? I did not ask nor I engaged in a conversation about what a native is or what difference that would make.

Later on, when the coordinator introduced me to the rest of the staff. She emphasized that I was there just for that day and that a native would be the one in charge. The coordinator knew the name of the other teacher, but forgot mine. Despite the fact that she had my CV, too and that we had met before. She remembered the 'native' teacher's name who she had never interacted with. This experience and some similar stories I have heard and read about are undoubtedly why this matter is so appealing to me.

In this research, I would like to explore how strong the bias towards native speakers is by having teachers rank potential colleagues who come from different backgrounds and have

similar qualifications or experience. To achieve this, some key concepts, related research and findings will be explored in the literature review in addition to findings in studies that have preceded this research and can provide the reader with the context of this problem and why it should be addressed. Furthermore, in the Methodology chapter, I will explain the type of investigation, the instrument design, the sample and how the research was conducted. In the Data and Analysis chapter, the quantitative and qualitative analysis applied to the three groups of participants will be presented and, if relevant, comparisons will be made. Finally, in the Conclusion chapter, the reader will be able to see the findings, contributions and limitations of the study along with recommendations for further research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will discuss key concepts, previous research, and articles that were used as grounds to carry out the study on the native-speaker bias. The content discussed in this chapter comes from academic journals, books, theses, and institutional websites. The information below was grouped according to the content and the search focused on certain key words and phrases such as: native speakerism, native-speaker bias, native and non-native ESL teachers, ESL hiring practices, perceptions of ESL teachers, ESL teachers' identity, ESL in Ecuador, ESL in Latin America.

2.1   Native Speakerism

Holliday (2005) defines native speakerism as a belief in which teachers coming from English-speaking countries represent Western culture and, therefore, are more capable of teaching the English language. In other words, native speakerism is a bias towards teachers born in certain countries, with certain names or looks.

To illustrate this, there is a study conducted by Ruecker and Ives (2015) where the authors analyzed fifty-nine (59) different websites that were looking for English teachers across different Asian countries. After their research they concluded that the ideal candidate should be 'a young, white, enthusiastic, native speaker of English from a stable list of inner-circle countries. So, this is one of the many ways in which the native-speaker bias can be seen in the English Language Teaching (ELT) industry. (Ruecker and Ives, 2015, p. 734)

A recent study on Native-speakerism was conducted in China by Li Wang and Fan Fang (2020). In their research, the authors explore teachers' and students' attitudes towards native and non-native English-speaking teachers in a university in the southeast of China. One hundred and six (106) students had to respond to a questionnaire and were given the option of a follow-up interview. Four (4) teachers accepted the invitation to participate in the study after

being informed of the purpose. Teachers had semi-structured interviews with a pre interview guide. One of the key findings in this study is when asked about who they preferred, sixty-two point twenty-six percent (62.26%) of the students stated that native and non-native English speakers were suitable for the language-teaching role, whereas twenty-seven point thirty-six percent (27.36%) opted for a native-speaking teacher. Another point worth mentioning is that in this study students were also confronted with the concept of native-speakerism and once they were familiar with the term, only nine point forty-three percent (9.43%) agreed with it.

2.1.1   The Native Speaker and Non-Native Speaker's Definition

George Braine defines Native Speakers (NS) as ''one who speaks the language as his/her first language'' whereas a Nonnative Speaker (NNS) is ''one who speaks that language as a foreign language'' (Braine, 2010, p. 9). Braine goes on and states that when acquiring English, NS will imitate the speech of fellow NS; whereas NNS will do so with other NNS' speech which is an approximation of the NS' language system. Braine also explains that each of the terms carries connotations with them. The Native-speaker label has positive ones ''it denotes birthright, fluency, cultural affinity, and sociolinguistic competence.'' On the other hand, being labeled as a Nonnative Speaker is associated with ''the burden of minority, of marginalization, and stigmatization''.

Some authors have discussed the issue of 'authenticity' in the classroom. The authenticity of the native speaker is an idealization. (Gill, 2007, as cited in Creese et al., 2014). When it comes to analyzing the bias in favor of a certain group, we need to consider what learners interpret as an authentic native speaker. In several countries, this interpretation may mean that the teacher has the appearance of what they would expect from someone who comes from an English-speaking country, a foreign-sounding last name, body language, clothes and

any other cues that learners may relate to those who speak English as a native language and, therefore, 'belong'.

Other authors, such as Adrian Holliday and Pamela Aboshiha (2009) suggest that being perceived as a Native Speaker goes beyond the country of origin of the teachers, and therefore, their first language. In the article *The Denial of Ideology in Perceptions of 'Nonnative Speaker'*, they explain how some 'non-native speakers' of English could pass for 'natives' if their physical appearance meets the expectation of students or if they are associated with Western culture. Although the terms 'native' and 'non-native' are often discouraged, they will be used in this study to see if teachers in Ecuador see this distinction as relevant.

2.1.2 Native Speakerism in Hiring Practices

When analyzing jobs advertised for English-teaching positions, it can be seen that whether someone is perceived as a native or not can increase or decrease their job prospects significantly. Moussou (2006) explains that despite the fact that the TESOL organization has issued statements against discrimination of teachers based on whether they are native speakers or not, this has been ignored by many and can be observed in various online job boards. She mentions Dave's ESL Café and the Chronicle of Higher Education as evidence of that. Ruecker and Ives (2015) use a Korean platform as an example of this bias and they state that although the platform does not explicitly write it in their job ad, they use imagery and phrasing that imply a preference for native speakers. In their findings, they state that in addition to being used to attract more students, native-speakers are seen by some recruiters as consumers of language-teaching opportunities. In their conclusions these authors mention that the English-language teaching advertising promotes stereotyping and discrimination because they repeatedly portray teachers as white and add texts that demand teachers from a reduced group of English-speaking countries.

A recent study in Turkey, conducted by Tatar (2019) aimed to examine the views of school administrators on local teachers or expatriate teachers. In this investigation, ninety-four (94) questionnaires from school administrators were collected and analyzed. The hiring criterion in the questionnaire included eight points that were ranked by school administrators, being a native speaker was the seventh aspect in importance, and citizenship ranked eighth. Administrators in schools recognized that both expatriate (foreign or native speakers of English) and local (Turkish) teachers had strengths and weaknesses. The main strength of the former was language use and the ability to teach culture, and the latter were praised for their teaching methods and knowledge of grammar rules. Another pertinent finding in this study is the fact that some of the participants acknowledged that they had hired expatriate staff without teaching qualifications or training based on their linguistic proficiency, whereas the minimum requirement for local teachers was either a certificate or degree.

2.1.3 Perceptions and Stereotypes of Native and Non-Native Teachers

One of the most compelling factors of the native or non-native language teacher is the fact that their competency is judged based on perceptions and generalizations that students, school owners and other colleagues have even before teachers enter the classroom. This factor has been studied by several authors in different places.

Ma (2012) interviewed thirty (30) students in three different schools in Hong Kong to determine their perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of learning from native English teachers and local English teachers, who were non-native speakers. The results showed that students perceived their native teachers as models of real or pure English, whereas they considered that local teachers provided a use of language that was labeled as fake or untrustworthy.

Amin (1997) states that whereas for sociolinguists, race and linguistic competency are not intrinsically interwoven, her research indicates that some learners assume that they are connected. In her research, she interviewed five visible-minority female teachers who taught ESL groups of adults in Canada, those teachers believed that students assumed that only white people could be native English speakers, that only native speakers know 'real' English and that white people are 'real' Canadians.

Yang and Liu (2016) used questionnaires to analyze how Chinese college students perceived Native and Non-native English in the EFL classroom. They did not focus only on the speaker but also on the language. In their findings, it was made clear that the preference for either Native or Non-native English was varied depending on the student but also the area of language that was being analyzed. The respondents in this study were divided in their views. There was a preference for Native speakers but they also had positive attitudes towards Non-native speakers. Native speakers had the lead as pronunciation models and Non-native speakers were said to be as good as natives or better in their knowledge of grammar rules. When analyzing the attitudes of students towards the aforementioned groups of teachers, fifty-six percent (56%) of the Chinese students who participated indicated that native English would increase their job prospects because of its prestige.

Regarding stereotypes and biases, Wilkinson (2016) investigated this using a semi-ethnographic approach interviewing and staying in contact with a group of eight college students at an international university in Thailand. Out of the eight (8) participants, one (1) was from Brazil, one (1) from Taiwan, one (1) from Senegal, and four (4) from Thailand. Students participating in this study described non-native teachers as more traditional and less open to discussion. On the other hand, native-speaking teachers were said to be more flexible, less traditional and more open. Moreover, non-native teachers whose accents were felt to be closer to a native accent were stated to have 'good' or 'likable' accents. Last but not least, the Thai

and Taiwanese participants shifted the blame when there were communication breakdowns. When talking to native speakers, they blamed their skills; conversely, when non-native teachers were in the equation, miscommunication was the teacher's fault. In terms of race, there were more claims to misunderstand non-native teachers who were non-white than European (white) teachers. These studies show how the perceptions of native and nonnative English-speaking teachers have been addressed in countries where English is the dominant language and where it is not.

2.1.4 The Native Speaker Discussion in Ecuador

Sevy-Biloon (2017) was a native English speaker who taught English in Ecuador and did research on teachers' and students' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers (NEST) knowledge and quality. She carried out this study because she noticed that students would frequently ask her questions about pronunciation of words that they would not ask their non-native teachers, who were mainly Ecuadorian teachers who had learned English in Ecuador. The author found that Ecuadorian students preferred native speakers at higher levels because of their oral proficiency skills and not because Ecuadorian non-native speakers lacked pedagogy or subject knowledge. Similarly, it is suggested in the study that given the choice, Ecuadorian beginners would opt for an Ecuadorian non-native teacher provided that they have, according to students, grammatical knowledge and effective explanation techniques. Finally, the author concluded that rather than being a native or non-native, the key factor students considered to evaluate their teachers was their communicative competence, linguistic awareness, teaching strategies and ability to explain.

2.2 Legislation in Ecuador

The Ecuadorian Constitution in its 11th article prohibits discrimination of all types in Ecuador. It is stated in that article that all people are equal and should be granted the same rights, duties, and opportunities.

In addition to the Constitution, the Ecuadorian Ministry of Labor signed the Ministerial Agreement number 82 in 2017 to address discrimination at work. This agreement does not only refer to discrimination of employees but also candidates. In its 4th article, it can be read that all people have the right to equal opportunities during the recruitment process of both the private and the public sector.

2. 3 Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFRL)

The Council of Europe has developed the CEFRL to organize the levels of proficiency of different languages used in Europe. Those levels are A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2. This framework describes the levels of competency through the *can-do descriptors*. These levels are used in Ecuador by publishers, institutions and even the government to assess the competency of staff and students and to establish minimum linguistic requirements for teachers.

3. METHODOLOGY

Being labeled as non-native English speaker of English can hinder the opportunities of ESL/EFL teachers (Alanazi, 2014). Oftentimes, teachers' competency is based before they utter a word or teach a class. They are not judged the same by recruiters, colleagues, and students (Alanazi, 2014). The gray area, however, is when we analyze what qualifies someone as a 'native' or as a 'non-native' speaker and when do qualifications, if ever, become enough to prove that a teacher's competency is as valid as their 'native' peers. In this regard, the question posed is: How do a teacher's name, qualifications and years of experience influence the perception of qualification of other teachers, recruiters, and students?

3. 1 Variable Definition

This study has one dependent variable, three independent variables and three controlled variables. The dependent variable is the perception of qualification. This study aims to explore the perceptions teachers, students and recruiters have regarding how qualified potential teachers are based on the participants' opinions. The independent variables are the candidates' *name* which can be Spanish-sounding, non-Spanish sounding and native-English sounding, *highest qualification* which could either be a degree or certificate, and *experience* which can be domestic or international. The controlled variables are the *workplace* or *place of study* of the participants, which could be a school, institute or university, and the *instructions* which will be provided to all participants before completing the survey and ranking the teachers' profiles in the instrument.

Three groups will be asked to take part in this survey: ESL directors/coordinators, ESL teachers, and ESL students. The reason why these three groups were chosen is because they are to some extent the ones that will affect the hiring process the most. ESL directors/coordinators will normally receive the candidates' CVs and carry out interviews

which means that they will generally have the last word regarding recruitment. ESL teachers may suggest to recruiters what profiles are needed or may become directors/coordinators eventually; therefore, they are likely to have an opinion and a voice, in some cases, of what candidates should be hired. As for students, they will witness the teacher's performance directly and will have an idea of what they want or do not want as a teacher. Even though students hardly ever make hiring decisions, schools, institutes and universities might consider students' demands and perceived needs when selecting their personnel. Hence, students' beliefs on what makes the most suitable teacher should not be dismissed.

3. 2 Type of Investigation

This investigation in relation to the level of control of the independent variables will be experimental. Three variables are being manipulated (teachers' names, qualifications and experience) and the effects of other variables are being minimized. It is also a field experiment, as the instrument and study are administered to simulate a real-life situation (Kerlinger & Lee, 2002). The investigation design is quasi-experimental, as described by Campbell and Stanley (1973), as it does not meet the triple-blind criteria, there is an intentional selection of participants and all have been assigned to analyze all six teacher CVs. Finally, it is also a cross-sectional study, as the data collected from the population is at one specific moment in time (Kerlinger & Lee, 2002).

3. 3 Data-Gathering

The instrument used to collect information was a Google form. The form was to be completed in English or Spanish. This form included information about the participants such as how they would describe themselves in relation to the ESL world (ESL director/coordinator, ESL teacher, or ESL student), the type of institution where they study or work, their English

language proficiency, their highest qualification, and their years of teaching experience if applicable. Provided that the survey was anonymous, names were not asked. The only personal information collected was the one the researcher considered that may help group and analyze the results of the study.

Once participants entered their personal information, they were provided with sets of six fake CVs of candidates who were applying for a teaching job in Ecuador. The participants needed to rank the candidates based on how qualified they thought candidates would be to teach English based on their CVs. Participants would only need to rank the first three of each set. The two sets of CVs included two teachers with stereotypical English-sounding names and last names, two teachers with stereotypical foreign-sounding names, and two with Spanish-sounding names. The reason for this was to determine the extent to which having a 'native-speaker' name or a foreign name would affect the possibility of being hired as an English language teacher. All CVs included information about the experience and duties, education and languages of the candidates.

Regarding the experience, in the first set, three candidates had experience in Ecuador only and three had experience in Ecuador and a foreign country. This difference was distributed evenly across the native-sounding, foreign-sounding and Spanish-sounding candidates. The duties and responsibilities included were chosen at random and are either vague or obvious for most English-teaching profiles. Duties and responsibilities were included to make the CVs more realistic and to make the objective of the survey less obvious. The education of the profiles of the candidates in the first set was almost identical. All candidates had a Bachelor's degree in a language-related field in a US university. This was done so that the country or university where candidates studied was not used as a reason for selecting a candidate. In terms of the languages, all candidates had a C2 level in English and some degree of competency in

another language. The ones that were not native-English speakers had a C2 level in a foreign language or Spanish in order to imply their country of origin.

As for the second set, the main variable was whether they had a Bachelor's degree or TEFL certificate. Three candidates had a degree and three a certificate. This difference was also distributed equally between the native-sounding, foreign-sounding, and Spanish-sounding candidates. The reason why two sets were used was so that participants' hiring tendencies could be clearly identified. This may be seen in the quantitative analysis or in the qualitative analysis when participants explained why they believed the chosen candidates were most suitable.

The omissions and the wording were deliberate throughout the profiles in order to remove certain variables that would make the analysis more complex and less conclusive. The country of origin was excluded because for example if all Spanish-speaking teachers were from Ecuador and they were voted most, nationalism could have been a reason for the choice, if 'native-teachers' were from the US and the UK then a preference or negative sentiment towards one of those countries could have also affected the hiring decision. In the case of the candidates with a foreign-sounding names, certain countries may be associated with better education or second-language proficiency which could have also influenced the decision on who to hire.

All teachers used in the profiles were male in order to remove gender as a variable. While gender may be an issue when it comes to hiring practices, adding it to the profiles was not relevant in the native-speaker discussion and could have created additional inconveniences in the responses and analysis. For example, unless gender was made explicit, which is not common practice in Ecuador, participants would have had to guess the gender based on the candidates' names, and they might have failed to do so accurately granted that candidates were from other countries and had names with which participants were, in some cases, unfamiliar.

Finally, in terms of language proficiency, all candidates had C2 as the highest level of competency. The word 'native', which is used in many real-life CVs was excluded because

that term can sometimes be too vague and open to interpretation whereas the CEFRL offers a more limited and specific framework for comparison.

3. 4 Data Analysis

This is a mixed-methods study because both quantitative and qualitative methods will be used to analyze and interpret the results. Both methods will aim to gather enough information on what elements determine how candidates' qualifications or competency is perceived by ESL directors/coordinators, ESL teachers and ESL students. In order to analyze the data quantitatively, the information entered by the participants will be analyzed through Excel. This will help pinpoint what answer elements are common enough for patterns to be identified. This along with the justifications of the answers which will provide qualitative information, will help draw conclusions on the researcher's hypothesis.

4. DATA AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Participants' Personal Information

There were thirty-two (32) participants in this study divided in three groups: six (6) ESL directors/coordinators, fourteen (14) ESL teachers and twelve (12) ESL students, all of which live and study or work in Ecuador. Sixty-eight percent (69%) of the participants completed the survey in English, whereas thirty-one percent (31%) filled it out in Spanish.

Among the ESL directors/coordinators qualifications varied, they were all asked to say what their highest qualification was. One (1) held a PhD, two (2) a Master's degree, two (2) a Bachelor's degree, and one (1) a teaching certificate. ESL teachers' highest qualifications were said to be as follows: one (1) had a PhD, nine (9) a Master's degree, three (3) a Bachelor's degree, and one (1) a teaching certificate. In the case of the ESL students who took the survey, one (1) claimed to be completing or have completed a Master's degree, four (4) were doing a major or have completed it, and the remaining seven (7) did not say what their highest qualification was.

If we compare the three different groups, we can see that ESL students are clearly the least qualified group with 52% having a Bachelor's or Master's degree. As for teacher's, the largest part of that group 64% had a Master's degree, 22% a Bachelor's degree, and 7% a PhD and a certificate respectively. Finally, ESL directors/coordinators had 66% of participants having a Master's or Bachelor's distributed evenly, and the other 34% was also split equally between a PhD and a certificate holder.

Sixty-nine per cent (69%) of the participants study or teach English in Quito's Metropolitan area. Originally, the study had been thought to be conducted in Quito. Nevertheless, the fact that a lot of the teaching and learning is taking place online has increased the interaction between teachers and students who live in different regions of Ecuador. Because of that, the study did not exclude any location as long as it was in Ecuador. The location may

affect the native speaker bias, however, because some locations had only one participant it is impossible to make comparisons between specific parts of Ecuador.

Participants were asked to indicate what their English competency was using the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFRL). Twenty-one percent (21%) claimed to have a C2 level. The same percentage of participants stated they had a C1 level English. Twenty-four percent (24%) of participants said they had a B2 or B1, with twelve percent (12%) in each of those two levels. The remaining thirty-five percent (35%) labelled their proficiency as 'other' and when asked to explain, reported their competency as native. Although this study did not exclude participants who had a lower level of English, all participants had some degree of experience learning or teaching the language.

Fifty-three percent (53%) of the participants are either teaching or studying at university. Twenty-eight percent (28%) study or work at a school and nineteen percent (19%) do so at an institute. School students were excluded from this research because interviewing minors would have required additional procedures and they were not an essential part of this investigation. The place of work or study may also affect what aspects are considered when hiring a teacher. For example, schools and universities are more likely to have to comply with government policies and regulations than institutes. In addition to that, universities tend to have stricter requirements on the qualifications applicants need. Institutes may care more or less about certain qualifications or experience depending on their philosophy and management. Schools will probably require certain types of experience and qualifications. Another important factor is that depending on the work or study context ESL Directors/Coordinators or teachers may not always agree on whether they want natives or non-natives. Students are also likely to have a variety of expectations that will differ depending on the academic setting.

Fifty-six percent (56%) of the participants have more than five years of experience, six percent (6%) had less than 5 years of experience, and the remaining thirty-eight percent (38%)

have no teaching experience. The percentage of participants who do not have any teaching experience corresponds to the ones that identified themselves as ESL students.

4.2 Results

Two sets of six candidate profiles each were provided to participants. As mentioned earlier, participants had to rank them and justify their choices. The profiles included two candidates with Spanish-sounding names, two with English-sounding names and two who seemed foreign but from non-English-speaking countries.

4.2.1 Quantitative Analysis

In the first set the results were as follows:

ESL Teachers

The top three choices were non-native teachers. As a first choice, Carlos Torres was chosen by forty-six percent (46%) of this group of participants, followed by Hanz Müller and Fred Jenkins with fifteen percent (15%) each, and then Miguel López, Ahmed Mortezai and Gary Bradley with eight percent (8%) respectively.

As their second choice, thirty-six percent (36%) of the teachers chose Ahmed Mortezai, twenty-two percent (22%) Miguel López, fourteen percent (14%) Carlos Torres and the same percentage for Hanz Müller, then Fred Jenkins and Gary Bradley were selected by seven percent (7%) each.

The preferred candidate as third choice was Ahmed Mortezai, who was selected by forty-three percent (43%) of the teachers. Then, Carlos Torres chosen by twenty-nine percent (29%) of the teachers, followed by Hanz Müller with twenty-one percent (21%) and Miguel López, seven percent (7%).

These results show that the two most competitive profiles were Carlos Torres' and Ahmed Mortezai's, both of whom had names and CVs which implied that they are non-native speakers. Conversely, the two native-sounding candidates, Fred Jenkins and Gary Bradley, were the ones who were selected the least. The results with this set suggest that being a native was not the most important factor for teachers completing the survey when choosing who they would hire.

ESL Directors/Coordinators

This group of participants selected Carlos Torres and Hanz Müller as their first choice. Eighty-three percent (83%) chose the former, and seventeen percent (17%) the latter.

As their second choice, there was a tie between Miguel López and Ahmed Mortezai, each of whom was selected by fifty percent (50%) of this group of participants.

The most popular choice was Hanz Müller with fifty percent (50%), followed by Carlos Torres, Miguel López and Fred Jenkins with seventeen percent (17%) each.

It seems that Carlos Torres and Hanz Müller were the top two candidates for ESL Directors/Coordinators. Fred Jenkins, one of the native-sounding candidates, got selected by a minority only as a third option and Gary Bradley was not selected any time. It can be inferred that the native-speaker factor was not considered above other elements in the candidates' CVs.

ESL Students

Students' opinions on who would be the best candidate were divided almost evenly. Gary Bradley is the only candidate that no one would have selected as their first choice. Twenty-five percent (25%) would have hired Carlos Torres or Miguel López, seventeen percent Ahmed Mortezai or Hanz Müller, and sixteen percent (16%) would have done so with Fred Jenkins.

Students' best second options are Ahmed Mortezai and Fred Jenkins. Both candidates were chosen by thirty-four percent (34%) of the students participating in the study, whereas Miguel López, Carlos Torres, Hanz Müller, and Gary Bradley were chosen by eight percent (8%) respectively.

Hanz Müller and Gary Bradley are the top two candidates as students' third choice. Each of them was selected by thirty-four percent (34%) of the students. Carlos Torres or Ahmed Mortezai were the third choice of seventeen percent (17%) of the students. Finally, Fred Jenkins was chosen by seven percent (7%).

The ESL students participating in this study were the most divided group. Both of the native-speaker profiles would be likely to be recruited by these students. Fred Jenkins, who had a slightly stronger CV than Gary Bradley, would be likely to be hired. Interestingly, they are the only group that might consider a profile such as Gary Bradley's to be suitable in the place where they study. Students' bias towards Bradley was seen more openly in the justifications of their choices, one participants claimed that Bradley had good English and given that all candidates had a C2, this is an assumption that is probably made on the name and thought of Bradley as a native speaker.

If we consider the three groups of participants and their choices, we can see that participants seem to agree on who the best are, but results vary more when they are given room to hire more than one teacher. Students are the only group that has results that indicate a slight bias towards native speakers.

In the second set the results were as follows:

ESL Teachers

Thirty-eight percent (38%) of the teachers participating in this study selected Tomás Reyes as their first choice, followed by Lars Jakobsson who was chosen by sixteen percent (16%), then Sean Phillips and Darius Enache with fifteen percent (15%) each, and finally Daniel Cabezas and Chris Buckley, each with eight percent (8%). Same as with the first set of candidates. The most popular candidate was not a native speaker of English or someone with a native-sounding name, which shows that these teachers did not prioritize being a native speaker above other elements in the CVs.

As the second choice, we have that again, Tomás Reyes was chosen by several teachers. Forty-two percent (42%) did so. After Tomás Reyes, Daniel Cabezas was the second best option with twenty-five percent (25%) of teachers choosing him, then Lars Jakobsson and Darius Enache with seventeen percent (17%) each. Neither of the native-speaking sounding candidates, Sean Phillips and Chris Buckley, was selected this time.

Interestingly, Sean Phillips and Chris Buckley were the top two candidates as third choice, they were chosen by thirty-one percent (31%) and twenty-three percent (23%) of the teachers respectively. Lars Jakobsson and Darius Enache followed with fifteen percent (15%) each, and Tomás Reyes and Daniel Cabezas had eight percent (8%) of the votes each as well.

In this second set, it is also evident that teachers would not necessarily hire a native speaker if that candidate does not have the strongest profile. However, if multiple vacancies exist, it is unclear whether the native-speaker factor may be more decisive.

ESL Directors/Coordinators

Sixty-seven percent (67%) of ESL Directors/Coordinators agreed that Tomás Reyes would be the best candidate if there were a vacancy in their workplace, after him Daniel

Cabezas and Darius Enache were selected by seventeen percent (17%) each. The decision of hiring Tomás Reyes coincides with the selection many teachers made and indicates that, objectively, Tomás Reyes may have the best profile to fill an English language teaching position.

Lars Jakobsson was the most popular second option with fifty percent (50%) of the votes. Sean Phillips, Darius Enache and Daniel Cabezas were selected by seventeen percent (17%) each.

Finally, Chris Buckley was selected in third place by fifty percent (50%) of the ESL Directors/Coordinators. Sean Phillips, Daniel Cabezas and Lars Jakobsson were selected by seventeen percent (17%) each. It is interesting that Chris Buckley had so many votes provided that he was at the bottom of the list as first and second choice and was the least voted option among teachers. So, although no definitive conclusions can be drawn, it can be inferred that for some of these ESL Directors/Coordinators having a stereotypical English-speaking name may have influenced the decision of who to hire.

ESL Students

Students voted for Sean Phillips and Lars Jakobsson as the best candidates. Both of them were selected by thirty-three percent (33%) of the students. Tomás Reyes and Daniel Cabezas followed with seventeen percent (17%) each. While Lars Jakobsson was also chosen by some ESL teachers and Directors/Coordinators, Sean Phillips was not at the top of their list. Hence, it can be concluded that students' hiring decisions do not necessarily align with ESL Directors/Coordinators or teachers.

Students' opinions were divided in the second choice. Twenty-five percent (25%) selected Daniel Cabezas and Lars Jakobsson respectively, followed by Tomás Reyes and Sean Phillips who were selected by seventeen percent (17%) each, and Darius Enache and Chris Buckley who divided the remaining sixteen percent (16%) evenly.

Tomás Reyes by thirty-three percent (33%) of the students as their top third choice. Darius Enache was the second best third option, chosen by twenty-five percent (25%) of the students. Daniel Cabezas and Chris Buckley had seventeen percent (17%) each, and finally Lars Jakobsson was chosen by eight percent (8%) of the students.

In this second set, Tomás Reyes was definitely the profile that was overall perceived as the best since the three groups of participants would have hired him. Then we could say Lars Jakobsson was the most popular because he would have been provided with a job by two of the three groups. The three groups would have opted for a native if three vacancies were open. However, the groups did not seem to agree on which of the two natives was better. Students were more inclined towards Sean Phillips, ESL directors/coordinators preferred Chris Buckley, and teachers were divided between the two. Therefore, it is clear that participants do not share the same criteria when hiring and it seems that if there is a native-speaker bias, it is more predominant among students than teachers or directors/coordinators.

4.2.2 Qualitative Analysis

In order to analyze the results qualitatively, participants were asked to explain why they had chosen specific candidates. After that, the reasons participants provided were read and grouped based on how similar they were. The most frequent justifications for hiring a teacher were the following: years of experience, teaching competencies/skills, knowledge of more than one language, qualifications and specific experience. Then, a smaller number of participants stated that English proficiency, the methods and approaches used, and the international background were important factors in their decisions. Finally, there were reasons that were only mentioned by one or two participants such as: having a native-sounding name, being Ecuadorian, the CV format, being professional, living nearby, not speaking their students' L1, and having local experience.

ESL Teachers

Among the group of teachers, experience was the aspect that was mentioned the most. Experience without further explanation was used fifteen (15) times and experience in specific areas or with specific tasks was mentioned sixteen (16) times. Experience in specific areas included experience with mixed-ability groups, preparation for international exams and tutoring weaker students or personalizing learning.

After experience, qualifications and collaborating with other teachers followed. Both were used as a justification seven (7) times. In terms of qualifications, although patterns cannot be determined because there was only one teacher participating who had a certificate as his highest qualification, it is worth mentioning that this teacher selected the three candidates who had a teaching certificate above the candidates who had a Bachelor's degree in English or Education and explicitly stated that their CELTA certificate was the main reason for choosing the candidates.

English proficiency was used five (5) times. Two of the teachers who referred to this were the ones that more explicitly showed a bias towards native speakers. One of them used the word 'native' when talking about Chris Buckley, and the other said 'It is clear that he has a good level of English' when explaining why Gary Bradley was his or her choice. It is worth mentioning that all candidates had the same English proficiency on their CV, so whenever participants stated that one candidate was more proficient it was their assumption.

Material and test design were included four (4) times. With three (3) or (2) mentions we have teaching skills, professional development, international experience, contributing to staff diversity, methods or approaches, strong knowledge of more than one language, and being able to adapt and evaluate the curriculum.

Finally, aspects that were mentioned only one (1) time were the CV design and being Ecuadorian. The CV design was nearly the same in all the profiles which shows that this may

have not been the real reason behind the choice. Regarding being Ecuadorian, this was also an assumption because although there were four candidates whose names and last name suggested Hispanic ancestry, no country of origin was included in any of the CVs.

Upon completing the qualitative analysis, it can be said that the majority of teachers did not consider being a native speaker as the main reason for hiring a teacher. There were only two who clearly had a preference for natives in their justifications. There were other teachers who chose natives but used experience or qualifications as their main arguments in favor of their choices. One correlation that may be interesting to explore is the correlation between the language competency of participants and the value they give to native teachers. In the first set for example, the three (3) occasions on which a native was chosen as the first choice, the teacher selecting the candidates had a B2 level of English, which was the lowest level of English among the teachers participating in this study.

ESL Directors/Coordinators

The most decisive factor when hiring a teacher according to ESL Directors/Coordinators is qualifications. Qualifications were mentioned thirteen (13) times in their responses. After that, experience was used nine (9) times, material design seven (7), methods and approaches three (3), and finally, the following were used twice (2): language proficiency in more than one language, knowledge of Spanish, English proficiency, collaboration with other teachers, and experience with assessment. No ESL director/coordinator used the word 'native' or anything that indicated a bias towards native speakers. Five (5) out of six (6) ESL Directors/coordinators work either at a school or university and only one works at an institute, which may explain why the qualifications are so important.. One of the participants in this group explicitly said that a degree is a requirement where he works.

ESL Students

As it happened when analyzing the data quantitatively, students differed significantly from ESL teachers and directors/coordinators in their choices and justifications. Experience was the number one factor taken into account when hiring a teacher with twenty-one (21) mentions, followed by being bilingual or knowledge of many languages, which were mentioned eleven (11) and eight (8) times respectively. Factors such as being a native, experience in Ecuador, places of study, qualifications and collaboration with other teachers were included in the justifications twice (2), and having international experience, a foreign name, studying in the US, and English proficiency were mentioned only once (1).

One of the key differences between this group and the other two, is that little attention was paid to qualifications. One reason for this may be that ESL teacher and directors/coordinators may have a better understanding of what qualifications are needed or prestigious enough for teaching English, another reason could simply be that ESL students believe that other elements on the CV are more relevant. Unfortunately, no information was gathered to draw conclusions on this.

In terms of native speakerism, there were some explicit and implicit examples of it. As said before, there were two participants in this group who stated that being a native was the reason for hiring the teacher. However, there were other cases where participants chose a teacher with a native-sounding name and provided a justification that could have been used to choose any candidate. For example, one participant said 'Has a C2 level' when choosing Gary Bradley, all candidates had a C2 level nonetheless. Another participant said 'Good level of English' as a justification for hiring Chris Buckley. There were other cases where students understood that the teacher was not a native but made assumptions on why the teacher would be a suitable candidate because he would have near-native proficiency. After opting for Lars

Jakobsson, one of the participants wrote 'Europeans, mainly people from Nordic countries, speak English fluently like natives.

All in all, the justifications show that students are the ones that more openly included the native-speaker factor as a positive one when recruiting new teachers. Yet, the native speaker bias is not something that can be generalized across all students taking the survey.

I believe that the qualitative analysis shows that being a native speaker is indeed relevant for some, however, the majority of the people consider other aspects above that one.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

5.1 Conclusions

The quantitative analysis does not reveal a preference towards teachers based solely on being considered native speakers. Teachers, directors and coordinators had similar choices with minimal variations. Students were slightly more inclined to hire teachers whose names suggest they are native speakers.

When asked to justify their choices, very few participants explicitly used the term 'native' or anything alike to support their decision. There were cases in which the bias could be inferred but not confirmed. The participants that identified themselves as ESL directors/coordinators did not show any signs of preferring native speakers over qualified teachers. The bias towards native speakers was seen in a small number of teachers who, as mentioned before, had lower level of English competency than other peers, and in a larger amount in the students.

Based on the participants interviewed, I would say that there is insufficient evidence to state that there is a predominant native-speaker bias in Ecuador. Quantitatively, a larger sample would be needed so as to make a more definitive statement. Nonetheless, the justifications of some participants had mentions of 'good level of English' when referring to candidates with English-sounding names.

There are other elements that are worth mentioning, being proficient in two or more languages and having knowledge of other cultures were two things that some participants included as factors that made a profile more interesting. Additionally, collaborating with other teachers, knowledge of the communicative approach, preparing for international exams and experience with mixed-ability lessons, all of which were included in some CVs just as a complement to make them seem more realistic received enough mentions to consider them as characteristics that are desirable in a good teaching profile.

The hiring decisions participants made were justified with objective justifications in many of the cases and reflected that ESL directors, coordinators, teachers, and students are aware of what to look for when choosing a teacher. ESL students were the ones that seemed to have the most obvious bias towards native speakers.

5. 2 Contributions

This study will provide those who want to discuss the native-bias in countries where English is taught as a foreign or second language with data that can be used to confirm or rebut their arguments. This data and the discussion that this and other related studies generate will additionally serve public and private institutions to improve hiring processes and practices.

Future researchers in Ecuador and Latin America who are interested in exploring native speakerism have now more data on which they can build. As shown in the second chapter, most of the native vs non-native speaking teacher research has been conducted in Asia, but there is limited information about this in the Americas.

This study can also offer valuable information on what different ESL stakeholders consider relevant when hiring a teacher. This information can be used by recruiters when considering what to look for; in the case of teachers, understanding what is expected of them can help them take the necessary action to gain the knowledge and skills to make their profiles better.

Furthermore, for all actors involved in the English-teaching industry, this investigation offers an opportunity for everyone to reflect on how to make it fairer.

5. 3 Limitations

The fact that the survey was conducted online posed many challenges. Some of them were: reaching participants who wanted to take part in the study, estimating the number of surveys available to be answered, and predicting the number of participants per group (directors, teachers, or students).

The response rate was very low. About three hundred people were sent the email with the survey, but with only thirty-one (31) completed surveys, it can be said that the response rate was below five percent (5%).

Moreover, although surveys were anonymous and data analysis did not include any matching of the answers to the individual participants, surveys were sent to specific emails and emails were collected, which may have affected how some participants responded because they may have felt that their anonymity would be compromised. The only reasons emails were collected was to guarantee that if anyone decided to end their participation, their data could be removed.

The majority of the teachers and recruiters who completed the survey are qualified and experienced non-native English speakers. They may have related to candidates with similar profiles and preferred them over native speakers.

REFERENCES

Alanazi, O. (2014). *The Employment of Native and Non-Native Speaker EFL Teachers in Saudi Higher Education Institutions: Programme Administrators' Perspective.* Newcastle University (Unpublished master's thesis).

Amin, N. (1997). "Race and Identity of the Nonnative ESL Teacher." *TESOL Quarterly,* 31(3): 580-583.

Braine, G. (2010). *Nonnative Speaker English Teachers: Research, Pedagogy, and Professional Growth.* Taylor and Francis Group.

Campbell, D., y Stanley, J. (1973). *Diseños Experimentales y Cuasi-experimentales en la Investigación Social.* Bueno Aires: Amorrortu.

Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment -- Companion Volume*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.

Creese, A., Blackledge, A. and J.K. Tahki. (2014). "The Ideal 'Native Speaker' Teacher: Negotiating Authenticity and Legitimacy in the Language Classroom." *The Modern Language Journal, 98* (4). 937-951.

Floris, F. and W. Renandya. (2020). Promoting the Value of Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers. *PASAA, 59.* 1-19.

Kachru, B. (1992). *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures.* Urbana: University of Illinois

Kerlinger, F., y Lee, H. (2002). *Investigación del Comportamiento* (4ta ed.) México: McGraw Hill.

Holliday, A. (2005). *The Struggle to Teach English as an International Language*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Holliday, A. and P. Aboshiha (2009). The Denial of Ideology in Perceptions of 'Nonnative Speaker' Teachers. *TESOL Quarterly,* 43(4): 669-689.

Ma, L.P.F. (2012). Advantages and Disadvantages of Native- and Nonnative-English-Speaking Teachers: Student Perceptions in Hong Kong. *TESOL Quarterly, 46* (2): 280-305.

Martínez, A. J. D. D. (Ed.). (2017) *Native and Non-Native Teachers in English Language Classrooms: Professional challenges and teacher education.* De Gruyter, Inc.

Moussu, L. (2006). *Native and Non-Native English-Speaking English as a Second Language Teachers: Student Attitudes, Teacher Self-Perceptions, and Intensive English-Program Administrator Beliefs and Practices*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, USA.

Republic of Ecuador. (2008). *Constitución de la República del Ecuador* 2008. Available at: https://www.oas.org/juridico/pdfs/mesicic4_ecu_const.pdf

Republic of Ecuador, el Ministro del Trabajo. (2017). *Normativa Erradicación de la Discriminación en el Ambito Laboral*. Available at: https://www.trabajo.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/AM-82.-NORMATIVA-ERRADICACION-DE-LA-DISCRIMINACION-EN-EL-AMBITO-LABORAL.pdf?x42051

Ruecker, T., and L. Ives. (2015). White Native English Speakers Needed: The Rhetorical Construction of Privilege in Online Teacher Recruitment Spaces. *TESOL Quarterly, 49*(4). 733-746.

Sevy-Biloon, J. (2017). Educators and Students Perceptions about Ecuadorian NEST Knowledge and Quality in Terms of Effective Teaching. *3L, Language, Linguistics, Literature, 23*(3), 123-132.

Tatar, S. (2019). Employment of English Language Teachers in an EFL Context: Perspectives From School Administrators. *Profile, 21*(2), 45-61.

Wang, L., and Fang, F. (2020). Native-Speakerism Policy in English Language Teaching Revisited: Chinese University Teachers' and Students' Attitudes towards Native and Non-Native English-speaking Teachers. *Cogent Education, 7*(1).

Wilkinson, M. T. (2016). What Do They Think Of Me? A Semi-ethnographic Investigation into Student Stereotypes and Biases towards Teachers. *The New English Teacher, 10*(1), 20-41.

Yang, Q., & Liu, J. (2016). Chinese College Students' Views on Native English and Non-Native English in EFL Classrooms. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 7*(4), 84-94.

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Research Protocol Approval

Universidad San Francisco de Quito USFQ

Certificado de exención

N°. CE013.2021-P2021.026TPG
Quito, 19 de abril de 2021

Señor
Pablo Armando Armas Gómez
Investigador Principal
Universidad San Francisco de Quito USFQ
Ciudad

Referencia: Protocolo 2021-026TPG
Informe de evaluación: IE01.E040.2021-CEISH-USFQ

De nuestra consideración:

El Comité de Ética de Investigación en Seres Humanos de la Universidad San Francisco de Quito (CEISH-USFQ), notifica a usted que analizó la investigación que se describe a continuación:

A. DATOS DE LA INVESTIGACIÓN				
Códigos USFQ	CEISH: 2021-026TPG			
Título de la Investigación	Determinar el sesgo en profesores nativos del idioma inglés, en su enseñanza del idioma como segunda lengua en Ecuador. *Evaluating Teachers' Native-Speaker Bias in ESL in Ecuador.*			
Tipo de estudio	Observacional cuantitativo descriptivo			
Investigadores + afiliación institucional	**Investigador**		**Institución**	**Rol en la investigación**
	1_Pablo Armando Armas Gómez		Universidad San Francisco de Quito	Investigador principal
	2_Troy E. Spier		USFQ	Director de tesis
Lugar de implementación	**Zona**	**Provincia**	**Ciudad**	**Centro de investigación**
	09	Pichincha	DMQ	Centros de enseñanza del ESL
Duración del estudio	1.5 meses desde aprobación			

Este estudio se cataloga como *"exento"*, de acuerdo con las regulaciones internacionales que rigen las investigaciones en seres humanos.

El CEISH-USFQ otorga este certificado, toda vez que la investigación cumple con uno o más criterios elegibles para una exención:

Investigación con recopilación y/o análisis de datos anonimizados, obtenidos de registros existentes.	☐
Investigación in-vitro, con piezas dentarias extraídas previamente, donadas voluntariamente y anonimizadas	☐
Investigación con recopilación y/o análisis de datos disponibles públicamente.	☐
Investigación con recolección de datos de manera anonimizada.	☑
Investigación que evalúe anónimamente programas públicos o practicas educativas.	☑
Investigación que evalúe anónimamente el sabor y/o calidad de alimentos, o estudios de aceptación del consumidor.	☐

USFQ

UNIVERSIDAD SAN FRANCISCO DE QUITO USFQ

	Documentos que sustentan y que se utilizarán en la investigación	Versión	Fecha	# pgs
1	Protocolo de investigación	E02	27 feb 2021	05
2	Modificación del formulario de consentimiento para aplicación digital	E02	01 mar 2021	03
3	Instrumentos a ser utilizados para el desarrollo de la investigación: Encuesta a participantes (personal information and teaching profiles)	I01	25 feb 2021	04

Este certificado tiene una vigencia de dos meses, **desde el 19 de abril hasta el 18 de junio de 2021**, tomando en cuenta el período de duración del estudio especificado en el Protocolo de investigación presentado (versión E02).

Esta certificación aplica solo para las actividades descritas en los documentos revisados según el informe de evaluación **No. IE01-E040.2021-CEISH-USFQ**. Cualquier modificación a los documentos antes aprobados debe ser notificada a este Comité, para un nuevo análisis y determinación del nivel de riesgo.

El CEISH-USFQ deslinda cualquier responsabilidad en cuanto a la veracidad de la información presentada.

Iván Sisa, MD, MPH, MS
Presidente CEISH-USFQ
Correo electrónicos: comitebioetica@usfq.edu.ec

Adjunto: Informe de evaluación del estudio
cc. Archivo digital del estudio
IS/ammt

USFQ

Appendix B: Invitation to participate in the study

Estimados:

Espero que se encuentren muy bien. Con fines académicos estamos realizando un estudio relacionado con la contratación de profesores de inglés en Ecuador. Tu participación involucra evaluar CVs de profesores y justificar tus escogencias.

Hemos adjuntado en pdf el consentimiento informado que te dará información relevante que debes conocer antes de proceder a responder la encuesta. Muchas gracias por tu colaboración.

Una vez leído el pdf, si no tiene preguntas puede hacer click aquí para iniciar la encuesta. En caso de que tenga alguna pregunta, puede escribir a parmasg@estud.usfq.edu.ec.

Saludos

_____

Dear all,

I hope you are all doing well. We are conducting a research study on English-teaching hiring practices in Ecuador. Your participation will require you to evaluate some teachers' CVs and justify your choices.

Enclosed in this email is a pdf copy of the informed consent which will provide you with information that you need to know before completing the survey. Thanks for participating.

Once you have read and understood the informed consent, click [http://Una vez leído el pdf. Haga click aquí para iniciar la encuesta.]here to start the survey. In case you have any questions, do not hesitate to write to parmasg@estud.usfq.edu.ec.

Regards

Appendix C: Informed consent

Consentimiento informado

Este estudio de participación voluntaria, que lo lleva a cabo la Universidad San Francisco de Quito. No lo lleva a cabo ninguna red social.

El propósito del estudio es determinar algunos factores que determinan la contratación de profesores de inglés. La población participante serán directores, coordinadores, reclutadores, profesores y estudiantes de inglés. El estudio se implementará en Quito de manera digital.

La encuesta que aplicaremos tiene aproximadamente 15 preguntas sobre los siguientes temas: información personal, jerarquización de perfiles, justificación de jerarquización y escogencia. Le tomará entre 20 y 30 minutos contestarla.

Los datos recopilados en esta encuesta serán utilizados solo para fines investigativos; por tanto sus respuestas no serán compartidas sino solo con los investigadores del estudio. Los datos se almacenarán en una nube protegida con contraseña y archivo encriptado en el computador del investigador principal por un lapso no mayor de 1 año y luego se borrarán.

No existen riesgos de participar porque: · Esta encuesta es anónima, no le solicita ningún dato que pudiera identificarlo. Además, a cada encuesta se le asignará un código en lugar del nombre. · Para la publicación de los resultados se utilizarán datos grupales, no individuales.

Usted tiene la opción de contestar todas las preguntas o dejar en blanco aquellas que no desea contestar. Los beneficios que se esperan de los resultados de este estudio son:

·Mejor comprensión de algunos factores que favorecen o desfavorecen a profesores en el proceso de contratación.

·Contribuir a la promoción de mejores prácticas en la contratación de profesores de inglés. ·Generar datos que sirvan como base para futuras investigaciones académicas en el área de reclutamiento y enseñanza del inglés en Ecuador.

Si usted...

1) Tiene dudas o preguntas sobre este estudio o cualquiera de sus procedimientos; y-o

2) Decide que ya no quiere participar y desea que ya no se utilicen los datos que ya se recolectaron de su persona.

Por favor comunicarse con: parmasg@estud.usfq.edu.ec.

Consentimiento:

Me han explicado claramente el propósito de la investigación, comprendo los riesgos y beneficios de participar, entiendo que los investigadores adoptarán las medidas necesarias para asegurar la confidencialidad de mis datos personales; me facilitaron un contacto para que responda todas mis preguntas; me dieron tiempo suficiente para tomar una decisión, por lo cual acepto participar voluntariamente en esta encuesta realizada por la Universidad San Francisco de Quito.

| Iniciar encuesta | Salir |

Appendix D: Survey

Hiring a New English Teacher

1. Email *

   _____

   Language Selection / Selección de idioma

2. Preferred Language / Idioma de preferencia *

   Mark only one oval.

   ( ) English/Inglés   *Skip to question 3*

   ( ) Spanish/Español   *Skip to question 5*

   Survey on ESL teachers

   The following survey aims to determine some key factors when seeking and recruiting ESL teachers. The risks of participating in this study will be minimal since your answers will be kept anonymous and your data will only be handled by the main researcher and stored on a password-protected cloud. If you have any questions before continuing, please email parmasg@estud.usfq.edu.ec.

   By participating in this study you will provide the ESL community in Ecuador with valuable data which will may help them make better informed decisions, improve quality and even have an impact on hiring practices.

   Consent: Part 1

3. I have been explained the risks and benefits of participating in this research using clear and simple language. I have been provided with a copy of the consent, all my questions were answered and I was given enough time to decide whether to participate or not. If your answer is negative, but you would still like to participate, please email parmasg@estud.usfq.edu.ec with your questions or concerns. *

Mark only one oval.

◯ Yes

◯ No

Consent: Part 2

4. *

Mark only one oval.

◯ I voluntarily accept to participate in this research project.   *Skip to question 7*

◯ I do not wish to participate in this research project.

Skip to question 7

Encuesta sobre profesores de inglés

La siguiente encuesta tiene como objetivo determinar ciertos factores durante la búsqueda y reclutamiento de profesores de inglés. Los riesgos de participar en esta investigación son mínimos ya que la información entregada será guardada de forma anónima y los datos serán únicamente manejados por el investigador principal en una nube protegida con contraseña. Si tiene alguna pregunta antes de continuar, por favor escriba a parmasg@estud.usfq.edu.ec.

Al participar en este estudio, proveerá a la comunidad de enseñanza de inglés con datos valiosos que ayudarán a tomar decisiones con mayor información, mejorar la calidad, e inclusive impactar prácticas dentro del proceso de contratación.

Consentimiento: Parte 1

5. Se me han explicado los riesgos y beneficios de participar en esta investigación con lenguaje claro y sencillo. Se me ha enviado una copia del consentimiento, todas mis preguntas fueron respondidas y tuve tiempo suficiente para decidir si participaba o no. Si tu respuesta es negativa, pero desearías conocer más información para poder participar, por favor escribe a parmasg@estud.usfq.edu.ec con tus preguntas o inquietudes. *

Mark only one oval.

◯ Sí

◯ No

Consentimiento: Parte 2

6. *

Mark only one oval.

◯ Acepto voluntariamente participar en esta investigación.   *Skip to question 13*

◯ No acepto participar en esta investigación.

Skip to question 13

Personal Information

7. Which of these best describes you? (ESL: English as a second language) *

Mark only one oval.

◯ ESL Director/Coordinator

◯ ESL Recruiter

◯ ESL Teacher

◯ ESL Student

8. Where do you work or study? (Check all that apply.) *

Check all that apply.

- [ ] school
- [ ] institute
- [ ] university

Other: [ ] _____

9. Where is the institution you work or study at located? *

Mark only one oval.

- ( ) Distrito Metropolitano de Quito
- ( ) Other: _____

10. What is your English competency level? *

Mark only one oval.

- ( ) B1
- ( ) B2
- ( ) C1
- ( ) C2
- ( ) Other: _____

11. How many years of teaching experience do you have? *

   Mark only one oval.

   ◯ N/A

   ◯ Less than 1

   ◯ 1-2

   ◯ 2-5

   ◯ More than 5

12. What is your highest teaching qualification? *

   Mark only one oval.

   ◯ PhD   *Skip to question 19*

   ◯ Master's Degree   *Skip to question 19*

   ◯ Bachelor's Degree   *Skip to question 19*

   ◯ Certificate   *Skip to question 19*

   ◯ N/A   *Skip to question 19*

   ◯ Other: _____

Skip to question 19

Información personal

13. ¿Cuál de las siguientes te describe mejor? *

   Mark only one oval.

   ◯ Director/coordinador del área de inglés

   ◯ Reclutador de profesores de inglés

   ◯ Profesor de inglés

   ◯ Estudiante de inglés

14. ¿Dónde trabajas o estudias? *

Mark only one oval.

○ Colegio/Escuela

○ Instituto

○ Universidad

○ Other: _____

15. ¿Dónde se encuentra la institución donde trabajas o estudias? *

Mark only one oval.

○ Distrito Metropolitano de Quito

○ Other: _____

16. ¿Cuál es tu nivel de inglés? *

Mark only one oval.

○ B1

○ B2

○ C1

○ C2

○ Other: _____

17. ¿Cuántos años de experiencia docente tienes? *

Mark only one oval.

◯ NA

◯ Menos de 1

◯ 1-2

◯ 2-5

◯ Más de 5

18. ¿Cuál es tu máximo nivel educativo? *

Check all that apply.

☐ PhD

☐ Maestría

☐ Licenciatura/Pregrado

☐ Certificado

☐ NA

Skip to question 31

Applicants' CVs – Part 1

Hanz Müller

+593 978345003

Salinas, Ecuador
hmullen@gmail.com

Work Experience
English Teacher   **September 2016-Present**
Colegio Celleri Aviles   Salinas, Ecuador

- Creating lesson plans
- Teaching online lessons
- Supporting underperforming students
- Preparing staff for international examinations

Education
B.A. in TESOL   **2011**
Concordia University   Seward, NE, USA

Languages
English (C2)
German (C2)
Spanish (B1)

Gary Bradley
+593 984345056

Riobamba, Ecuador
Gary.bradley@gmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
U.E. Carlos Cisneros

2018-2021
Riobamba, Ecuador

- add responsibilities here -- complete sentences
- Responsible for ...
- lesson planning, evaluating curriculum, providing instruction, ...

English Teacher
U.E. Atahualpa

2017-2018
Ambato, Ecuador

- Responsible for:

    lesson planning, designing assessment instruments, providing instruction, collaborating with other teachers.

Education

B.A. in English/Education
Montana State University
USA

2016
Bozeman, MT,

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (B1/B2)

Miguel López
+593 912435004

Machala, Ecuador
mlopez@gmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
Windsor Languages

2019-2021
Machala, Ecuador

- Prepared students for Cambridge exams
- Delivered high-quality lessons
- Led the advanced conversation course

English Teacher
U.E. Guillermo Ordoñez Gómez

2018-2019
Santa Elena, Ecuador

- Delivered high-quality lessons
- Conducted monthly training sessions
- Revised curriculum

Education

English B.A.
University of North Dakota

2017
Grand Forks, ND, USA

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (C2)

Carlos Torres

+593 953809782

Puyo, Ecuador
carlosftorres@hotmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher   2019-present
Colegio Orellana   Puyo, Ecuador

- have provided instruction using the communicative approach
- have adapted materials to local context
- have promoted learner autonomy

English Teacher   2017-2019
Colegio Aiapaec   Trujillo, Perú

- provided instruction using the direct method
- assessed students
- designed mixed-ability lessons

Education

B.A. in English Language Arts Education   2016
Jacksonville State University   Jacksonville, AL, USA

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (C2)

Fred Jenkins

+593 9903030

Tena, Ecuador
fredmjenkins@yahoo.com

Work Experience

English Teacher   **2021**
U.E. Juan XXIII   Tena, Ecuador

- have provided instruction
- have designed lesson plans
- have developed assessment tools

English Teacher   **2018-2020**
Handan N.4 Middle School   Handan, Hebei, China

- assisted main teachers
- tutored students after school
- created supplementary materials

Education

B.A. in English   **2018**
University of the West   Rosemead, CA, USA

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (A2)

Ahmed Mortezai

+593 902444927

Ibarra, Ecuador
a.mortezai@gmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
U.E. Dr. Victor Mideros

2019-2021
Ibarra, Ecuador

- lesson planning
- designing culturally-relevant activities
- teaching and assessing young learners

English Teacher
Colegio Benavente

2018-2019
Puebla, México

- lesson planning
- teaching young learners
- monitoring progress and providing feedback

Education

B.A. in Linguistics
University of Oklahoma

2017
Norman, OK, USA

Languages

- English (C2)
- Farsi (C2)
- Spanish (A2)

19. If the place where you teach had one vacancy, which of the following candidates would be your FIRST choice? *

Mark only one oval.

( ) Hanz Müller

( ) Gary Bradley

( ) Miguel López

( ) Carlos Torres

( ) Fred Jenkins

( ) Ahmed Mortezai

20. Please explain why you selected this candidate. Be as specific as possible, making particular reference to his or her CV. *

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

21. If the place where you teach had one vacancy, which of the following candidates would be your SECOND choice? *

Mark only one oval.

( ) Hanz Müller

( ) Gary Bradley

( ) Miguel López

( ) Carlos Torres

( ) Fred Jenkins

( ) Ahmed Mortezai

22. Please explain why you selected this candidate. Be as specific as possible, making particular reference to his or her CV. *

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

23. If the place where you teach had one vacancy, which of the following candidates would be your THIRD choice? *

Mark only one oval.

◯ Hanz Müller

◯ Gary Bradley

◯ Miguel López

◯ Carlos Torres

◯ Fred Jenkins

◯ Ahmed Mortezai

24. Please explain why you selected this candidate. Be as specific as possible, making particular reference to his or her CV. *

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Skip to question 25

Applicants' CVs – Part 2

Tomás Reyes

+593 953 809 266

Ambato, Ecuador
tom.reyes@yahoo.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
U.E. Particular Iberoamérica

2018-2021
Ambato, Ecuador

- Lesson planning
- Creating and adapting materials
- Designing assessment instruments
- Providing instruction

English Teacher
U.E. Atenas

2016-2018
Ambato, Ecuador

- Lesson planning
- Providing instruction
- Evaluating syllabus

Education

Cambridge CELTA Certificate Pass B
British Council Bogotá

2016
Bogotá, Colombia

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (C2)

Darius Enache

+593 912 401 104

Tena, Ecuador
dar.enache@hotmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
U.E. José Peláez

2020-2021
Tena, Ecuador

- Lesson planning
- Providing instruction
- Evaluating and adapting curriculum

English Teacher
U.E. Ciudad de Tena

2018-2019
Tena, Ecuador

- Lesson planning
- Creating supplementary materials
- Providing instruction

Education

B.A. in English/Education
Montana State University

2017
Bozeman, MT, USA

Languages

English (C2)
Romanian (C2)
Spanish (B1)

Lars Jakobsson

+593 975 058 265

Ibarra, Ecuador
larsjak@gmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
Colegio Oviedo

2020-present
Ibarra, Ecuador

- Delivering language lessons
- Planning lessons
- Preparing learners for standardized tests

English Teacher
U.E. Provincia de Pastaza

2017-2020
Puyo, Ecuador

- Delivering language lessons
- Collaborating with other teachers
- Designing assessment tools

Education

Cambridge CELTA Certificate Pass B
British Council Bogotá

2017
Bogotá, Colombia

Languages

English (C2)
Swedish (C2)
Spanish (B1)

Sean Phillips

+593 983 459 222

Puyo, Ecuador
seanjphillips@yahoo.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
U.E. Provincia de Pastaza

2019-2021
Puyo, Ecuador

- Providing instruction
- Designing skill-based tests
- Collaborating with other teachers

English Teacher
Colegio Orellana

2018-2019
Puyo, Ecuador

- Providing instruction
- Lesson planning
- Collaborating with other teachers

Education

Cambridge CELTA Certificate Pass
British Council Bogotá

2018
Bogotá, Colombia

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (B1)

Daniel Cabezas

+593 956990746

Riobamba, Ecuador
daniel.cabezas@gmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
U.E. Vigotsky

2019-2021
Riobamba, Ecuador

- Designing and evaluating assessment instruments
- Teaching general English
- Collaborating with other teachers

English Teacher
U.E. San Felipe Neri

2017-2019
Riobamba, Ecuador

- Teaching general English
- Lesson planning
- Tutoring weaker students after school

Education

B.A. in English
University of the West

2017
Rosemead, CA, USA

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (C2)

Chris Buckley

+593 969 230 111

Tulcán, Ecuador
cbuckley@gmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
Colegio Vicente Fierro

2018-2021
Tulcán, Ecuador

- Assessing students' skills and use of English
- Teaching general English
- Preparing students for international examinations

Education

B.A. in English Teaching
New Hampshire University

2018
Durham, NH, USA

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (A1)

25. If the place where you teach had one vacancy, which of the following candidates would be your FIRST choice? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Tomás Reyes
- ◯ Darius Enache
- ◯ Lars Jakobsson
- ◯ Sean Phillips
- ◯ Daniel Cabezas
- ◯ Chris Buckley

26. Please explain why you selected this candidate. Be as specific as possible, making particular reference to his or her CV. *

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

27. If the place where you teach had one vacancy, which of the following candidates would be your SECOND choice? *

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Tomás Reyes
- ◯ Darius Enache
- ◯ Lars Jakobsson
- ◯ Sean Phillips
- ◯ Daniel Cabezas
- ◯ Chris Buckley

28. Please explain why you selected this candidate. Be as specific as possible, making particular reference to his or her CV. *

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

29. If the place where you teach had one vacancy, which of the following candidates would be your THIRD choice? *

   Mark only one oval.

   ( ) Tomás Reyes

   ( ) Darius Enache

   ( ) Lars Jakobsson

   ( ) Sean Phillips

   ( ) Daniel Cabezas

   ( ) Chris Buckley

30. Please explain why you selected this candidate. Be as specific as possible, making particular reference to his or her CV. *

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Hoja de vida de aplicantes - Parte 1

Gary Bradley

+593 984345056

Riobamba, Ecuador
Gary.bradley@gmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher   **2018-2021**
U.E. Carlos Cisneros   Riobamba, Ecuador

- add responsibilities here -- complete sentences
- Responsible for ...
- lesson planning, evaluating curriculum, providing instruction, ...

English Teacher   **2017-2018**
U.E. Atahualpa   Ambato, Ecuador

- Responsible for:

  lesson planning, designing assessment instruments, providing instruction, collaborating with other teachers.

Education

B.A. in English/Education   **2016**
Montana State University   Bozeman, MT,
USA

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (B1/B2)

Miguel López
+593 912435004

Machala, Ecuador
mlopez@gmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
Windsor Languages

2019-2021
Machala, Ecuador

- Prepared students for Cambridge exams
- Delivered high-quality lessons
- Led the advanced conversation course

English Teacher
U.E. Guillermo Ordoñez Gómez

2018-2019
Santa Elena, Ecuador

- Delivered high-quality lessons
- Conducted monthly training sessions
- Revised curriculum

Education

English B.A.
University of North Dakota

2017
Grand Forks, ND, USA

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (C2)

Carlos Torres

+593 953809782

Puyo, Ecuador
carlosftorres@hotmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
Colegio Orellana

2019-present
Puyo, Ecuador

- have provided instruction using the communicative approach
- have adapted materials to local context
- have promoted learner autonomy

English Teacher
Colegio Aiapaec

2017-2019
Trujillo, Perú

- provided instruction using the direct method
- assessed students
- designed mixed-ability lessons

Education

B.A. in English Language Arts Education
Jacksonville State University

2016
Jacksonville, AL, USA

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (C2)

Fred Jenkins

+593 9903030

Tena, Ecuador
fredmjenkins@yahoo.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
U.E. Juan XXIII

2021
Tena, Ecuador

- have provided instruction
- have designed lesson plans
- have developed assessment tools

English Teacher
Handan N.4 Middle School

2018-2020
Handan, Hebei, China

- assisted main teachers
- tutored students after school
- created supplementary materials

Education

B.A. in English
University of the West

2018
Rosemead, CA, USA

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (A2)

Ahmed Mortezai

+593 902444927

Ibarra, Ecuador
a.mortezai@gmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
U.E. Dr. Victor Mideros

2019-2021
Ibarra, Ecuador

- lesson planning
- designing culturally-relevant activities
- teaching and assessing young learners

English Teacher
Colegio Benavente

2018-2019
Puebla, México

- lesson planning
- teaching young learners
- monitoring progress and providing feedback

Education

B.A. in Linguistics
University of Oklahoma

2017
Norman, OK, USA

Languages

- English (C2)
- Farsi (C2)
- Spanish (A2)

31. Si el lugar donde trabajas o estudias tuviera una vacante. ¿Cuál de los siguientes candidatos sería tu PRIMERA escogencia? *

    Mark only one oval.

    ◯ Hanz Müller

    ◯ Gary Bradley

    ◯ Miguel López

    ◯ Carlos Torres

    ◯ Fred Jenkins

    ◯ Ahmed Mortezai

32. Por favor justifica por qué seleccionaste a ese candidato. Sé tan especifico como sea posible con referencias a la hoja de vida del candidato. *

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

33. Si el lugar donde trabajas o estudias tuviera una vacante. ¿Cuál de los siguientes candidatos sería tu SEGUNDA escogencia? *

    Mark only one oval.

    ◯ Hanz Müller

    ◯ Gary Bradley

    ◯ Miguel López

    ◯ Carlos Torres

    ◯ Fred Jenkins

    ◯ Ahmed Mortezai

34. Por favor justifica por qué seleccionaste a ese candidato. Sé tan especifico como sea posible con referencias a la hoja de vida del candidato. *

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

35. Si el lugar donde trabajas o estudias tuviera una vacante. ¿Cuál de los siguientes candidatos sería tu TERCERA escogencia? *

Mark only one oval.

◯ Hanz Müller

◯ Gary Bradley

◯ Miguel López

◯ Carlos Torres

◯ Fred Jenkins

◯ Ahmed Mortezai

36. Por favor justifica por qué seleccionaste a ese candidato. Sé tan especifico como sea posible con referencias a la hoja de vida del candidato. *

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Hoja de vida de aplicantes – Parte 2

Tomás Reyes

+593 953 809 266

Ambato, Ecuador
tom.reyes@yahoo.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
U.E. Particular Iberoamérica

2018-2021
Ambato, Ecuador

- Lesson planning
- Creating and adapting materials
- Designing assessment instruments
- Providing instruction

English Teacher
U.E. Atenas

2016-2018
Ambato, Ecuador

- Lesson planning
- Providing instruction
- Evaluating syllabus

Education

Cambridge CELTA Certificate Pass B
British Council Bogotá

2016
Bogotá, Colombia

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (C2)

Darius Enache
+593 912 401 104

Tena, Ecuador
dar.enache@hotmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
U.E. José Peláez

2020-2021
Tena, Ecuador

- Lesson planning
- Providing instruction
- Evaluating and adapting curriculum

English Teacher
U.E. Ciudad de Tena

2018-2019
Tena, Ecuador

- Lesson planning
- Creating supplementary materials
- Providing instruction

Education

B.A. in English/Education
Montana State University

2017
Bozeman, MT, USA

Languages

English (C2)
Romanian (C2)
Spanish (B1)

Lars Jakobsson

+593 975 058 265

Ibarra, Ecuador
larsjak@gmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
Colegio Oviedo

2020-present
Ibarra, Ecuador

- Delivering language lessons
- Planning lessons
- Preparing learners for standardized tests

English Teacher
U.E. Provincia de Pastaza

2017-2020
Puyo, Ecuador

- Delivering language lessons
- Collaborating with other teachers
- Designing assessment tools

Education

Cambridge CELTA Certificate Pass B
British Council Bogotá

2017
Bogotá, Colombia

Languages

English (C2)
Swedish (C2)
Spanish (B1)

Sean Phillips

+593 983 459 222

Puyo, Ecuador
seanjphillips@yahoo.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
U.E. Provincia de Pastaza

2019-2021
Puyo, Ecuador

- Providing instruction
- Designing skill-based tests
- Collaborating with other teachers

English Teacher
Colegio Orellana

2018-2019
Puyo, Ecuador

- Providing instruction
- Lesson planning
- Collaborating with other teachers

Education

Cambridge CELTA Certificate Pass
British Council Bogotá

2018
Bogotá, Colombia

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (B1)

Daniel Cabezas
+593 956990746

Riobamba, Ecuador
daniel.cabezas@gmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
U.E. Vigotsky

2019-2021
Riobamba, Ecuador

- Designing and evaluating assessment instruments
- Teaching general English
- Collaborating with other teachers

English Teacher
U.E. San Felipe Neri

2017-2019
Riobamba, Ecuador

- Teaching general English
- Lesson planning
- Tutoring weaker students after school

Education

B.A. in English
University of the West

2017
Rosemead, CA, USA

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (C2)

Chris Buckley

+593 969 230 111

Tulcán, Ecuador
cbuckley@gmail.com

Work Experience

English Teacher
Colegio Vicente Fierro

2018-2021
Tulcán, Ecuador

- Assessing students' skills and use of English
- Teaching general English
- Preparing students for international examinations

Education

B.A. in English Teaching
New Hampshire University

2018
Durham, NH, USA

Languages

English (C2)
Spanish (A1)

37. Si el lugar donde trabajas o estudias tuviera una vacante. ¿Cuál de los siguientes candidatos sería tu PRIMERA escogencia? *

Mark only one oval.

◯ Tomás Reyes

◯ Darius Enache

◯ Lars Jakobsson

◯ Sean Phillips

◯ Daniel Cabezas

◯ Chris Buckley

38. Por favor justifica por qué seleccionaste a ese candidato. Sé tan especifico como sea posible con referencias a la hoja de vida del candidato. *

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

39. Si el lugar donde trabajas o estudias tuviera una vacante. ¿Cuál de los siguientes candidatos sería tu SEGUNDA escogencia? *

Mark only one oval.

◯ Tomás Reyes

◯ Darius Enache

◯ Lars Jakobsson

◯ Sean Phillips

◯ Daniel Cabezas

◯ Chris Buckley

40. Por favor justifica por qué seleccionaste a ese candidato. Sé tan especifico como sea posible con referencias a la hoja de vida del candidato. *

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

41. Si el lugar donde trabajas o estudias tuviera una vacante. ¿Cuál de los siguientes candidatos sería tu TERCERA escogencia? *

Mark only one oval.

◯ Tomás Reyes

◯ Darius Enache

◯ Lars Jakobsson

◯ Sean Phillips

◯ Daniel Cabezas

◯ Chris Buckley

42. Por favor justifica por qué seleccionaste a ese candidato. Sé tan especifico como sea posible con referencias a la hoja de vida del candidato. *

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix E: Acuerdo Ministerial 82 – Ecuadorian legislation on discrimination at work

NORMATIVA ERRADICACION DE LA DISCRIMINACION EN EL AMBITO LABORAL
 Acuerdo Ministerial 82
Registro Oficial 16 de 16-jun.-2017
 Estado: Vigente

No. MDT-2017-0082

EL MINISTRO DEL TRABAJO

Considerando:

Que, la Constitución de la República del Ecuador, en su artículo 11 referente a los principios de aplicación de derechos, establece la igualdad de todas las personas y el total goce de los derechos, deberes y obligaciones. "Nadie podrá ser discriminado por razones de etnia, lugar de nacimiento, edad, sexo, identidad de género, identidad cultural, estado civil, idioma, religión, ideología, filiación política, pasado judicial, condición socio-económica, condición migratoria, orientación sexual, estado de salud, portar VIH, discapacidad, diferencia física; ni por cualquier otra distinción, personal o colectiva, temporal o permanente, que tenga por objeto o resultado menoscabar o anular el reconocimiento, goce o ejercicio de los derechos. La ley sancionará toda forma de discriminación;

Que, la Constitución de la República, en su artículo 33 establece que: "El trabajo es un derecho y un deber social, y un derecho económico, fuente de realización personal y base de la economía. El Estado garantizará a las personas trabajadoras el pleno respeto a su dignidad, una vida decorosa, remuneraciones y retribuciones justas y el desempeño de un trabajo saludable y libremente escogido o aceptado";

 Que, la Constitución de la República, en su artículo 35 señala que: "Las personas adultas mayores, niñas, niños y adolescentes, mujeres embarazadas, personas con discapacidad, personas privadas de libertad y quienes adolezcan de enfermedades catastróficas o de alta complejidad, recibirán atención prioritaria y especializada en los ámbitos público y privado. La misma atención prioritaria recibirán las personas en situación de riesgo, las víctimas de violencia doméstica y sexual, maltrato infantil, desastres naturales o antropogénicos. El Estado prestará especial protección a las personas en condición de doble vulnerabilidad";

Que, la Constitución de la República, en el artículo 47, numeral 5 establece que: "El Estado reconoce a las personas con discapacidad en derecho al trabajo en condiciones de igualdad de oportunidades, fomentando sus capacidades y potencialidades, a través de políticas que permitan su incorporación en entidades públicas y privadas";

Que, la Constitución de la República, en el artículo 66, referente a los derechos de libertad, garantiza en su numeral 3, el derecho de libertad de integridad personal, es decir física, psíquica, moral y sexual; y, en el numeral 11 del mismo artículo, garantiza el derecho a la libertad de guardar reserva de sus convicciones, señalando que: "nadie podrá ser obligado a declarar sobre las mismas, en ningún caso se podrá exigir o utilizar sin autorización del titular o de sus legítimos representantes la información personal o de terceros sobre sus creencias

religiosas, filiación o pensamiento político; ni sobre datos referenciales a su salud y vida sexual, salvo por necesidades de atención médica.";

Que, la Constitución de la República del Ecuador, en su artículo 226 establece que: "Las instituciones del Estado, sus organismos, dependencias, las servidoras o servidores públicos y las personas que actúen en virtud de una potestad estatal ejercerán solamente las competencias y facultades que les sean atribuidas en la Constitución y la ley. Tendrán el deber de coordinar acciones para el cumplimiento de sus fines y hacer efectivo el goce y ejercicio de los derechos reconocidos en NORMATIVA ERRADICACION DE LA DISCRIMINACION EN EL AMBITO LABORAL - Página 1 LEXIS FINDER - www.lexis.com.ec la Constitución";

Que, la Constitución de la República del Ecuador, en el artículo 325 señala que el Estado garantizará el derecho al trabajo;

Que, la Constitución de la República del Ecuador, en su artículo 331 garantiza a las mujeres "...igualdad en el acceso al empleo a la formación y promoción laboral y profesional, a la remuneración equitativa, y a la iniciativa de trabajo autónomo. Se adoptarán todas las medidas necesarias para eliminar las desigualdades. Se prohíbe toda forma de discriminación, acoso o acto de violencia de cualquier índole, sea directa o indirecta, que afecte a las mujeres en el trabajo.";

Que, el Convenio 100 de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo, ratificado por el Ecuador y publicado en el Registro Oficial No. 177 del 03 de abril de 1957 , determina la igualdad de remuneración entre la mano de obra masculina y la mano de obra femenina por un trabajo de igual valor, estableciendo que las tasas de remuneración sean fijadas sin discriminación en cuanto al sexo;

Que, el Convenio 111 de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo, relativo a la discriminación, ratificado por nuestro país el 30 de julio de 1962, señala varios aspectos concernientes a la discriminación en el empleo y la ocupación;

Que, el Convenio 156 de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo, ratificado por nuestro país y publicado en el Registro Oficial Suplemento No. 641 del 15 de febrero de 2012 , hace referencia a la igualdad de oportunidades y de trato entre trabajadores y trabajadoras con responsabilidades familiares; en su artículo 3 señala que: "...con miras a crear la igualdad efectiva de oportunidades y de trato entre trabajadores y trabajadoras, cada país Miembro deberá incluir entre los objetivos de su política nacional el de permitir que las personas con responsabilidades familiares que desempeñen o deseen desempeñar un empleo ejerzan su derecho a hacerlo sin ser objeto de discriminación y, en la medida de lo posible, sin conflicto entre sus responsabilidades familiares y profesionales";

Que, la Decisión del Acuerdo de Cartagena 584, publicada en el Registro Oficial del Ecuador, Suplemento 461 de 15 noviembre de 2004, emite el Instrumento Andino de Seguridad y Salud en el Trabajo, que en su artículo 11 dispone que: "En todo lugar de trabajo se deberán tomar medidas tendientes a disminuir los riesgos laborales. Estas medidas deberán basarse, en directrices sobre sistemas de gestión de la seguridad y salud en el trabajo y su entorno como responsabilidad social y empresarial, además de fomentar la adaptación del trabajo y de los puestos de trabajo a las capacidades de los trabajadores, habida cuenta de su estado de salud física y mental, teniendo en cuenta la ergonomía y las demás disciplinas

relacionadas con los diferentes tipos de riesgos psicosociales en el trabajo";

Que, la decisión citada anteriormente, manifiesta en su artículo 18, que: "Todos los trabajadores tienen derecho a desarrollar sus labores en un ambiente de trabajo adecuado y propicio para el pleno ejercicio de sus facultades físicas y mentales, que garanticen su salud, seguridad y bienestar. Los derechos de consulta, participación, formación, vigilancia y control de la salud en materia de prevención, forman parte del derecho de los trabajadores a una adecuada protección en materia de seguridad y salud en el trabajo";

Que, esta misma decisión indica que en artículo 26, que: "El empleador deberá tener en cuenta, en las evaluaciones del plan integral de prevención de riesgos, los factores de riesgo que pueden incidir en las funciones de procreación de los trabajadores y trabajadoras, en particular por la exposición a los agentes físicos, químicos, biológicos, ergonómicos y psicosociales, con el fin de adoptar las medidas preventivas necesarias";

Que, el Decreto Ejecutivo 60, referente al Plan Plurinacional para eliminar la Discriminación Racial, en su artículo 1 señala que es una política pública la aplicación a nivel nacional, por todos los medios del Estado del "Plan Plurinacional para Eliminar la Discriminación Racial";

Que, el Decreto 2393, en su artículo 189 numeral 1, dispone que la Dirección General o las Subdirecciones del Trabajo, sancionaran las infracciones en materia de seguridad e higiene del trabajo, de conformidad con los Arts. 435 y 628 del Código del Trabajo.

Que, el Código del Trabajo en el artículo 79, hace referencia a la Igualdad de remuneración, y establece que a trabajo igual corresponde igual remuneración, sin discriminación en razón de nacimiento, edad, sexo, etnia, color, origen social, idioma, religión, filiación política, posición económica, orientación sexual, estado de salud, discapacidad, o diferencia de cualquier otra índole; más, la especialización y práctica en la ejecución del trabajo se tendrán en cuenta para los efectos de la remuneración;

Que, el Código del Trabajo en sus artículos 42 y 220, dispone las obligaciones del empleador, indicando que se deberá garantizar la igualdad de oportunidades y la no discriminación en el trato de trabajadores y contratos colectivos;

Que, el Código de Trabajo en su artículo 539, manifiesta que: "Corresponde al Ministerio de Trabajo y Empleo la reglamentación, organización y protección del trabajo y las demás atribuciones establecidas en este Código y en la Ley de Régimen Administrativo en materia laboral.";

Que, la Ley Orgánica de Servicio Público señala como uno de sus objetivos y principios la no discriminación e inclusión laboral;

Que, mediante Acuerdo Ministerial 398, publicado en el registro oficial 322, del 27 de julio de 2006 se expidió la normativa regulatoria en materia laboral que prohíbe la terminación de relación laboral a personas con VIH-SIDA;

Que, a través de los años se ha discriminado a las personas trabajadoras, por distinciones del color de su piel, sexo, religión, idioma, opinión o filiación política, origen social, condición migratoria, nacionalidad, estado civil, pasado judicial, discapacidad, poseer algún tipo de enfermedad, encontrarse en periodo de gestación, entre otros, que ha impedido que

mantengan igualdad de oportunidades de trabajo, dando como resultado la precarización laboral; sin embargo con el presente acuerdo se busca un libre acceso al trabajo sin exclusión ni restricción, basados en el respeto e igualdad.

Que, la Constitución de la República del Ecuador, en su artículo 154 numeral 1 dispone que a las Ministras y Ministros de Estado, además de las atribuciones establecidas en la Ley, les corresponde ejercer la rectoría de las políticas públicas del área a su cargo y expedir los acuerdos y resoluciones administrativas que requiera su gestión;

Por lo que, en ejercicio de sus atribuciones legales.

Acuerda:

EXPEDIR LA NORMATIVA PARA LA ERRADICACION DE LA DISCRIMINACION EN EL AMBITO LABORAL.

Art. 1.- OBJETO.- El presente acuerdo tiene como objeto establecer regulaciones que permitan el acceso a los procesos de selección de personal en igualdad de condiciones, así como garantizar la igualdad y no discriminación en el ámbito laboral, estableciendo mecanismos de prevención de riesgos psicosociales.

Art. 2.- DEFINICION DE DISCRIMINACION.- Se entenderá como discriminación a cualquier trato desigual, exclusión o preferencia hacia una persona, basados en la identidad de género, orientación sexual, edad, discapacidad, vivir con VIH/SIDA, etnia, tener o desarrollar una enfermedad catastrófica, idioma, religión, nacionalidad, lugar de nacimiento, ideología, opinión política, condición migratoria, estado civil, pasado judicial, estereotipos estéticos, encontrarse en periodo de gestación, lactancia o cualquier otra, que tenga por efecto anular, alterar o impedir el pleno ejercicio de los derechos individuales o colectivos, en los procesos de selección y durante la existencia de la relación laboral.

No se considerará como discriminación los criterios de selección de talento humano, basados en el conocimiento técnico específico, experiencia necesaria y además requisitos inherentes para el adecuado desenvolvimiento de la vacante laboral.

Art. 3.- AMBITO DE APLICACION.- Las disposiciones de esta normativa son de aplicación obligatoria para el sector público y privado, en reconocimiento de los derechos de las personas y de los grupos de atención prioritaria y/o en condiciones de vulnerabilidad.

Art. 4.- PARTICIPACION EN PROCESOS DE SELECCION DE PERSONAL.- Todas las personas tienen el derecho de participar en igualdad de oportunidades y libres de discriminación de cualquier índole en los procesos de selección de personal en el sector público y privado.

Art. 5.- PROHIBICION DE EXIGENCIA DE REQUISITOS EN LA SELECCION DE PERSONAL.- Dentro de todo proceso de selección de personal para el acceso al trabajo se prohíbe solicitar al postulante:

a) Pruebas y/o resultados de embarazo.
b) Información referente al estado civil.
c) Fotografías en el perfil de la hoja de vida.

d) Pruebas y/o resultados de exámenes de VIH/SIDA.
e) Información de cualquier índole acerca de su pasado judicial.
f) Su asistencia prohibiendo vestimentas propias referentes a su etnia o a su identidad de género.
g) Pólizas de seguro privado por enfermedades degenerativas o catastróficas.
h) Establecer como requisitos, criterios de selección referentes a la edad, sexo, etnia, identidad de género, religión, pasado judicial, y otros requisitos discriminatorios detallados en el presente acuerdo.

Art. 6.- PROHIBICIONES DE DISCRIMINACION EN EL ESPACIO LABORAL.- En los espacios laborales, tanto públicos como privados, se prohíbe:

a) La desvalorización de habilidades, aptitudes, estigmatización y estereotipos negativos.
b) La divulgación de la intimidad corporal y orientación sexual diversa con fines peyorativos.
c) La intimidación y hostigamiento.
d) La segregación ocupacional y abuso en actividades operativas.
e) Asignar tareas no acordes a la discapacidad, formación y/o conocimiento con el fin de obligar al trabajador a terminar con la relación laboral.
f) Cualquier tipo de discriminación en procesos de ascensos laborales.
g) La limitación o coerción a la libertad de expresión cultural.
h) Cualquier tipo de agresiones verbales y/o físicas basadas en género, edad, costumbres, ideología, idioma, orientación sexual, identidad, de género, vivir con VIH o cualquier otra distinción personal o colectiva.
i) Determinar dentro del área laboral, espacios exclusivos que señalen evidente diferenciación injustificada y discriminatoria en el uso de servicios higiénicos, comedores, salas recreacionales, espacios de reunión, ascensores, etc.

Art. 7.- DENUNCIA DE DISCRIMINACION.- En caso de incumplimiento de lo dispuesto en los Arts. 5 y 6 del presente Acuerdo, el postulante o el trabajador podrán denunciar cualquier acto discriminatorio, de manera escrita o verbal, detallando los hechos y anexando pruebas que sustenten la denuncia, ante las Inspectorías provinciales de Trabajo, donde se seguirá el siguiente proceso:

1. Una vez que se ha ingresado la denuncia, se procederá con el sorteo correspondiente, en el término de 2 días, a fin de determinar quién es la o el inspector que se encontrará a cargo de la causa.
2. El inspector se encargará de realizar la notificación al denunciado, a fin de que este ejerza su derecho a la defensa, y se pronuncie en el término de 5 días.

Deberá además poner en conocimiento de la Dirección de Grupos Prioritarios del Ministerio rector del Trabajo, la denuncia ingresada, a fin de que en caso de ser necesario acompañen en el desarrollo del proceso administrativo.

3. Con o sin la respuesta del denunciado; a juicio del inspector o a petición de parte, se convocará a audiencia para escuchar a las partes en el término de 5 días.
4. En cualquier parte del proceso investigativo, el inspector puede acudir al establecimiento del empleador, para realizar una inspección sin aviso previo.
5. En caso de que no exista evidencia suficiente de la discriminación, ya sea en los procesos de selección o en los espacios laborales; se procederá con el archivo de la denuncia presentada.

6. En caso de considerarse necesario, la autoridad a cargo del proceso, podrá solicitar a la Dirección de Atención a Grupos Prioritarios o a la Dirección de Seguridad y Salud Ocupacional, el criterio necesario, previo a la elaboración del informe correspondiente.

7. De considerar que se ha incurrido en un acto de discriminación, el inspector a cargo del proceso, en el término de 5 días, elaborará un informe dirigido al Director Regional, para que éste en el término de 15 días, resuelva sobre la pertinencia o no de sancionar al empleador.

8. Las sanciones a establecerse, se realizarán dependiendo de la gravedad del hecho corroborado y de que se hayan dado o no medidas de reparación.

El monto de las sanciones impuestas podrá ser desde 3 hasta 20 RBU.

En caso de reincidencia, se procederá a sancionar con el doble de la sanción impuesta previamente, sin superar las 20 RBU.

El proceso como tal, no podrá exceder el término de 45 días, desde el ingreso de la denuncia, hasta la emisión de la resolución por parte del Director Regional.

Art. 8.- DERIVACION.- Si en cualquier estado del proceso administrativo que se lleva a cabo, se presume la existencia de un delito o vulneración de Derechos Humanos, la autoridad del Trabajo deberá poner en conocimiento de la autoridad competente tales hechos, para que procedan a iniciar las investigaciones correspondientes.

El proceso sobre discriminación que se ha iniciado en las Direcciones Regionales de Trabajo deberá concluir dentro de los términos establecidos, independiente de las investigaciones que se encuentre realizando la autoridad competente, por las presunciones de un delito.

Art. 9.- DEL PROGRAMA DE PREVENCION DE RIESGOS PSICOSOCIALES.- En todas las empresas e instituciones públicas y privadas, que cuenten con más de 10 trabajadores, se deberá implementar el programa de prevención de riesgos psicosociales, en base a los parámetros y formatos establecidos por la Autoridad Laboral, mismo que deberá contener acciones para fomentar una cultura de no discriminación y de igualdad de oportunidades en el ámbito laboral.

El programa deberá ser implementado y reportado cada año al Ministerio Rector del Trabajo, por medio del sistema que se determine para el efecto.

Art. 10.- DE LAS SANCIONES POR INCUMPLIMIENTO DEL PROGRAMA.- Las empresas e instituciones públicas y privadas que no cumplan con lo establecido en el artículo anterior, tendrán como sanción: montos pecuniarios, cierre de establecimientos o locales; y/o la suspensión de actividades de conformidad a lo establecido en los Artículos 435, 436 y 628 del Código del Trabajo, y conforme a las normas que en esa materia haya emitido o emita el Ministerio rector del Trabajo.

En el caso de instituciones del Estado, serán sujetos de sanción las y los servidores públicos que incumplieren la aplicación del presente Acuerdo, de conformidad a lo establecido en el régimen disciplinario de la LOSEP, su Reglamento General y los reglamentos internos institucionales.

DISPOSICIONES GENERALES

PRIMERA.- Conforme a lo establecido en el presente acuerdo y en el ámbito de sus competencias, la Autoridad Laboral publicará los formatos estandarizados que deberán aplicar las empresas e instituciones públicas y privadas, siendo responsabilidad de ésta, mantener los mismos en su página institucional para el acceso correspondiente.

DISPOSICIONES TRANSITORIAS

PRIMERA.- La Autoridad Laboral en el plazo de 30 días a partir de la publicación del presente Acuerdo en el Registro Oficial, incluirá en su página institucional el programa de prevención de riesgos psicosociales, así como las guías técnicas y herramientas necesarias para el cumplimiento de lo establecido en el presente acuerdo, los mismos podrán ser ajustados por cada empresa o institución de conformidad a sus particularidades, sin dejar de cumplir los parámetros básicos establecidos en esta norma.

SEGUNDA.- La autoridad laboral iniciará el proceso de control de cumplimiento del programa de prevención de riesgos psicosociales a partir del 1 de Enero del 2018.

TERCERA.- La Autoridad Laboral organizará y realizará charlas y talleres de socialización y sensibilización sobre el programa de prevención de riesgos psicosociales.

DISPOSICION FINAL.- El presente Acuerdo entrará en vigencia a partir de la fecha de su publicación en el Registro Oficial.

Dado en la ciudad de San Francisco de Quito Distrito Metropolitano, a 11 de mayo de 2017.

f.) Dr. Leonardo Berrezueta Carrión, Ministro del Trabajo.