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Abstract

This qualitative study explores the way various education stakeholders, including students, parents and other subject teachers (OSTs), perceive Indonesian teachers of English (ITEs) in relation to the strong preference for native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) in the field of English language teaching in Indonesia. More importantly, it investigates the way the ITEs perceive their professional selves despite the other stakeholders’ perceptions. The study also explores some relevant issues, such as the way the stakeholders perceive English, the way they conceptualize an ideal English teacher, the way they understand the term ‘native English speaker’ and the way they perceive NESTs.

The study was conducted at a senior high school in Malang, Indonesia, involving 178 third-year students, twelve parents, eight OSTs and six ITEs. Semi-structured interviews were employed for collecting data from eighteen students, the twelve parents, the eight OSTs and the six ITEs. In interviews with the students, a computer-based image elicitation technique was used for exploring the racial aspects of students’ various concepts of an ideal English teacher. Additionally, 160 students were involved in group discussions. In the data analysis, a hermeneutic-reconstructive approach was used.

This study reveals that the participants’ perceptions of English are not isolated from sociocultural, economic and political factors related to the language. This suggests that there is a discourse closely intertwined with such complex factors in classrooms which influences the identity of teachers. Furthermore, it is found that the participants’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher are multifaceted. The native speaker fallacy, the belief that ideal English teachers are native speakers of English, is visible among the students and there is a racial dimension to the students’ various concepts of the teacher. Nevertheless, the fallacy was not dominant in the participants’ conceptualizations. Generally, the perceived characteristics of an ideal English teacher identified in this study favor neither NESTs nor NNESTs. Therefore, there are opportunities for both NESTs and ITEs to be regarded as ‘good’ English teachers. The study also indicates that the native speaker fallacy is problematic not only because it is founded on misconceptions about native English speakers, but also because there are misunderstandings about the term ‘native English speaker’, particularly among students and parents.

Surrounded by such problematic issues, the professional identity of NESTs and ITEs were perceived differently by the participants. The stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers had
influenced the way the participants perceived NESTs and ITEs. NESTs were seen as having more strengths, particularly by students, parents and OSTs. ITEs, by contrast, were perceived as having more varied strengths and weaknesses. The students, parents and OSTs used the stereotypical image of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers as a benchmark against which to assess ITEs.

ITEs perceived themselves positively despite the presence of negative perceptions. Through the analytical lenses of social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978) and dialogical self theory (Hermans, 2001), this study has identified two factors contributing to ITEs’ self-perceptions: (1) ITEs’ awareness of different characteristics of NESTs and ITEs, and their ability to see their distinctive features as strengths, and (2) ITEs’ ability to see other individuals, particularly students, as an important element of their professional selves. Overall, this study contributes to the understanding of the complexity and multifacetedness of ITEs’ professional identity.
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All dreams are possible...
I still remember. It was in June 1997 after the national examination when my mother asked me to study English at a state university in my hometown. She told me that English is a door to prosperity and that studying the language would give me good opportunities in the future. Why English? I never questioned her. As a son of a traditional Javanese family, I always obeyed what my parents asked me to do. I believe that parents’ thoughts define children’s fate. *Heaven is under mothers’ feet*: that is what I learned from my mother.

I spent four years studying English at the university. Although I had learnt English since junior high school, my times at the university were not easy. Learning English is different from learning Javanese, my first language, or from learning Indonesian language, my national language, as the two languages are spoken by people in my local community. Learning English was more difficult because people in the community do not speak it. Moreover, I had never been to places where English is spoken as a daily language. The only learning sources I had were my English teachers and movies on TV. My only motivation for learning the language was my mother’s belief that it would help me in my life; I believed her.

My mother was right. It was not hard for me to get a job as a teacher. I graduated in 2001. Since then, I have been an English teacher. I had taught English for children and teenagers in the inland of Borneo, given training workshops for employees of some state-owned companies, and spent much time teaching students at some higher education institutions in Indonesia. I am now a full-time lecturer of a state polytechnic in Indonesia.
My twelve year experience of being in the field of English language teaching has shown me many things. One of them, which personally concerned me, is the way native and non-native English-speaking teachers are seen by individuals in the local community. For me, English is a paradox. On the one hand, it elevates my identity. Using the language means yielding my image as an educated Indonesian, a teacher of English. On the other hand, the way I use English is a sociolinguistic marker of my non-nativeness. It denotes my image as a non-native speaker of English who is often stereotyped as having relatively lower language competence as compared to native English speakers. I believe that teaching English is complex, requiring more than English competence, and that both native and non-native speakers of English can be good English teachers. However, in the field of English language teaching, native and non-native English-speaking teachers have different personae. Native English-speaking teachers are often seen as ‘professional’ teachers. On the contrary, non-native English-speaking teachers are often perceived as less competent. Because of such unequal images and status, there is a strong preference for native English-speaking teachers as teachers of English.

In 2005 I went to Monash University to undertake a Master of Education in TESOL. During my study at the university, I met many fellow non-native English-speaking teachers from various countries. Knowing them was both a blessing and an encouragement. I found out that I was not the only one who felt that non-native English-speaking teachers are ‘second-class citizens’. It was an encouraging experience; one student, a fellow teacher from Japan, showed me a picture (Figure 1. Japanese advertisement) which changed the way I see the issue of native and non-native English-speaking teachers. The picture sparked my curiosity; it inspired me to question the unequal status and explore the issue of native and non-native English-speaking teachers, which has long been a cause of heated academic debates in English language teaching. I became aware that the issue has been addressed by many researchers
and that, in spite of previous research, voices from the periphery, from contexts where English is used as a foreign language, particularly from Indonesia, are still underexplored.

Figure 1. Japanese advertisement

(E R English School, 2006)
I went back to Indonesia in early 2007, bringing with me a host of new questions to explore. What about Indonesian teachers of English? How do various education stakeholders perceive Indonesian teachers of English in relation to the strong preference for native English-speaking teachers? How do the Indonesian teachers of English perceive themselves? Such questions are the breath of this qualitative ethnographic study.
Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1. Background

English has become a world language. It is used in more than seventy territories in the world and has become a lingua franca for approximately two billion speakers (Graddol, 2006; Crystal, 2003; 2012). Canagarajah (2005) proposes that English is mostly used and learned out of its native settings; it is ‘more commonly used in multinational contexts by multilingual speakers than in homogeneous contexts by monolingual speakers’ (p. 23). Consequently, non-native English speakers outnumber native speakers of English (Crystal, 2003, 2012; Graddol, 2006). Crystal (2012) estimates that the ratio of non-native speakers and native speakers of English has reached approximately four to one. Furthermore, he suggests that the differential ratio will increase steadily as the population growth in contexts in which English is a second language is around twice that in contexts in which the language is used as a first language (see also Graddol, 2006).

Consistent with the ratio of non-native and native speakers of English, in the field of English language teaching, the majority of English teachers are non-native English speakers. Approximately, eighty percent of English teachers in the world are non-native speakers of English (Canagarajah, 2005; Graddol, 2006; Braine, 2010; Murray & Christison, 2011). Along with the existence of native and non-native English speakers, two terms emerged in the field of English language teaching: native English-speaking teachers (hereafter NESTs), which refers to English teachers who are native speakers of the language, and non-native English-speaking teachers (hereafter NNESTs), which refers to English teachers who are non-native speakers of the language. In this study, the term ‘NNESTs’ refers to all non-native English-
speaking teachers, including Indonesian teachers of English. To specifically refer to Indonesian teachers of English, the term ‘ITEs’ is used.

Despite the large number of NNESTs, there is a strong preference for NESTs (Mahboob, Uhrig, Newman, & Hartford, 2004; Clark & Paran, 2007; Moussu & Llurda, 2008; Braine, 2010; Selvi, 2010, 2014). The strong preference for NESTs has caused difficulties for NNESTs, particularly in terms of employment and classroom interactions (Amin, 1997; Kamhi-Stein, Aagard, Ching, Paik, & Sasser, 2004; Mahboob et al., 2004; Moussu, 2010). A study conducted by Clark and Paran (2007) in the United Kingdom revealed that employers considered individuals’ status as a native speaker of English as an important criterion in the recruitment of English teachers. A more recent study by Mahboob and Golden (2013), which analyzed 77 advertisements mostly from East Asia and from the Middle East, demonstrated that the problematic issue of the strong preference for NESTs is still visible in English language teaching professions. Based on their empirical findings, Mahboob and Golden argue that ‘there remains a distinction between NESTs and NNESTs, with a strong preference for NESTs as candidates for English teaching positions’ (p. 77). Consistent with the two studies, Walkinshaw and Oanh (2014) assert that in English teaching industry in East and Southeast Asia, NESTs are often seen as ‘the gold standard’ of spoken and written English, whereas NNESTs are often seen as lacking linguistic skills (p. 1).

The findings demonstrated by Clark and Paran’s (2007) and Mahboob and Golden’s (2013) research, and the view proposed by Walkinshaw and Oanh (2014) reflect the discourse of native and non-native English-speaking teachers in the context of this study. In Indonesia, the strong preference for NESTs is prevalent; many English course institutions and schools hire native speakers of English regardless of the speakers’ education backgrounds. Not only are the native speakers of English often seen as better English teachers, they are also often regarded as a symbol of prestige which can elevate the status of the institutions and
schools, and attract more students. Such a circumstance marginalizes NNESTs (Maum, 2002); it has a negative implication for the ‘teacher persona’ of NNESTs (Selvi, 2014, p. 579). The circumstance is likely to influence the way NNESTs, particularly Indonesian teachers of English (hereafter ITEs), perceive themselves and are seen by other individuals in the local community because the identity of the teachers is constructed in sociocultural spaces (Duff & Uchida, 1997; Norton, 1997; Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, & Johnson, 2005).

1.2. Objectives of the research

Addressing the research problem described in the introductory section (1.1), the overarching purpose of this study is to understand the way the professional identity of ITEs is perceived by various education stakeholders, including students, parents and other subject teachers (hereafter OSTs) in relation to the strong preference for NESTs in Indonesia. More specifically, the study focuses on exploring how ITEs perceive their professional selves despite the perceptions of the education stakeholders. Additionally, the study also explores some relevant issues, including the way the research participants perceive English, as their views of the language are likely to shape their perceptions of both NESTs and NNESTs (Murray & Christison, 2011). Because the strong preference for NESTs and particularly the way the participants perceive NESTs and ITEs are closely related to the concept of an ideal English teacher, the study also explores the way the participants conceptualize an ideal English teacher. The participants’ understandings of the term ‘native English speaker’ are also explored as the ‘native speaker’ concept is often used as the norm and model for language learning (Murray & Christison, 2011). Last, this study also investigates the way the participants perceive NESTs, as their images are often used as a point of opposition for
generating the images of NNESTs (Brutt-Griffler & Samimi, 2001; Davies, 2003; Murray & Christison, 2011).

1.3. **Research questions**

Informed by the research objectives, this study addresses the following research questions:

1. How do various education stakeholders, including students, parents, other subject teachers and Indonesian teachers of English, perceive English?
2. How do the various education stakeholders conceptualize an ideal English teacher?
3. How do they understand the term ‘native English speaker’?
4. How do they perceive native English-speaking teachers?
5. How do they perceive Indonesian teachers of English?

1.4. **Scope of the research**

The problematic issue of the strong preference for NESTs is pervasive; it can be found in various contexts (Clark & Paran, 2007; Braine, 2010; Mahboob & Golden, 2013). However, this study focuses on exploring the issue in a context where English is used as a foreign language. More specifically, it investigates the way the professional identity of ITEs is perceived by various education stakeholders at a senior high school in Malang, a city in East Java, Indonesia. The participants involved in the study were individual stakeholders of the school, including students, parents, OSTs and ITEs (further discussed in Chapter 3).

In terms of methodology, the study employs three theoretical frameworks: Homi Bhabha’s (1983) concepts of colonial discourse and stereotype, Henri Tajfel’s (1978) social identity theory, and Hubert Hermans’ (2001) dialogical self theory. Subsequently, the analysis
of data in this study focuses on aspects which can be seen or identified and understood through the analytical lenses of these three theoretical frameworks.

1.5. Research significance

The significance of this study is founded upon some rationales. First, considering the large number of NNESTs and the pervasiveness of the strong preference for NESTs, there is a need to understand the experiences of English teachers from various backgrounds, particularly NNESTs (Park, 2012). As the strong preference for NESTs marginalizes NNESTs, it is important to understand how such a problematic issue affects the way ITEs perceive their professional selves. Furthermore, understanding English teachers is important as they are critical elements of the teaching and learning of English; it is necessary to understand the ‘professional, cultural, political, and individual identities which they claim or which are assigned to them’ (Varghese et al., 2005, p. 22). Third, many studies have addressed the issue of native and non-native English-speaking teachers (e.g. Mahboob, 2004; Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Ling & Braine, 2007; Chun, 2004; Sung, 2014). However, research which focuses on the professional identity of ITEs in relation to the strong preference for NESTs is scarce. Such a gap provides a research area to explore. Additionally, this study is also practically significant as it generates empirical findings which indicate the way the various education stakeholders perceive ITEs and how the teachers perceive their professional selves. Revealing the teachers’ perceived strengths and weaknesses, the findings are useful for ITEs, particularly for their professional development, and for teacher training institutions which prepare future teachers of English as a foreign language, particularly in the Indonesian context.
1.6. Organization of thesis

This thesis is arranged into eight chapters. The first chapter introduces the research problem; it also presents the objectives and questions of the research. Chapter 2 provides a review of literature guiding the research and introducing the theoretical frameworks employed in the study. Chapter 3 deals with methodology of the research, outlining philosophical and methodological aspects of the study. Chapters 4 to 7 present discussions of empirical findings gathered from the four groups of participants: students, parents, OSTs and ITEs. Addressing the research questions, chapter 8 presents summaries of the findings and discussions of the way they align. In this last chapter, conclusions arising from the study are proposed.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

As has been described in the introductory chapter, this research explores and elucidates the way the professional identity of ITEs is perceived by various education stakeholders in relation to the strong preference for NESTs in the field of English language teaching with particular reference to the Indonesian context. More specifically, it focuses on exploring the way ITEs perceive their professional selves in the context of other stakeholders’ perceptions of them. The study also explores some related issues such as the way the various stakeholders see English, the way they conceptualize an ideal English teacher, how they understand the term ‘native English speaker’, and how they perceive NESTs. This chapter presents a review of the literature which guides the research in exploring such concerns.

2.1. Native and non-native English-speaking teachers

The issue of native and non-native English-speaking teachers\(^1\) has long been a problematic subject in the field of English language teaching. NNESTs are often compared unfavourably to NESTs, resulting in the strong preference for the later (Borg, 2006; Butler, 2007; Braine, 2010). Medgyes (1992), one of the first researchers who explored the issue, in his seminal work ‘Native and Non-native: Who’s Worth More?’ convincingly argues that both NESTs and NNESTs can be good English teachers. They are ‘two different species’ who have different strengths and weaknesses (Medgyes, 1994, p. 25).

\(^1\) I am aware that these terms are problematic as they derive from the simplistic dichotomous terms of ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ speakers of English (Mahboob, 2005; Moussu & Llurda, 2008; Braine, 2010). I use them because there has been no consensus in finding more appropriate terms (Sharifian, 2009; Murray & Christison, 2011).
The view that NESTs and NNESTs each have their own advantages and disadvantages has been acknowledged by many researchers (e.g. Edge, 1988; Medgyes, 1992, 1994; Reves & Medgyes, 1994; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999; McKay, 2003; Cook, 2005). Generally, NESTs are described as having good language proficiency (Medgyes, 1994). They are more competent in using idiomatic and colloquial English (Medgyes, 1994; Reves & Medgyes, 1994). Therefore, they can be understood to teach a language rather than teach about language (Medgyes, 1994). On the other hand, NESTs do not share the emotional, social and cultural experiences of students who learn English as a second or foreign language; consequently, NESTs are often unable to empathize with learners of their language (McKay, 2003). Furthermore, NESTs do not share the same mother tongue with students, which is useful in second or foreign language learning (Medgyes, 1994; Reves & Medgyes, 1994).

While NESTs have such advantages and disadvantages, NNESTs have different strengths and weaknesses. Edge (1988) contends that it is important to give real models to students learning a foreign or second language. NNESTs who are native speakers of their students’ mother tongue are good models for the students (Edge, 1988; Medgyes, 1994; McKay, 2003; Cook, 2005). Such teachers share the experience of learning English as a foreign or second language (Edge, 1988; Medgyes, 1994; McKay, 2003). Therefore, they are more sensitive to students’ learning needs (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). Furthermore, these teachers can anticipate students’ language learning difficulties and share their own learning strategies with students (Medgyes, 1992, 1994). On the other hand, NNESTs generally have lower English language proficiency compared to NESTs (Medgyes, 1992, 1994); they are more dependent on textbooks in their teaching (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999); and they also have fewer insights into cultures related to English (Medgyes, 1994).

Despite such different strengths and weaknesses, in the field of English language teaching, NESTs and NNESTs appear to have different status. NESTs are commonly perceived
as ideal English teachers or professional teachers who have ‘prestigious’ status (Moussu, 2010, p. 764). On the other hand, NNESTs are often stereotyped as less competent or less qualified teachers (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 1999; Medgyes, 1999, 2001; McKay, 2002, 2003; Maum, 2002; Holliday, 2006, 2008, 2009); they are often seen as ‘second-grade’ teachers (Medgyes, 1994; Braine, 2004).

Such disparate views and different status of NESTs and NNESTs can be related to ‘the native speaker fallacy’ (Phillipson, 1992) and ‘native speakerism’ (Holliday, 2006, 2009). The native speaker fallacy is the belief that native speakers of English are ideal teachers for teaching the language (Phillipson, 1992). Such a belief has been widespread in the field of English language teaching (Mahboob et al., 2004; McKay, 2006; Braine, 2010). Native speakerism, as Holliday terms it, is an ideology characterized by the belief that NESTs represent Western culture from which ‘good’ standards of English language and its teaching methodology come. Native speakerism is based on the assumptions that native speakers of a language are the authorities on their language and have superior competence, and that learners of the language as a second or foreign language must aim for native-speaker competence as their main learning target (Canagarajah & Ben Said, 2011).

2.2. The professional identity of English teachers

The different stereotypes and disparate status of NESTs and NNESTs, and particularly the strong preference for NESTs, is thought to affect the professional identity of NNESTs and the way they perceive themselves as professionals in the field of English language teaching, because identity is not self-constructed; rather, it is constructed in sociocultural spaces and shaped by sociocultural values (Norton Pierce, 1995; Duff & Uchida, 1997; Norton, 1997; Varghese et al., 2005).
2.2.1. Identity

The concept of identity is one of the most commonly researched concepts in social science (Fina, Schiffrin, & Bamberg, 2006; Mockler, 2011a). In education, identity has also become an important issue. Many studies have employed the concept, especially those dealing with teachers and teacher education; however, as some researchers observe (Beijard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004; Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Mockler, 2011a, 2011b), these studies often lack a clear definition of ‘identity’.

What is identity?

To define the concept of identity, this research draws from the field of social psychology. In general, there are two perspectives of identity: the individual and social perspectives. The individual perspective focuses on self-aspects of individual identity; it is commonly employed for exploring personal aspects and the development processes of individual identity (Sedikides & Brewer, 2001). On the other hand, the social perspective regards identity as constituted by social processes; this perspective is commonly used in social psychology for examining relational and collective identity, and for exploring the way social processes contribute to the formation of identity (Sedikides & Brewer, 2001).

A very basic definition of identity can be extracted from answers to the question ‘who are you?’ (Vignoles, Schwartz, & Luyckx, 2011). Although this seems simple, Vignoles et al. assert that the answers are complex, as ‘you’ can be understood as singular or plural. Identity can refer to either an individual, (such as ‘I am an English teacher’) or larger social categories (such as ‘we are English teachers’). The term can also imply a reflexive-self such as ‘who am I?’ in interactions between individuals, or reflexive-selves such as ‘who are we?’ in social
interactions between groups. Therefore, in its simple definition identity can refer to the ‘self’ at the individual level or ‘selves’ at the group level.

Based on its level of inclusiveness, identity can be defined and classified into individual or personal identity, relational identity, and collective identity (Sedikides & Brewer, 2001). The individual or personal identity refers to ‘aspects of self-definition at the level of the individual person’ (Vignoles at al., 2011, p.3). This, Vignoles et al. suggest, covers self-aspects such as an individual’s goals, values, ideals, religious beliefs, standards for behavior, and life story. Identity in this sense is understood as a personal or individual entity. While the focus of personal or individual identity is ‘the agentic role of the individual in creating or discovering his or her own identity’ (Vignoles at al., 2011, p.3), relational identity refers to ‘aspects of the self associated with one’s relationships with significant others’ (Chen, Boucher, & Kraus, 2011, p.149). From this point of view, identity is seen as socially established. It is located within interpersonal space and is reliant upon recognition from within a particular social context. Collective identity is different from individual identity (which is understood as self-definition at the individual level) and relational identity (which refers to interpersonally formed identity). Collective identity refers to ‘people’s identification with the groups and social categories to which they belong’ (Vignoles at al., 2011, p.3). It includes the feelings, beliefs, and attitudes which result from the identification process (Vignoles et al., 2011). Therefore, collective identity can also be defined as membership in any social group (Taylor, 1997).

The nature of identity

The way identity is perceived has shifted from a common-sense view which sees identity as fixed and stable to a non-essentialist perspective which holds that identity is fluid and constantly negotiated. Studies on identity (e.g. Hall, 1996, 1997; Duff & Uchida, 1997;
Norton, 1997; Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998; Varghese et al., 2005) note three critical points. First, identity is neither fixed nor stable; it is ‘shifting’ and ‘in conflict’ (Varghese et al., 2005, p.35). It is always ‘multiple’ and ‘subject to change’ (Norton Pierce, 1995, p.9); it is always constructed (Hall, 1997). The concept of identity should not be understood as ‘an already accomplished fact’ (p.392); rather, it is ‘a “production” which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside representation’ (p.392). It always involves the question of ‘becoming’ (Hall, 1996, p.4). Second, identity is always contextually related to sociocultural and political settings (Duff & Uchida, 1997), and is, therefore, ‘multifaceted’ (Vignoles et al., 2011, p.6) and dynamic across time and space (Norton, 1997). Third, identity is constantly constructed and maintained through language and discourse (Norton, 1997; Varghese et al., 2005). Thus, identity and the way it is researched should not be approached using simplistic perspectives; exploration requires due recognition of its dynamic nature and multiplicity (Hall, 1996; 1997).

Identity, social psychology and colonial discourse

The perspectives on identity from social psychology have been useful frameworks for this study. However, theories on identity should be extended to take into account the past history and the colonial discourse (Hook, 2005). Some researchers (Hook, 2005; Okazaki, David, & Abellmann, 2008) criticize the field of social psychology for being ahistorical; it fails to attend to the larger discourse of colonialism. Okazaki et al. (2008) warn that works in psychology and many other related disciplines have missed historical perspectives. The field suffers from ‘the dangers of ahistoricity’, that is, the danger of being simplistic by only referring to the present time (p.91). Similarly, Hook (2005) recognizes that social psychologists have failed to notice colonial discourses. Reviewing the theoretical foundations of critical social psychology, Hook identifies the absence of postcolonial theory. He maintains
that because of such absence, there are ‘gaps in the growing orthodoxy of critical psychology’ (p.476). Postcolonial theory should provide the foundations of social psychology, as the theory is ‘psychological in both its concern and its critical resources’ (p.475).

History affects individuals; socially shared history plays a critical role in shaping and maintaining identity in social contexts (Liu & Hilton, 2005). Similarly, colonialism and its legacies produce a powerful influence on individuals (Okazaki et al., 2008). They affect the way individuals perceive themselves and the others, because ‘the colonial past is... not only a historical legacy, but a vivid memory and a lived reality’ (p.94). Therefore, in this study historical and colonial discourses are regarded as important factors contributing to identity.

Professional identity of English teachers

In attempting to understand the professional identity of English teachers, this study draws on concepts of identity from social psychology alongside social constructionist and non-essentialist perspectives. The professional identity of English teachers can thus be understood as both a relational and a collective identity. It is relational in the sense that professional identity derives from interpersonal relationship in particular workplace settings; it cannot be individually established. Professional identity is constructed and maintained by both the English teachers themselves and other individuals, such as students and co-teachers. Furthermore, the professional identity of English teachers can also be viewed as a collective identity because it originates from the teachers’ identification with the groups and social categories to which they belong.

An important feature of the professional identity of English teachers is its social nature. It is socially defined and acknowledged by other individuals and institutions. Norton’s (1997) notion is useful here; she explains that identity refers to ‘how people understand their
relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space’ (p.410). Thus, the professional identity of English teachers is context-dependent on the professional ‘world’ – the workplace; it is defined by the teachers themselves and others in their workplace. Furthermore, the professional identity of English teachers cannot be separated from what the teachers are expected to be able to do as English teachers (Borg, 2006). Put simply, the professional identity of English teachers can be understood as the relational and collective images or representations of English teachers which derive from their roles as professionals in the field of English language teaching. Such images or representations are socially constructed by the English teachers themselves and other individuals in their professional contexts.

2.3. Social perceptions, categorization, and stereotypes

In exploring how various education stakeholders perceive ITEs and focusing on how ITEs perceive themselves, the concepts of social perceptions, social categorization and stereotypes are useful. Social psychology offers a theoretical lens to approach these concepts.

2.3.1. Social perception

Social perception refers to the process by which individuals understand their social world (McGarty, Yzerbyt, & Spears, 2004) and other people in that social world (Lee, Albright, & Malloy, 2001; Freeman, Johnson, Adams Jr., & Ambady, 2012; Quinn & Rosenthal, 2012). It involves a reciprocal relationship of ‘individuals judging other individuals who may also judge them’ (Lee et al., 2001, p. 187); therefore, social perception is related to ‘a judgement of social stimuli’ (p. 186).
As a cognitive process, social perception is both highly efficient and complex. It is efficient in that it allows us to apply general categories to individuals (Freeman et al., 2012; Quinn & Rosenthal, 2012). Complexity arises in the huge range of available categories; individuals can categorise others based on such aspects as identity, race, age, religion, occupation and so on (Quinn & Rosenthal, 2012). According to Freeman et al. (2012), social perception requires complex mental processing, because, 'unlike objects, other people are highly complex stimuli, embedded in a rich set of contexts and grounded in multiple sensory modalities' (p. 1). The complexity of social perception is also related to the fact that it is a situated cognitive process. The process of perceiving others is embedded in social contexts which shape judgments of the self and others. Wyer, Lambert, Budesheim, and Gruenfeld (1992) argue that information which an individual receives about other individuals is necessarily conveyed in a social setting. Thus, social perception is influenced by a dynamic interplay of individuals and the social settings where the perception takes place.

An important part of social perception, therefore, is social categorization, that is the cognitive processes by which individuals recognize the differences and similarities of other individuals compared to themselves (McGarty et al., 2002). DiDonato, Ullrich, and Krueger (2011) propose that social categorization is a necessary condition for social perception. They contend that 'if categories were removed from perception, judgments of individual instances or individuals would be more difficult, less reliable, and less accurate overall’ (p. 66). Therefore, in individuals’ perception processes, categorical thinking is unavoidable (Quinn, Macrae, & Bodenhausen, 2003)
2.3.2. Experience and prior knowledge in social perception

Experience and prior knowledge play important roles in the way individuals perceive others (Lee, Jussim, & McCauley, 1995; Quinn et al., 2003; Blum, 2004; Ferguson & Bargh, 2004; Freeman et al., 2012; Quinn & Rosenthal, 2012). As Ferguson and Bargh (2004) propose, ‘people’s understanding of the world is automatically shaped by previous experiences and knowledge’ (p. 33). Furthermore, the way individuals perceive other individuals can be shaped by the stimulus target behaviour and collective consensus about category membership (Lee et al., 1995). Thus, individuals’ perceptions of others may either be accurate and ‘expose humans’ exquisite ability to perceive other people’ or ‘expectancy-driven and biased by our stereotypes’ (Freeman et al., 2012, p. 1).

Stereotypes, as a specific form of knowledge, can shape individuals’ experience and thus indirectly influence their perceptions of others (Quinn et al., 2003; Ferguson & Bargh, 2004; Freeman et al., 2012; Quinn & Rosenthal, 2012). According to Freeman et al. (2012), individuals bring their ‘prior knowledge, stereotypic expectations, and affective and motivational states to the process of perceiving others’ (p. 1). This knowledge shapes individuals’ interpretation of their experience (Quinn & Rosenthal, 2012). Furthermore, stereotypes also have powerful implications for the experience of interacting with others (Quinn et al., 2003). This is because knowledge of a social category remains ‘activated (primed) for some time thereafter, even after the original stimulus is no longer present in the environment... it remains active and accessible, it can influence the categorization of others’ (Ferguson & Bargh, 2004, p. 34). Such a view is also supported by Freeman et al. (2012) who explain that:

The bidirectional and dynamic nature of the neural processing subserving social perception opens up the opportunity for social perceptions to be modulated by factors that are inherent to the perceiver, including existing
knowledge structures (i.e., stereotypes) and current motivation states. Indeed, mounting evidence demonstrates that such factors impact social perception systematically, leading to functional biases or attunements in perceptions of the world and the people within it. (p. 3)

2.3.3. Stereotyping

Stereotyping is one of the results of social categorization (McGarty et al., 2004; DiDonato, Krueger, & Ullrich, 2011; Quinn & Rosenthal, 2012). A stereotype is ‘an inference drawn from the assignment of a person to a particular category’ (Brown, 2010, p. 68). It is not based on the person’s behaviour, but on the collective consensus about category membership (Lee et al., 2001). Stereotypes are ‘the beliefs, shared by members of one group, about the shared characteristics of another group’ (Wright & Taylor, 2007, p. 433). To stereotype individuals is to attribute to the individuals some characteristics which are understood as being shared by their fellow group members.

Fundamentally, stereotyping is a useful cognitive process: (1) stereotypes are aids to explanation, helping the perceiver make sense of a situation; (2) stereotypes are energy-saving devices that reduce effort on the part of the perceiver; and (3) stereotypes are shared group beliefs (McGarty et al., 2004). According to Quinn and Rosenthal (2012), social categorization is more efficient than personal identity recognition. They argue that ‘stereotypes allow perceivers to take mental shortcuts to save time and processing capacity, treating group members as functionally equivalent and interchangeable’ (p. 248).

While stereotyping has its uses, it can also be a negative process. As McGarty et al. (2004) assert:
Individual people have limited capacities to perform cognitive tasks such as processing information. Nevertheless they exist in a complex, multifaceted world that places enormous demands on that limited capacity. This complexity is certainly true of the social environment, and the resulting overload of human information processing capacity leads people to take shortcuts and to adopt biased and erroneous perceptions of the world. Stereotypes are simply one example of the biases that can develop. (p. 4)

Due to the complex and overwhelming information that is available in our complex social world, individuals can adopt misleading categorical representations (Quinn et al., 2003). In that sense, stereotypes become either negative overgeneralizations or oversimplifications; they become false representations of individuals from particular groups, as Blum (2004) describes:

Stereotyping a group involves not seeing members of the group as individuals. Stereotyping involves seeing individual members through a narrow and rigid lens of group-based image, rather than being alive to the range of characteristics constituting each member as a distinct individual. (p. 271)

2.3.4. Stereotype formation

Stereotypes can emerge either from individuals’ own experience or their socialization (Blum, 2004; McGarty et al., 2004; Moskowitz, 2005; Quinn et al., 2003; Brown, 2010). Blum (2004) contends that stereotypes arise from individuals generating images of groups based on their own experiences, so that particular characteristics of one member are then generalized
to the whole group. Alternatively, stereotypes can also emerge from socialization (Blum, 2004; McGarty et al., 2004; Moskowitz, 2005; Quinn et al., 2003; Brown, 2010). McGarty et al. (2004) propose that the formation of stereotypes involves the encoding of new information and prior knowledge; the encoding process is social since the process of perception is situated in social contexts. Therefore, stereotypical images of individuals originate in a social process (Blum, 2004). Individuals acquire the images of others from various 'socializing agents' within culture, such as parents, teachers, friends, religion, TV, the internet and so on (Moskowitz, 2005, p. 438). Brown (2010) contends that stereotypes are

embedded in the culture in which we are raised and live, and they are conveyed and reproduced in all the usual socio-cultural ways – through socialization in the family and at school, then through repeated exposure to images in books, television and newspapers. (p. 69)

Stereotypes are rigid by nature (Blum, 2004; McGarty et al., 2004; Brown, 2010). Blum (2004) suggests that as false or misleading generalizations or oversimplifications, stereotypes have ‘fixedness’ (p. 261). The fixity of stereotypes ‘is not an attribute of the generalization itself, but the way it is held by the individual cognizer’ (p. 261). Brown (2010) regards such rigidity as the ‘persistence’ of stereotypes (p. 69). Stereotypes should be seen as ‘rigid and distorted mental structures’ which often lead individuals to erroneous perceptions of other individuals and groups (McGarty et al., 2004).
2.4. English and English language teaching in Indonesia

This section discusses how historical, political, and sociocultural factors have shaped the status of English in the Indonesian context. The discussion contextualizes the study and explores the wider background of the issue.

2.4.1. Historical account

The spread of English in Indonesia is closely intertwined with colonial and postcolonial history; in Pennycook’s (1994) terms, it is neither ‘natural’ nor ‘neutral’ (p. 9). Its spread was defined primarily by government language planning driven by two factors: the anti-Dutch movement and the power of the US and the UK. English began to be used in the Indonesian government and education system as soon as the country gained its independence from the Netherlands in 1945. While at that time Dutch was the formal language widely used in Indonesia, the Indonesian Government preferred English to be the medium of international communication and the main foreign language to be taught in Indonesian schools (Paauw, 2009). Anderson (1990) argues that this decision of the Indonesian Government was due to the anti-Dutch movement; Indonesian leaders did not adopt Dutch as they regarded it as the colonizing language of the enemy (Anderson, 1990; Mistar, 2005; Paauw, 2009). In contrast, English was seen as ‘a counter language’ to Dutch by Indonesian political leaders (Anderson, 1990, p. 125). It was also regarded as a language that had a special stature and advantages by being a vehicle of international communication (Paauw, 2009).

The decision of the Indonesian Government regarding English as the medium of international communication and a foreign language in the Indonesian education system was also strongly influenced by the power of the US and the UK (Lauder, 2008; Paauw, 2009). In the 1950s the US and the UK exerted their dominant economic, cultural, and political power
over other countries. Indonesia was unavoidably shaped in the post-war era by this power dynamic (Anderson, 1990; Philpott, 2000; Vicker, 2005). Anderson (1990) contends:

Indonesia (and many other countries in the world) formally became a nation at the historical moment that the US became not only a superpower in geopolitical/military terms, but the economic, cultural, and intellectual centre of ‘the West’. In other words, there is a double break with the past: colonies became nations and European modes of Orientalist knowledge production gave way to American social scientific ways of knowing the new world which emerged in the aftermath of WWII. (p. xix)

Pennycook (1994; 2008) argues that English is embedded in social, economic, and political struggles; it is closely related to capitalism through development aid and the dominance of the Western media. Such a critical view reflects the way English was promoted in Indonesia by English-speaking countries, particularly the US. After its independence, the Indonesian Government received substantial economic and political support from the US. For example, in the 1950s, the Ford Foundation provided financial and technical assistance for training school teachers in Indonesia. The foundation also developed curricula and materials for teachers. Consequently, English teaching materials and methods used in Indonesia are US-oriented; they operate as ‘a transfer from Western education theory and practice’ (Lie, 2002, p. 59).

In 1967, the Indonesian Government released Decree No. 096 proclaiming English as the primary foreign language to be taught in Indonesian schools; the language planning policy became a formal decision of the Government to establish the linguistic landscape and became a milestone of English language use in Indonesia (Wright, 2004; Lauder, 2008).
2.4.2. The status of English in Indonesia

Language planning reproduces language ideologies (Woolard, 1992; Blommaert, 2006). The way English was formally promoted in Indonesia by the Indonesian Government and the strong influence of the sociocultural, economic and political power of the US and the UK have shaped the way English is seen in Indonesian society. Generally, the status of English in Indonesia is similar to what has been portrayed by Sayer (2012); English is seen as ‘the linguistic engine of globalization’ (p. 2). The dominant belief is that ‘a country with lots of English speakers has more fuel for the engine’ and that ‘creating more English speakers will better position them [developing countries] to participate in the global marketplace’ (p. 2). English is seen as ‘a commodity’ through which Indonesia will become more economically competitive (Murray & Christison, 2011, p. xii). Thus, the spread of English in Indonesia is seen as ‘beneficial’ (Pennycook, 1994, p. 9). Such beliefs are reflected by Hamied's (2012) description of English in Indonesia, which portrays it as a language that can help Indonesia elevate its position, especially in terms of economics and politics:

To improve our current political and economic standing, intensive communication and relevant support is required from other countries. Bilateral and multilateral interactions with other countries necessitate that many Indonesians need adequate proficiency in foreign languages, especially English.

The role of English in the era in which information technology has become so advanced and socially penetrating is both fundamental and strategic. It is fundamental, as information is commonly disseminated in English; it is strategic, as English is also used to introduce our own marketable strengths and capacities to the global community. (pp. 71-72)
This discourse associates English with globalization; as Candraningrum (2008) critically proposes, English is ‘a powerful colonial tool in which globalization becomes the name that legitimizes the reproduction of its imperialism’ (p. 78).

In the Indonesian education system, English has a special status as a foreign language which students must learn at almost all levels. Lie (2007) explains that English teaching in Indonesian schools serves two main purposes. First, students have to be prepared for their college and university years where many text books are in English. Second, many employers use English language proficiency as a factor to determine employment and remuneration; many job advertisements demand good competence in English as one of the main requirements.

English is also a symbol of social status in Indonesia. Proficiency in English is used as a gatekeeper to prestigious positions in the community (Pennycook, 1994). English is often seen as a language that indicates high social class or a ‘modern’ lifestyle. Murray and Christison (2011) argue that such views are due to the influence of English language-dominant media. They suggest that the pervasiveness of English in the media has shaped global culture, especially youth culture; it has impacted on how English is seen by non-English-speaking societies. This notion is reflected by Lie’s (2007) observation of the growth in numbers of English speakers in Indonesia:

there have been a growing number of speakers of English... among the young, urban middle class segment of the population. Inspired by their idolized celebrities from MTV-like stations, which often recruit their reporters and newscasters from among graduates of Western universities, the young Indonesians speak at least chunks of English phrases and utterance as a matter of boosting their urban lifestyle. (p. 3)
2.5. English as an international language

In many non-English-speaking countries, there is a widespread belief that English functions as a bridge for international interaction; English is thought to enable these countries to cooperate with English-speaking countries (Pennycook, 1994; Nunan, 2003; Wright, 2004). In Indonesia, the image of 'English as an international language' is pervasive and easily found in many official documents and references; this term is also often used by individuals (Lauder, 2008). Indeed, this image of English as an international language is also one of the main reasons English is the compulsory foreign language taught in Indonesian schools.

In the field of applied linguistics and English language teaching, the concept of English as an international language has been addressed by many researchers. Generally, the term 'English as an international language' reflects the notion of English as a lingua franca (Widdowson, 1998; Sharifian, 2009). Widdowson (1998) proposes that English as an international language is as 'a kind of composite lingua franca which is free of any specific allegiance to any primary variety of the language' (pp. 399-400). In the same vein, Sharifian (2009) asserts that English as an international language 'emphasizes that English, with its many varieties, is a language of international, and therefore intercultural communication' (p. 2). While such views which reflect the notion of English as a lingua franca are prominent, Pennycook (1998, 2004, 2007) suggests that the notion of English as an international language should be reviewed critically. It should also be seen as a ‘myth’ – as ‘the relentless repetition of the stories and tales about this thing called English’ (Pennycook, 2007, p. 31). The myth, Pennycook further explains, does not imply falsehood. Rather, it implies ‘a construction, as a telling of a particular story about English’ (Pennycook, 2004, p. 26). He (2007) describes,
Particularly salient today are claims that English is merely a ‘language of international communication’ rather than a language embedded in processes of globalisation; that English holds out promise of social and economic development to all those who learn it (rather than a language tied to very particular class positions and possibilities of development); and that English is a language of equal opportunities (rather than a language which creates barriers as much as it presents possibilities). (p. 26)

Such a discourse, Pennycook further proposes, has justified the hegemony of English. This construction of English has *collusory, delusionary, and exclusionary* effects (Pennycook, 2004, p. 26). *Collusory effects* refer to how English is often associated with and seen as inseparable from globalization; but it is ‘a simplistic version of globalization’ (p. 26). It ‘colludes with multiple domains of globalization, from popular culture to unpopular politics, from international capital to local transaction, from so-called diplomacy to so-called peace-keeping, from religious proselytizing to secular resistance’ (Pennycook, 2007, p. 27). *Delusionary effects* are the ways English ‘deludes many learners through the false promises it holds out for social and material gain’ (p. 26). English is often associated with economic benefit/profit and is believed to better individuals’ lives. Last, *exclusionary effects* refer to how English operates as an exclusionary language and does not offer equal opportunities for all individuals; English ‘excludes many people by operating as an exclusionary class dialect, favouring particular people, countries, cultures and forms of knowledge’ (p. 26).

### 2.6. Investment in second language learning

One objective of this study is to explore the way the participants perceive English, which is reflected in their reasons for learning the language. This issue is important to address as the participants’ perceptions of English can inform the way they see ITEs (Murray
& Christison, 2011). With regard to such a topic, this section explores the concept of investment in second language learning.

Second language motivation is a complex concept which has attracted the attention of many second language acquisition scholars (Norton, 1995; Gardner, 1985, 2010; MacIntyre, 2010; MacIntyre & Blackie, 2012). To understand the complexity of the concept, this study employs Norton Pierce’s (1995) and Norton’s (1997, 2000, 2001, 2006a, 2006b, 2010, 2013) concepts of investment and imagined identity. Prior to discussing the concepts, this section briefly reviews Gardner’s (1985) theory of motivation and argues that Norton’s concepts of investment and imagined identity provide better explanation for individuals’ multifaceted second language learning motivation.

2.6.1. Revisiting Gardner’s theory of motivation in second language learning

Gardner (1985) defines the motivation to learn a second language as ‘the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language’ (p. 10). In Gardner’s theoretical perspective, second language learners are seen as having two motivational orientations toward learning a language: integrative and instrumental orientations. Integrative orientation refers to individuals’ desire to learn a language in order to interact and identify with the community of the target language. Individuals learn a second language because of a social expectation of engaging with and being accepted by the community which uses the language. Martin and Daiute (2013) describe such an orientation as ‘a solidarity function’ (p. 119). On the other hand, instrumental orientation refers to individuals’ practical goals for learning a second language, such as passing certain tests or getting a job.
While Gardner's theory is well-recognized in the field of second language acquisition, it has been criticized by some researchers. Noel (2001), for example, proposes that Gardner's two orientations do not sufficiently cover the full range of possible motivations. In the same vein, Murray and Christison (2011) argue that Gardners' theory 'ignore[s] the multiple group membership that individuals have, such as gender, race, language, language variety, [and] social institutions' (p. 4). The theory does not 'do justice to the complex identities of language learners, and the often inequitable relations of power they negotiated in different sites' (Murray & Christison, 2011, p. 415). It conceptualizes second language learners' identities 'as their fixed personalities, learning styles, and motivations' (p. 419). Norton Pierce (1995) also regards the current theories as simplistic in their failure to pay sufficient attention to the multifaceted social contexts which shape individuals' motivations in learning a second language.

### 2.6.2. Investment in second language learning

Drawing on poststructuralist theories of identity and language, and more specifically on Bourdieu's (1986) economic metaphors, Norton Pierce (1995) and Norton (1997, 2000, 2001, 2006a, 2006b, 2010, 2013) propose the concept of *investment* to explain individuals' complex experiences in learning a target language. The concept complements the various constructs of motivation in the field of second language acquisition. Norton argues that by exploring individuals' various motives for learning a second language, the concept of *investment* moves away from the previously established *instrumental* and *integrative* orientations.

While motivation is a psychological construct, *investment* is considered to be sociological. It establishes 'meaningful connections between a learner's desire and
commitment to learn a language and their changing identities’ (Norton & Toohey, 2011, p. 420). The concept of investment ‘replace[s] the restrictive assumptions underlying the concept of motivation’ (Martin & Daiute, 2013, p. 119). It provides a framework to acknowledge the connections between the use of language and power; it also ‘signals the socially and historically constructed relationship of learners to the target language, and their sometimes ambivalent desire to speak, read, or write it’ (Norton, 2013, p. 86).

Norton (2001) views language learning as ‘a social practice that engages the identities of learners in complex and sometimes contradictory ways’ (p. 167). According to Norton,

... if learners invest in a second language, they do so with the understanding that they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which will increase their value in the social world. Learners will expect or hope to have a good return on their investment in the target language – a return that will give them access to the privileges of target language speakers. (p. 166)

Norton further contends that a second language learner’s investment in the target language is also ‘an investment in a learner’s own identity, an identity which is constantly changing across time and space’ (Norton, 2001, p. 166). When individuals use the second language, they are not only exchanging information, but ‘they are constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world’ (Norton, 2001, p. 166). The individuals ‘reassess their senses of themselves and their desires for the future’ (Norton & Toohey, 2011, p. 420).
2.6.3. Imagined language community and identity

As an important and inseparable part of investment, Norton (2001) applies Anderson’s (1991) concept of imagined community to second language acquisition theory. Wenger (1998) suggests that direct engagement with a community is not the only way individuals belong to the community. Instead, imagination – the ‘process of expanding oneself by transcending our time and space, and creating new images of the world and ourselves’ – also allows learners of a second language to engage with the speech community of the language (p. 176).

*Imagined community* refers to ‘groups of people, not immediately tangible and accessible, with whom we connect through the power of the imagination’ (Kanno & Norton, 2003, p. 241). For individuals who learn a second language, not only does the target community represent ‘a reconstruction of past communities and historically constituted relationships’ – but it also becomes ‘a community of the imagination, a desired community that offers possibilities for an enhanced range of identity options in the future’ (Norton & Toohey, 2011, p. 415). When individuals learn a second language, they ‘imagine who they might be, and who their communities might be’ (p. 422). For example, a student learning English might imagine himself or herself as a successful professional working in an international company, or see the language as a means for earning membership of the imagined community. Such imagining affects individuals’ learning trajectories as the ‘imagined communities are no less real than the ones in which learners have daily engagement and might even have a stronger impact on their current actions and investment’ (Kanno & Norton, 2003, p. 242). As learners become proficient in the second language, investment helps students establish a positive identity (Martin & Daiute, 2013).
2.6.4. English as linguistic capital – Bourdieusian perspective

The way individuals see English and learners’ various motives for learning the language can also be understood by employing Bourdieu’s (1986) concepts of capital, particularly his notion of linguistic capital which forms the basis of Norton's (1995, 1997) theoretical foundation in developing the concept of investment.

Bourdieu (1986) defines capital as ‘accumulated labor... which, when appropriated on a private, ie, exclusive, basis by agents or groups of agents, enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living labor’ (p. 241). Bourdieu further explicates that capital ‘takes time to accumulate and which, as a potential capacity to produce profits and to reproduce itself in identical or expanded form, contains a tendency to persist in its being’ (p. 241).

Bourdieu (1986) proposes three forms of capital: economic, social, and cultural (the latter includes linguistic capital). While economic capital is ‘immediately and directly convertible into money and may be institutionalized in the form of property rights’, social capital ‘made up of social obligations (connection)... is convertible, in certain conditions, into economic capital’ (p. 243). Social capital may also be ‘institutionalized in the form of a title of nobility’ (p. 243). On the other hand, symbolic capital refers to ‘capital in whatever form as it is represented apprehended symbolically, in a relationship of knowledge, or more precisely, of misrecognition and recognition, [that] presupposes the intervention of the habitus, as socially constituted cognitive capacity’ (p. 255). Last, cultural capital is the ‘instrument for the appropriation of symbolic wealth socially designated as worthy of being sought and possessed’ (Bourdieu, 1973, p. 73).

Bourdieu's cultural capital has been understood variously by scholars. Dumais (2002) proposes that cultural capital consists of cultural and linguistic competence. It also comprises
'a broad knowledge of culture that belongs to members of the upper classes and is found much less frequently among the lower classes' (p. 44). Sullivan (2001) defines cultural capital as 'knowledge of and participation in the dominant culture' (p. 896). According to De Graaf, De Graaf, and Kraaykamp (2000), cultural capital refers to 'familiarity with the conceptual codes that underlie a specific culture with its major artistic and normative manifestations' (p. 93).

When it comes to linguistic capital, Bourdieu (1986) argues that, as language is socially, culturally, and historically situated, it has a different symbolic value. From this perspective, the value of English can be understood to depend on the social context in which the language is learned or used. In some sociocultural settings, English might have symbolic value that can translate easily into economic resources and social prestige, so that English can 'denote knowledge of or competence with highbrow aesthetic culture' (Lareau & Weininger, 2003, p. 568). This can have beneficial effects for native speakers of English, who might be credited with more linguistic capital than non-native speakers.

2.7. The ‘native speaker’ concept

The concept of the ‘native speaker’ is central to this study for two main reasons. First, native speakers are often seen as the model and norm for language learning (Murray & Christison, 2011). The view that native speakers are the only appropriate models for language learners has been taken for granted by language teaching professionals (Cook, 1999). Second, the native speaker concept is often linguistically and socially used as a point of opposition for generating the image of non-native speakers (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001; Davies, 2003; Murray & Christison, 2011). It is a fundamental concept from which the issue of NESTs and NNESTs originates (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001). More importantly, as Faez (2011)
proposes, ‘individuals’ native or non-native status is mistakenly perceived to be a strong
determiner of their ability to perform well in various occupations and functions as a source of
privilege for some and as a discriminating factor for others’ (p. 231); the native speaker label
‘tend[s] to either open doors of opportunity or function as a gatekeeping device for gaining
access to the profession’ (p. 231). In effect, this categorization is closely tied to cultural and
linguistic capital.

The ‘native speaker’ is an intricate concept. Although it has been the subject of various
interpretations, arriving at consensus on a definition remains difficult (Davies, 2003, 2004;
Murray & Christison, 2011; Faez, 2011) and ‘rich in ambiguity’ (Davies, 2003, p. 2). Nevertheless,
many researchers have attempted this task. According to Davies (1991), an early biodevelopmental
definition of a native speaker was proposed by Bloomfield (1933) based on speaking the first language the individual has learned. However, such definition is
simplistic. As Davies argues, individuals can acquire a second language and become more
fluent in using the second language than their first; in such a circumstance the first language
can no longer be regarded as the ‘first’ (Davies, 1991, p. 16).

Stern (1983) characterizes a native speaker as having subconscious knowledge of
language rules, having an intuitive comprehension of meaning, having the ability to use the
language within social settings, possessing a range of language skills and having the ability to
use the language creatively. With regard to Stern’s notion, Cook (1999) proposes that
nativeness is an ‘unalterable historic fact’ (p. 186), and goes on to argue that such
characteristics are ‘not a necessary part of the definition of native speaker; the lack of any of
them would not disqualify a person from being a native speaker’ (p.186).

In contrast, Edge (1988) defines a native speaker based on the speaker’s place of birth
or infancy. In his view, the speaker is someone who has learned a particular language as a sole
or first language in a natural setting from childhood. While Edge’s definition seems to be relatively uncontroversial, it is problematic as many language speakers were born and grew up in multilingual social settings.

Rampton (1990) proposes that the native speaker concept is often associated with the following characteristics:

1. A particular language is inherited, either through genetic endowment or through birth into the social group stereotypically associated with it;
2. Inheriting a language means being able to speak it well;
3. People either are or are not native/mother-tongue speakers;
4. Being a native speaker involves the comprehensive grasp of a language;
5. Just as people are usually citizens of one country, people are native speakers of one mother tongue. (p. 97)

Acknowledging that the five characteristics have been contested by many researchers, Rampton further explains that:

The capacity for language itself may be genetically endowed, but particular languages are acquired in social settings. It is sociolinguistically inaccurate to think of people belonging to only one social group, once and for all. People participate in many groups (the family, the peer group, and groups defined by class, region, age, ethnicity, gender, etc.); membership changes over time and so does language. Being born into a group does not mean that you automatically speak the language well – many native speakers of English can’t write or tell stories, while many non-native speakers of English can. Nobody’s functional command is total: users of a language are more proficient in some areas than others. And most countries are multilingual: from an early age children normally encounter two or more languages. (pp. 97-98)
Nayar (1994) suggests that a native speaker refers to an individual who has linguistic, phonological and communicative competence. He also proposes that language nativeness is often associated with domicile or nationality, as individuals acquire a language in social contexts.

Closely aligned to Bloomfield’s biodevelopmental definition, Crystal (2003) defines a native speaker as:

... someone for whom a particular language is a first language or mother tongue. The implication is that this native language, having been acquired naturally during childhood, is the one about which a speaker will have the most reliable intuitions, and whose judgment about the way the language is used therefore be trusted. (p.308)

Davies (2003, 2004) argues that nativeness is not only about language competence. Rather, it is a sociolinguistic construct that is also about identity. Therefore, nativeness requires three aspects: proficiency of a language, self-affiliation and approval by other individuals (Davies, 2003). Hence, being a native speaker can mean:

1. Native speaker by birth or early childhood exposure;
2. Native speaker or native speaker-like by being an exceptional learner;
3. Native speaker through education using the target language medium;
4. Native speaker by virtue of being a native user;
5. Native speaker through long residence in the adopted country (p. 214)

Davies (1991, 2003, 2004) further explains that the native speaker may be defined in the following six ways:
1. The native speaker acquires the first language in childhood;

2. The native speaker has intuitions about his/her ideolectal grammar;

3. The native speaker has intuitions about the features of standard grammar which are different from his/her ideolectal grammar;

4. The native speaker has an ability to produce fluent spontaneous discourse. He/she exhibits a wide range of communicative competence both in production and comprehension;

5. The native speaker has a unique capacity to interpret and translate into his/her first language.

The view that language nativeness requires social acceptance by the speech community of the language is also suggested by Coppieters (1987) and Kramsch (1997). More specifically, Kramsch emphasizes that nativeness 'is more than a privilege of birth or even education' (p.363).
The following table summarizes definitions and characteristics proposed by various researchers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Acquisition</td>
<td>• Acquiring the language as a first language (Bloomfield, 1933; Edge, 1988; Crystal, 2003, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Acquiring the language during early childhood (Davies, 1991, 2003, 2004; Crystal, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Acquiring the language in natural settings (Edge, 1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>• Comprehensive knowledge of the language (Rampton, 1990; Nayar, 1994; Davies, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Subconscious knowledge of the language (Stern, 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>• Reliable language intuitions (Crystal, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communicative competence or ability to use the language in social settings (Stern, 1983; Rampton, 1990; Nayar, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Phonological competence (Nayar, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creativity of language use (Stern, 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A unique capacity to interpret and translate into the L1 (Davies, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/geographical</td>
<td>• By birth/domicile - born in social groups stereotypically associated with the language (Rampton, 1990; Kachru, 1992; Medgyes, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>• Acquiring the language in particular social settings (Nayar, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Affiliate him/herself with the speech community (Davies, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognized and approved as a native speaker by the speech community (Coppieters, 1987, Kramsch, 1995, 1997; Davies, 2003, 2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Misconceptions related to the native speaker concept**

A complicating aspect of the various definitions of native speakers outlined above is the fact that there are also misconceptions surrounding the idea. Lippi-Green (1997) points out that nativeness is often mistakenly valued by the presence or absence of particular kinds
of accents and is often associated with race. Much research has shown that race is often used to define native English speakers (e.g., Amin, 2004; Braine, 1999, 2010; Kubota & Lin, 2006, 2009; Shuck, 2006; Holliday, 2006, 2008; Liggett, 2009a, 2009b). In Amin’s (2004) study, for example, the participants believed that only Caucasians are native speakers of English and that only the speakers of North American English know ‘real’ and ‘proper’ English. Amin’s study reflects the discourse related to native English speakers in the field of English language teaching. Filho (2002) indicates that most learners of English as a second and foreign language see NESTs as ‘white’ monolingual teachers with particular accents; they appear to believe that no other prototype exists. As a result of such misconceptions, learners hold certain expectations of English teachers with regard to the phenotype of race (Kubota & Lin, 2009).

2.8. An ideal English teacher

Besides the concept of native speaker, an important concept which should be discussed in relation to the way the participants perceive ITEs is the concept of an ‘ideal’ English teacher.

Korthagen (2004) argues that defining a good teacher is an almost impossible undertaking as the concept is dependent upon a myriad of variables, but Brown (2014) and Harmer (2008) attempt this task. According to Brown, a good language teacher should possess the relevant education background and a passion for teaching, as well as a personal desire to upgrade his or her teaching skills and the ability to adapt to different cultures. On the other hand, Harmer (2008) is more concerned that a good language teacher should

---

2 Race is an intricate concept, similar to language nativeness. In this study, race is understood as an imagined social construct imposed upon individuals (Liggett, 2009a, 2009b). In everyday discourse, race is usually thought of as physically observable human characteristics such as skin colour, hair colour, facial characteristics, and so on (Kubota & Lin, 2009).
possess adequate knowledge of the target language and an ability to explain the use of the language to students; the teacher, he adds, should be enthusiastic and able to teach interestingly in the class. Studies from Australia, Korea, Yemen, Thailand, Saudi Arabia and Israel, though from very different cultural settings, indicate very closely related requirements for good language teachers.

Besides such definitions, the complexity of the concept of an ideal English teacher has also been scrutinized by researchers in the field of applied linguistics. While these researchers employed different terms such as ‘good teachers’ or ‘effective teachers’, fundamentally, they address the same concept. Mullock (2003) explores the perceptions of novice and experienced teachers in relation to what constitutes a good teacher. The study involved 42 postgraduate students of applied linguistics and TESOL from three universities in Sydney who have various cultural and first language backgrounds. Interviews and questionnaires were employed in the study. In the interviews, the teachers were asked to recall a good language teacher who had taught them and to describe the qualities which they believed made the teacher good. The respondents were also asked to generalize about the qualities of a good English teacher. Most of the teachers outlined that a good teacher knows and understands students’ needs and expectations, as well as students’ strengths and weaknesses. The other three qualities identified by respondents were: knowledge of subject matter, including knowledge of the target language and how the language works; skilled in teaching methods or techniques; and up-to-date knowledge of the subject and language teaching methods.

In a Korean research setting, Park and Lee (2006) investigated the perceptions of 169 teachers and 339 high-school students regarding the characteristics of effective English teachers. They employed a self-report questionnaire consisting of three categories: English proficiency, pedagogical knowledge and socio-affective skills. Park and Lee found that the
teachers’ perceptions of the characteristics of effective English teachers were different from those of the students; while the students ranked pedagogical knowledge the highest, teachers ranked English proficiency the highest.

Kadha (2009) conducted a study in Yemen to investigate teachers’ and students’ perceptions and conceptions of the qualities of a good language teacher at university level. Employing interviews and questionnaires, Kadha involved thirteen language teachers and 90 undergraduate students studying English at the University of Hodeidah, Yemen. The findings of the research show that there was no significant difference between teachers’ and students’ conceptions of the ‘ideal’ teacher. The results of the questionnaire indicate that most of the teachers and students considered the following aspects as the most important criteria of a good English teacher: preparation and presentation of materials, lesson planning, making class interesting, stating the objectives of learning, motivating students and analysing students’ needs. Both the teachers and students also regarded the following qualities to be important: flexibility, variety, the ability to manage the classroom, and the ability to provide students with accurate explanations of vocabulary and grammar. Findings from the interviews confirmed that the teachers and students all agreed that the ability to plan and deliver lessons effectively, language fluency, and communication skills in the target language are important characteristics of a good English language teacher. Based on his empirical findings, Kadha concluded that good English teachers ‘need to be skilled, professional, well-prepared, enthusiastic, ready to develop, motivated and possibly more aware than this study’ (p. 7).

In Bangkok, Wichadee (2010) explored the characteristics of effective English teachers as perceived by 400 students and 53 teachers at a university. Using a five-point rating scale questionnaire, the research focused on four categories: English proficiency, pedagogical knowledge, organization and communication skills, and socio-affective skills. The
findings indicate that the students placed high importance on all of the characteristics, with the highest ranking given to organization and communication skills. In contrast, the teachers ranked English proficiency the highest.

Barnes and Lock (2013) explored 2,170 first-year Korean university students’ perceptions of effective foreign language teachers. Using a questionnaire, they measured the importance that students place on a wide range of effective foreign language teacher attributes. Barnes and Lock found that the students placed high importance on attributes such as friendliness, care, patience, clear explanations, error correction and a participatory mode of instruction, but also rated language knowledge and good preparation highly.

Mahmoud and Thabet (2013) investigated the qualities of good English teachers as perceived by 60 students of English of Saudi and Yemeni colleges. They employed an open-ended questionnaire so that respondents could list the qualities of good English teachers. Mahmoud and Thabet categorized the findings under four main groups: English proficiency, pedagogical knowledge, socio-affective skills, and organization and communication. The findings indicate that the socio-affective category – that the teacher is patient, relaxed, good tempered, fair, helpful, encouraging, respectful, kind, loving, and caring – was regarded as the most important aspect of the teacher.

Some studies from the more general field of education, which explored the concept of a good teacher, also provide useful insights into the complexity of the concept. Brosh (1996) investigated language teachers’ and students’ perceptions of good language teachers. He found that the key perceived characteristics of good language teachers were knowledge and command of the target language, the ability to organize and explain teaching materials, the ability to sustain students’ motivation, the ability to be fair, and to be available to students. However, above all these, both the teachers and students valued language proficiency of the
target language and teaching comprehensibility as the most important characteristics of good language teachers.

Arnon and Rachel (2007) examined 89 Israeli students’ perceptions of an ideal teacher using a questionnaire which included open-ended questions. In the research, the students were asked to list three positive and three negative qualities of the teacher. The findings indicate that the students’ perceptions consisted of two major categories: personal qualities and knowledge of the subject taught, as well as didactic knowledge. Most students attributed great importance to personal qualities of the teacher such as having a sense of humour, being kind-hearted, calm, fair, optimistic, motivated, caring and serious.

While such studies from the field of applied linguistics and education (Brosh, 1996; Mullock, 2003; Park & Lee, 2006; Arnon & Rachel, 2007; Kadha, 2009; Wichadee, 2010; Barnes & Lock, 2013; Mahmoud & Thabet, 2013) have explored the concept of a good teacher, none of the studies addresses the racial aspect of the issue. This gap is surprising, because research has indicated that the preference for NESTs is often racial in nature (Amin, 1997, 1999, 2004; Braine, 2006; Mahboob, 2006, Mahboob & Golden, 2013; Kubota & Lin, 2006, 2009). Learners of English as a second or foreign language often perceive NESTs as ‘white’ monolingual speakers with particular accents (Amin, 1997, 2004; Filho, 2002). Despite this, TESOL scholarship has shied away from investigating the notion of race in English language teaching, perhaps owing to anxieties around the possibility of being accused of racism: talking about race ‘evokes racism which is often interpreted as overt forms of bigotry, rather than structural or institutional inequalities’ (Kubota & Lin, 2006, p. 472). Unfortunately, such an undertone prevents open dialogue (Kubota & Lin, 2006). Therefore, the research presented in the following chapters confronts this concern directly, and breaks new ground by investigating the racial dimension of the concept of an ideal English teacher as perceived by participants in the study.
The Javanese philosophy of guru

In Indonesia, particularly in Java, teachers are considered to be ‘guru’. The term ‘guru’ is derived from Sanskrit language, which was brought by Buddhism and Hinduism to Indonesia in the early fifth century (Taylor, 2003). Etymologically, the term refers to a spiritual or religious teacher who guides people, and passes on wisdom and knowledge. The Sanskrit term ‘guru’ was adopted into Javanese Keratabasa (Javanese folk etymology) (Widiyanto, 2005; Miyake & Yoshimi 2013). Keratabasa is a set of acronyms which consists of shortened rhyming phrases, clauses, or sentences providing the etymology of a word (Widiyanto, 2005; Miyake & Yoshimi, 2013). Guru is a clausal Keratabasa which represents the clauses digugu lan ditiru, meaning to ‘be obeyed and imitated’. Philosophically, a teacher or ‘guru’ in Indonesia refers to someone who should be listened to, obeyed, and imitated. The concept of guru socioculturally represents a character who not only teaches knowledge, but also becomes a model for students in terms of spiritual or religious values, including moral values. Such a philosophy is pervasive in Indonesia and necessarily influences the way the participants conceptualize an ideal English teacher.

2.9. Theoretical frameworks

As described in the introductory chapter, the purpose of this study is to understand the way the professional identity of ITEs is perceived by students, parents, and OSTs in relation to the strong preference for NESTs in Indonesia. The study also explores how ITEs perceive their professional selves despite the other stakeholders’ views.

This study employs three main theoretical frameworks. Bhabha’s (1983) concepts of colonial discourse and stereotype are used for understanding the perceptions of students, parents, and OSTs. For examining the self-perception of the ITEs, the research employs two

2.9.1. Bhabha’s colonial discourse and stereotype

Bhabha’s (1983) concepts of colonial discourse and stereotype are used in this study because this research deals with the issue of the strong preference for NESTs, which is likely to involve the stereotypes of NESTs and NNESTs. Additionally, the concepts are employed in the research to extend the concept of identity drawn from the field of social psychology.

Colonial discourse

According to Bhabha, stereotype operates as a ‘major discursive strategy’ (p.18) of colonial discourse to produce fixed images of colonial subjects. By this theoretical perspective, the stereotype of NNESTs can be regarded as a strategy of the discourse to create rigid images of NNESTs as ‘less competent teachers’.

To understand how stereotype works, it is important to understand colonial discourse. Bhabha suggests that the colonial discourse refers to

... an apparatus that turns on the recognition and disavowal of racial/cultural/historical difference. Its predominant strategic function is the creation of a space for a ‘subject people’ through the production of knowledges in terms of which surveillance is exercised and a complex form of pleasure/unpleasure is incited. It seeks authorization for its strategies by the production of knowledges of the colonizer and colonized which are stereotypical but antithetically evaluated. (p.23)
Colonial discourse is the discourse where representations/images/identities of the colonial subjects – the coloniser and the colonized – are unequally constructed and maintained. It is within this discourse that the sociocultural representations of NESTs as ideal teachers and NNESTs as less competent teachers are constructed and maintained.

Bhabha (1983) maintains that the objective of colonial discourse is ‘to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction’ (p.23). According to Bhabha, in order to achieve its objective to produce ‘the colonised as a fixed reality which is at the once an “other” and yet entirely knowable and visible’ (p.23), colonial discourse depends on the concept of ‘fixity’. Fixity functions as ‘the sign of cultural/historical/racial difference in the discourse of colonialism’ (p.18). Bhabha suggests that since fixity connotes rigidity and an unchanging order, it maintains the cultural/historical/racial difference between the colonizer and the colonized. This fixity, Bhabha asserts, is the foundation of colonial discourse.

**Stereotype**

In order to produce a fixed ‘paradoxical mode of representation’ (Bhabha, 1983, p.18) – ‘a regime of truth’ (p.23) – a rigid images of NESTs and NNESTs, colonial discourse uses stereotype as its main discursive strategy. Stereotype, Bhabha suggests, is ‘a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always in place, already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated’ (p.18). It emphasizes cultural/historical/racial difference, making the boundaries separating the colonial subjects – in this study, NESTs and NNESTs – obvious. Because of its rigid nature, stereotype ‘needs no proof’ and ‘can never really, in discourse, be proved’ (p.18). It is always firm in nature like ‘the essential duplicity of the Asiatic or the bestial sexual license of the African’ (p.18).
According to Bhabha (1983), stereotype is maintained by the interdependence of colonial subjects: the coloniser and the colonised. They are continually involved in tensions and interactions. The way they interact, Bhabha suggests, is ambivalent. The ambivalence refers to the flux of attraction and repulsion of the colonial subjects in a non-dialectical relation. In order to understand this ambivalent interaction, Bhabha maintains that more attention should be given to the construction process of representations/images/identities of the colonial subjects. The focus should ‘shift from the identification of images as positive or negative, to an understanding of the processes of subjectification made possible (and plausible) through stereotypical discourse’ (p.18).

The constant attraction and repulsion between colonial subjects, the ambivalence, is central to the maintenance of colonial discourse. In relation to this notion, Bhabha continues,

For it is the force of ambivalence that gives the colonial stereotype its currency: ensures its repeatability in changing historical and discursive conjunctures; informs its strategies of individuation and marginalisation; produces that effect of probabilistic truth and predictability which, for the stereotype, must always be in excess of what can be empirically proved or logically construed. Yet, the function of ambivalence as one of the most significant discursive and psychical strategies of discriminatory power – whether racist or sexist, peripheral or metropolitan – remains to be charted. (p.18)

For its successful operation, stereotype ‘demands an articulation of forms of difference – racial and sexual’ – which should be continual and repetitive (p.19). Describing the way stereotypical discourse works, Bhabha (1994) suggests the following.
Racist stereotypical discourse, in its colonial moment, inscribes a form of
governmentality that is informed by a productive splitting in its constitution
of knowledge and exercise of power. Some of its practices recognize the
difference of race, culture and history as elaborated by stereotypical
knowledges, racial theories, administrative colonial experience, and on that
basis institutionalize a range of political and cultural ideologies that are
prejudicial, discriminatory, vestigial, archaic, 'mythical', and, crucially, are
recognized as being so. By 'knowing' the native population in these terms,
discriminatory and authoritarian forms of political control are considered
appropriate. The colonized population is then deemed to be both the cause
and effect of the system, imprisoned in the circle of interpretation. (p.83)

In Bhabha’s theoretical view stereotype is a critical part of colonial discourse. It
operates by using differences of race, culture, and history as its starting positions for placing
colonial subjects in fixed domains. It frames them with assumed knowledge and exercises the
difference of power between the colonizer and the colonized. Stereotype institutionalizes
political and cultural ideologies which are ‘prejudicial, discriminatory, vestigial, archaic, and
‘mythical’ (Bhabha, 1994, p.83). Bhabha asserts that ‘the stereotype is not a simplification
because it is a false representation of a given reality. It is simplification because it is an
arrested, fixated form of representation that, in denying the play of difference (that the
negation through the other permits), constitutes a problem for the representation of the
subject in significations of psychic and social relations’ (p.27). While stereotype places
colonial subjects in rigid places, Bhabha suggests that it should be understood as ‘modes of
differentiation, realized as multiple, cross-cutting determinations, polymorphous and
pervasive, always demanding a specific calculation of their effects’ (p.67).
2.9.2. Social identity theory

Identity is not only self-constructed, but is also shaped by sociocultural variables (Hall, 1996; Norton, 1997; Varghese et al., 2005; Fina et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2011; Vignoles et al., 2011). Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) is especially useful in the current research into ITEs as it offers a particular focus on the way social values attached to a group contribute to the ‘self-definition’ of individual members (Tajfel, 1978, p.61). In this study the theory is employed to understand the complexity of the self-perceptions of ITEs.

Social identity theory originated from the work of Henri Tajfel and John Turner in the 1970s. The basis of this theory holds that identity is socially constructed through social comparisons; that is, individuals maintain their self-esteem by valuing their ‘ingroups’, the groups in which they are the members, and devaluing the ‘outgroups’, the groups to which they do not belong (Tajfel, 1978). This theory proposes four aspects related to identity: ‘social categorization, social identity, social comparison, and psychological group distinctiveness’ (Tajfel, 1978, p.61).

Social categorization

Social categorization is ‘a system of orientation which helps to create and define the individual’s place in society’ (Tajfel, 1978, p.63). It refers to ‘the ordering of social environment in terms of grouping of persons in a manner which makes sense to the individual’ (p.61). This aspect relies on value differentials. Emphasizing its importance, Tajfel asserts that:

... this interaction between socially derived value differentials on the one hand and the cognitive “mechanics” of categorization on the other is particularly important in all social divisions between “us” and “them” – that
is, in all social categorizations in which distinctions are made between the individual's own group and the outgroups which are compared or contrasted with it. (p.62)

Social categorization works by using aspects of differences, including sets of attributes such as skin complexion, language, nationality, and so on (Tajfel, 1978). Such attributes allow groups to be clearly defined at the same time as they emphasize differences between groups.

**Social identity**

Social identity refers to 'that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his or her knowledge of his or her membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership' (Tajfel, 1978, p.63). Tajfel (1978) acknowledges that an individual’s image or concept of him or herself is 'infinitely more complex, both in its contents and its derivations', but maintains that 'however rich and complex may be an individual's view of himself or herself in relation to the surrounding world, social and physical, some aspects of that view are contributed by the membership of certain social groups or categories' (p.63).

**Social comparison**

Social identity is also based on comparison in that it relies on a process that engages an individuals' awareness of the relativeness of the social identities of the ingroup and the outgroup (Tajfel, 1978; McNamara, 1997). One fundamental way this is applied is in the social reality test (Tajfel, 1978):
The only ‘reality’ tests that matter with regard to group characteristics are tests of social reality. The characteristics of one's group as a whole (such as its status, its richness or poverty, its skin colour or its ability to reach its aims) achieve most of their significance in relation to perceived differences from other groups and the value connotation of these differences. (p.66)

**Psychological group distinctiveness**

The values given to the perceived differences lead to psychological group distinctiveness (Tajfel, 1978): ‘a social group can fulfill its function of protecting the social identity of its members only if it manages to keep its positively valued distinctiveness from other groups’ (p.67). Thus, individuals who regard themselves as members of the ingroup will use their value differentials to maintain that identity. They will maximize a positive sense of themselves by emphasizing distinctive features favoring their ingroup membership (Tajfel, 1978; McNamara, 1997).

### 2.9.3. Dialogical self theory

Tajfel’s (1978) social identity theory provides useful concepts for understanding the way identity is constructed and maintained through social categorization and comparison processes at the group level. However, it does not offer concepts for understanding how identity is constructed and maintained at individual level. For that purpose, this study employs dialogical self theory.

Hermans’ (2001) dialogical self theory is inspired by two major paradigms: the Bakhtinian tradition which sees the meaning of human as constructed and maintained in dialogue; and the multiple-self perspective of William James. Dialogical self theory originates
from the school of dialogism and pragmatism (Hermans & Hermans-Konopka, 2010) and challenges ‘the idea of a core essential self’ (Hermans, 2001, p.243).

Hermans (2001) explains that dialogical self theory focuses on the multi-voiced self by employing the concepts of ‘I’ and ‘Me’ as conceptualized by William James. He argues that the ‘I’ refers to the ‘self-as-knower’ and the ‘Me’ refers to the ‘self-as-known’. The ‘I’ organizes the ‘Me’ in our everyday activities. The ‘I’ has three features: continuity, distinctness and volition (Hermans, 2001). Continuity is characterized by a sense of sameness or a sense of personal identity, while the distinctness results from the subjective nature of the ‘I’. The volition feature is reflected by the continuous rejection and appropriation of thoughts, which show the ‘I’ as ‘an active processor of experience’ (p.244). On the other hand, the ‘Me’ consists of empirical elements which belong to one’s self.

The second major influence, Hermans explains, is Bakhtin’s notion of polyphony. The self is viewed as being made up of many voices which communicate with each other and also consider other voices coming from outside. Thus, one’s identity is a site for assimilation of the inner voices and those voices around the self (Hermans, 2001).

Dialogical self theory allows the possibility for individuals to experience the ‘multiplicity of worlds’ (Hermans, 1996, p.33). Identity from this perspective is not determined by a single self, but results from a dynamic dialogue between voices (Dimmagio, Fiore, Salvatore, & Carcione, 2007). Therefore, individuals are seen as being shaped by dialogue, both dialogues within ourselves and in relation to other individuals. Hermans (2001) maintains that:

The dialogical self was conceived in terms of a dynamic multiplicity of relatively autonomous “I-positions.” Such I-positions can be parts of the internal domain of the self, such as I-as-ambitious, I-as-vulnerable, or I-as-
child-of-my-parents, but they can also refer to significant others as parts of the external domain of the self, such as my parents, my children, my friends, and even my opponent. (p.188)

Dialogical self theory is based on the notion that there are many positions of the ‘I’ which an individual can occupy; the ‘I’ in one stance can agree, disagree, oppose, challenge, understand, or even misunderstand the ‘I’ in another position (Hermans, 2001).

The multiplicity of the self

The individual self within Dialogical Self Theory is conceptualized as constructed from multiple voices (Hermans, 2001). Individuals are thus capable of evaluating their situation, taking different positions and producing responses to these situations. These processes can happen externally, such as when individuals use a certain voice in a situation with their ingroup, or internally when the individual’s ‘I’ adopts and manage various voices (Hermans & Lyddon, 2006; Hermans, 2006; Hermans & Dimaggio, 2007). For instance, a teacher can perform as a strict class manager at one time and change position to become a friend to students at another. Different voices and positions have the potential to cause either conflict or harmony; they can cause individuals to be either accepted or rejected (Hermans, 2003).

The other in the self

According to Hermans (2008), a dialogical self is possible if other individuals are seen not purely outside the self, but thought of as being essential parts of the self. The other should not be regarded as something added to the self; rather, the self can be understood properly ‘only when social interchange and intersubjectivity are considered as intrinsic to its nature’ (p.187). In other words, other individuals are considered as intrinsic parts of the self; they
become ‘imagination and imaginary figures’ (p.187). Thus, imaginary dialogues have an important role in bringing other individuals inside the self, where they ‘play a constitutive role in the creation of meaning’ (p.187). Hence, the self is necessarily social, as other individuals are regarded as occupying positions in a multi-voiced self (Hermans, 2001).

**The theatre of metaphor and the personal position repertoire**

Hermans (2006) proposes the theater of metaphor as a concept for explaining the shifting nature of dialogic voices. An individual’s mind is considered a stage; it becomes a space where different characters and voices interact, where there is a personal position repertoire (Hermans, 2001; 2003). The repertoire is a list of the ‘I’ positions or the characters that are available to the individual (Hermans, 2003). The dominant voice takes a central role and silences other voices so that they play lesser roles or even disappear all together. The stage director, the representation of the individual’s metaposition, is in charge of directing all actions on the stage. The play, the way various voices interact in the stage, is determined by the awareness of the director. Tension and friction between voices are considered to be arguments. The already disappearing characters and external characters are inactive, yet available to perform on the stage. Therefore, the voices are dynamic; they can interact with each other, and appear or disappear on the stage depending on their power at any given moment.

**2.10. Review of previous research**

This section reviews previous studies which explored the way NNESTs are perceived by other education stakeholders such as students and program administrators, and the way NNESTs perceive themselves. It is arranged into two parts. The first part (2.10.1) presents
research investigating the way NNESTs were perceived by other education stakeholders; the second part (2.10.2) presents previous studies exploring the ways in which NNESTs perceived themselves.

### 2.10.1. NNESTs perceived by other education stakeholders

There have been many studies (Mahboob, 2004; Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Nemtchinova, 2005; Ling & Braine, 2007; Chun, 2014; Sung, 2014; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014) exploring perceptions of NNESTs by other education stakeholders, most of which involved students as participants. While the studies were conducted in various contexts, the findings reveal fairly consistent perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of NESTs and NNESTs.

Mahboob (2004) explored students’ perceptions of NNESTs in the US. Employing discourse analysis, he asked 32 students enrolled in intensive English language programs to write responses reflecting their opinions comparing NESTs and NNESTs. The results showed mixed responses. NESTs were regarded positively in terms of oral skills, vocabulary and knowledge of English-related cultures, but negatively in terms of knowledge of grammar, experience as ESL learners, teaching methodology and their ability to answer students’ questions. On the other hand, NNESTs were regarded positively in terms of their experience as English learners, knowledge of grammar, teaching methodology, vocabulary, culture, ability to answer questions and literacy skills. As might be expected, students were negative about their oral skills and cultural knowledge.

In Hungary, Benke and Medgyes (2005) explored the perceptions of learners at both secondary and university levels of NESTs and NNESTs. They surveyed 422 students who had been taught by both NESTs and NNESTs. The students were at an intermediate level of English proficiency. The study found that NNESTs were seen as adopting a structured
approach to teaching grammar. The teachers were also perceived as having the ability to help students with difficulties related to grammar, prepare students for local examinations, promote effective learning and speak students’ first language. However, the students also saw NNESTs as having inaccurate pronunciation and using first language excessively. On the other hand, NESTs were perceived as having good speaking competence, providing good models for students with regard to English, encouraging students to speak and being friendly to students. However, the students saw NESTs as providing few grammatical explanations and being difficult to understand, particularly by students who had low English language competence.

Ling and Braine (2007) also conducted a study in Hong Kong, investigating the attitude of undergraduate students towards their NNESTs. Two instruments were used in the study: a questionnaire survey, which involved 420 students of seven universities, and interviews which involved ten students from three universities. All of the participants had the experience of being taught by both NESTs and NNESTs. Ling and Braine found that the participants showed a favorable attitude towards NNESTs and did not experience difficulties in relation to NNESTs’ language. NNESTs were seen by the students as having effective strategies in teaching as they had gone through a similar education system, understanding students better because of their shared cultural background, having the ability to explain difficult materials in the students’ mother tongue, and being capable of teaching materials suitable to students’ learning needs and styles. However, the students also saw NNESTs as being too focused on examinations and over-correcting students’ mistakes in using English.

Chun (2014) explored university students’ perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs in Korea. Employing a questionnaire, she involved 125 student participants. Chun found that the students did not uniformly prefer one group of teachers over the other, recognizing that NESTs and Korean English teachers have different strengths and weaknesses. The findings show that the participants had different beliefs about the characteristics, particular areas of
instructional competence, teaching effectiveness at different learning stages, and classroom performance of NESTs and NNESTs. NESTs were seen as being more effective in their language competence and their status as native speakers of English. On the other hand, Korean English language teachers were perceived as being more effective in dealing with psychological aspects of learning and being more sensitive to students’ needs, coming from the teachers’ experience as language learners and having a shared mother tongue.

Sung (2014) conducted a study to investigate the way Hong Kong 25 secondary students from four schools perceived NESTs and NNESTs. Semi-structured interviews again revealed that the participants saw NESTs and NNESTs as having different strengths and weaknesses. NESTs were perceived as having strengths with regard to their interactive styles in teaching and accurate pronunciation. However, the teachers were also seen as having weaknesses related to their teaching of grammar and examination skills, whereas these were strengths for NNESTs. However, NNESTs were criticized for their teacher-centered pedagogy and inaccurate pronunciation.

Walkinshaw and Oanh (2014) explored the views of university students in Vietnam and Japan about the advantages and disadvantages of learning English from NESTs and NNESTs. As in most of the other studies, they found that students perceived NESTs as good models for pronunciation and language use, and as having knowledge of cultures related to English. However, they were seen as having low ability in teaching English grammar, as we have seen in other contexts. On the other hand, NNESTs were perceived as having good ability in teaching grammar, having an advantage in the form of a shared mother tongue, and sharing the same culture with students, which the students thought helped them to interact with their teachers. However, NNESTs were seen as having a weakness with regard to their pronunciation, although the students reported that the teachers’ pronunciation is easier to comprehend than that of NESTs.
Not many studies involved education stakeholders other than students as participants. One is Nemtchinova (2005), who conducted a study in the US to explore the way host teachers, that is, ESL teachers with whom teacher trainees were paired to teach practicum classes, perceived the strengths of non-native English teacher trainees with regard to their classroom practice. Employing a questionnaire, she found that the host teachers saw non-native English teacher trainees as having the following strengths: knowledge of English grammar, the ability to understand the challenges which students face in learning English, empathy for students, cross-cultural experience, and the ability to serve as good role models for students. On the other hand, the host teachers also perceived the non-native English teacher trainees as having an inadequate command of English.

2.10.2. Non-native English-speaking teachers' self-perceptions

Similar to research exploring other education stakeholders’ perceptions of NNESTs, previous studies investigating the way NNESTs perceived themselves suggest that NNESTs saw themselves as having different strengths and weaknesses.

Reves and Medgyes (1994) surveyed 216 NESTs and NNESTs from ten countries: Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Israel, Mexico, Nigeria, Russia, Sweden, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe. Their hypotheses were that: NESTs and NNESTs are different in terms of their teaching behaviours; the differences were related to their different language proficiency levels; and their knowledge of the differences affects their teaching attitudes and self-perceptions. Reves and Medgyes found that sixty-eight percent of the participants perceived differences in NESTs’ and NNESTs’ teaching practices. Eighty-four percent of the NNESTs acknowledged their own language difficulties, especially in vocabulary and fluency, followed
by speaking, pronunciation, and listening. Only twenty-five percent of the respondents stated that their language difficulties did not influence their teaching practices.

Applying Reves and Medgyes’ (1994) approach, Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (1999) examined how seventeen non-native English-speaking TESOL students, who were pursuing a Master of Arts or PhD at a university in the US, perceived themselves as future NNESTs. While all of the participants were students in a TESOL program, some already had teaching experience. Using quantitative and qualitative methods, Samimy and Brutt-Griffler distributed questionnaires, conducted interviews, held class discussions, and analyzed autobiographical writings to gather data from the participants. Primary focus was given to participants’ perceptions of differences in teaching behavior and how those differences affected their practices. Two thirds of the participants reported that their teaching practices were influenced by their language proficiency. Nearly ninety percent perceived some differences between NESTs and NNESTs. While NESTs were identified as being informal, fluent, accurate and flexible, NNESTs were perceived themselves as being text-book dependent, applying differences between their first and second language, using their mother tongue as a medium of instruction, being more efficient, and knowing students’ cultural background. Brutt-Griffler and Samimy’s study revealed that NNESTs did not consider their native counterparts to be superior, confirming Reves and Medgyes’ (1994) findings which indicate that teaching contexts necessarily affect the self-perceptions of EFL teachers.

Arva and Medgyes (2000) investigated the way both NESTs and NNESTs perceived their own and each other’s teaching behaviours, comparing their perceived and actual teaching behaviours. Five British and five Hungarian teachers were interviewed and observed for one lesson. Arva and Medgyes found that NESTs and NNESTs were perceived to be different in four aspects. First, both groups perceived NESTs as having superior English-language competence, while NNESTs were seen as having a faulty command of English.
Second, in terms of grammar knowledge NNESTs were perceived to be more accomplished, as reported by both groups. Third, both groups saw NESTs’ inability to speak the local language as a weakness. In comparison, NNESTs were seen as having a first-language advantage, which helped them understand students’ learning difficulties, as well as be more sensitive to students’ needs and education goals. Fourth aspect, the professional behaviour of NESTs was criticized for being too casual in teaching and being permissive. Most NESTs were perceived by NNESTs as often not using course books. On the other hand, NNESTs were seen as stricter teachers, which Arva and Medgyes related to the teachers’ awareness of the school administrative tasks and regulations.

Ma’s (2012) Hong Kong study explored the perceptions of NNESTs regarding the strengths and weaknesses of NESTs and NNESTs. Involving 53 Hong Kong English teachers from 16 secondary schools, the study employed mixed methods, namely, a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. While the questionnaire was given to all participants of the study, the semi-structured interviews involved only three local English teachers chosen from the schools which participated in the previous stage of the research. Ma found that NESTs and NNESTs are perceived as having different linguistic, socio-cultural and pedagogical strengths and weaknesses. The participants believed that NNESTs can communicate more effectively with the local students; they have deeper understanding of the local education system and students’ socio-cultural backgrounds; they also understand more of the needs and difficulties of their students in learning English, since the teachers share the same mother tongue and learning experiences with the students. However, the inadequacy of NNESTs’ English proficiency was believed to cause low self-confidence. NNESTs also possessed insufficient cultural knowledge of English-speaking countries. The pedagogical practices of these teachers were perceived as less motivating: ‘too examination oriented’, ‘too demanding and always correcting students’ mistakes’ (p.7). NESTs, on the other hand, are perceived as having good
English proficiency, with good spoken English and colloquial linguistic knowledge. They are believed to provide a better language model, since they possess cultural knowledge of their home countries. In terms of speaking, the participants thought that NESTs are the sources of ‘authentic’ English. However, NESTs were also perceived to have low understanding of students’ needs and problems in learning English; they cannot assist students with low English proficiency. The participants believed that NESTs have pedagogical weaknesses, which are related to their different cultures and inadequate knowledge of local education system; they are viewed as too informal and not being oriented to local examinations. Ma does recognize that that the perceived strengths and weaknesses reported were related to the specific context of the study.

2.11. Chapter conclusions

This chapter has presented a review of the literature guiding the research in exploring the research topics. In the chapter, it has been suggested that although both NESTs and NNESTs can be good English teachers with their own strengths and weaknesses, both groups have different status in the field of English language teaching. NESTs are commonly perceived as ‘professional’ teachers, while NNESTs are often stereotyped as ‘less competent’ teachers. The chapter has indicated that the different stereotypes and status of NESTs and NNESTs can affect the professional identity of NNESTs. Further, for understanding the professional identity of NNESTs, in this chapter I have discussed the concept of identity drawn from the field of social psychology. It is argued that the concept should be further extended, taking into account the historical past and colonial discourse as crucial aspects which contribute to the construction of identity. As this study deals with perceptions, the literature review has also explored the concepts of social perceptions, categorizations and stereotypes.
In order to understand the participants’ perceptions of English, I have identified how historical, sociocultural and political factors have shaped English in Indonesia and the discourse of English as an international language in the context of this study. It has been proposed that English in Indonesia is intertwined with colonial and postcolonial history; it is shaped by the sociocultural, economic and political power of English-speaking countries, particularly the US and the UK. Furthermore, the chapter has introduced the concept of investment in second language learning. For exploring the participants’ understanding of the term ‘native English speaker’, the concept of ‘native speaker’ has been elaborated on in the chapter. It has been argued that there are misconceptions related to the concept. A review of research exploring the concept of ‘an ideal English teacher’ has been presented, reflecting the intricateness of the concept. Furthermore, the chapter has presented the theoretical frameworks of the study: Bhabha’s (1983) concepts of colonial discourse and stereotype for exploring the way students, parents and OSTs perceive ITEs, and Tajfel’s (1978) social identity theory and Hermans’ (2001) dialogical self theory for exploring the self-perceptions of ITEs. Last, the chapter has reviewed previous research with regard to the way education stakeholders perceive NNESTs and the way NNESTs perceive themselves.
Chapter 3
Research Methodology

Chapter 2 has presented review of literature which theoretically guides the research. This chapter introduces the research methodology employed in this study. Methodology refers to social-scientific discourse which relates discussions of issues in the philosophy of social science and discussions of research methods, including procedures and techniques (Schwandt, 2007). It situates the researcher in the empirical world, raises questions which are relevant to the design of research, and links research questions to data (Punch, 2005). The chapter begins with an explanation of the ontology, epistemology and paradigm of the research. It discusses the research design, qualitative ethnography, used to explore the research topic. Further, the chapter outlines the processes of data collection, which includes an account of a pilot study evaluating a computer-based image elicitation technique used in this research to explore and disclose students’ racial constructs of an ideal English teacher. This technique was used as a novel approach to the issue as previous research commonly uses interviews or questionnaires, or a combination of the two instruments (e.g. Mahboob et al., 2004; Clark & Paran, 2007; Ma, 2012). Last, this chapter discusses the data analysis of the study, including the approach and stages in the analytical process.

3.1. The ontology, epistemology, and paradigm of the research

All research begins with ontological and epistemological assumptions which serve as the foundation of inquiry (Guba & Lincoln, 2004; Hesse-Bibber & Leavy, 2004; Creswell, 2013, 2014). As these assumptions impact all phases of the research process, it is necessary for
researchers to be aware of their philosophical positions and to make their ontological and epistemological stances transparent (Guba & Lincoln, 2004; Creswell, 2013, 2014).

My ontological stance in this study is influenced by historical realism. Under such a philosophy, I see knowledge as social constructs shaped by various aspects of life. It ‘consists of a series of structural/historical insights’ (Guba & Lincoln, 2004, p. 31). Accordingly, I believe that reality is real because it is perceived as real. As Guba and Lincoln (2004) put it:

A reality is assumed to be apprehendable that once plastic, but that was, over time, shaped by a congeries of social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender factors, and then crystallized (reified) into a series of structures that are now (inappropriately) taken as “real” that is, natural and immutable. (p. 26)

As reality is seen as being shaped by such various factors and put into a seemingly fixed form, it generates both privilege and oppression; it gives certain advantages to some groups of individuals and disadvantages others (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011; Creswell, 2013).

Epistemologically, because I believe that all knowledge is socially constructed, I perceive research as a subjective inquiry. As such, in my view researchers are always subjective and linked to what is researched. As Guba and Lincoln (2004) suggest:

The investigator and the investigated objects are assumed to be interactively linked, with the values of the investigator (and of situated “others”) inevitably influencing the inquiry. Findings are therefore value mediated. ...what can be known is inextricably intertwined with the interaction between a particular investigator and a particular object or group. (p. 26)
3.2. Research design – Qualitative Ethnography

The design of this research is based on the nature of research problems and questions (Patton, 2002; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, 2013; Creswell, 2013, 2014; Tracy, 2013). Additionally, it is driven by the key objectives of the study (Flick, 2009). My methodological decision to employ qualitative design for this study is founded on three key aspects. First, I chose qualitative design because this research is exploratory; it explores the way the professional identity of ITEs is perceived by various education stakeholders in relation to the strong preference for NESTs. Creswell (2013) suggests that qualitative design can be employed when a particular issue ‘needs to be explored’ (p. 47). Second, the research questions which I address indicate that I seek to gain an in-depth understanding of the issue and cover the multiplicity of participants’ views. Qualitative research is appropriate as it presents ‘a complex, detailed understanding of a phenomenon’ (Creswell, 2013, p. 16). It is a research design which locates researchers in the natural world (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, 2013); it makes the world visible and captures individuals’ multiple perspectives which represents the complexity of the world (Creswell, 2013, 2014). Last, in the design of the research I considered the key objectives of this study. Qualitative research is suitable for the research because it deals with perceptions. Strauss and Corbin (1998) proposes that ‘qualitative methods can be used to obtain the intricate details about phenomena such as feelings, thought processes, and emotions that are difficult to extract or learn about through more conventional methods’ (p. 11).

This study employs ethnography as a method. Ethnography is a research method drawn from anthropology and sociology; it focuses on exploring the complexity of ‘culture sharing group[s]’ (Creswell, 2013, p. 90). Therefore, ethnography reflects the close relationships between action, knowledge, society, and culture (Thomas, 1993). It is a natural design as it takes place in a real setting in which individuals are researched in their day-to-
An ethnographic study consists of ‘procedures for describing, analysing, and interpreting a cultural group’s shared patterns of behaviour, beliefs, and language that develop over time’ (Creswell, 2011, p. 462). This research is an ethnographic study as the participants are researched in the school, their day-to-day context. Furthermore, it explores the participants’ shared culture (Creswell, 2013). The use of ethnography in this study allows the participants to share their complex experiences and views of the world (Creswell, 2013; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). More importantly, the design provides me with an opportunity to obtain an emic perspective, which is useful for understanding the participants’ perceptions.

3.2.1. My research reflexivity – Who am I in this research?

Reflexivity is ‘the recognition on the part of the researcher that research is a process that contains a variety of power dimensions’ (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2004, p. 133). It refers to ‘the careful consideration of the ways in which researchers’ past experiences, points of view, and roles impact these same researchers’ interactions with, and interpretation of, the research scene’ (Tracy, 2013, p. 2). Addressing a researcher’s reflexivity in ethnography is imperative as it ‘forces us to acknowledge our own power, privilege, and biases’ (Madison, 2012, p. 8). Generally, reflexivity determines the way a study is conducted (Flick, 2004; Creswell, 2013; 2014). It affects the overall ethnographic process: from collecting data, constructing theories, understanding methodology, constructing the researcher’s voice, to reporting the study (Chiseri-Strater, 1996).

The ‘I’ who conducted the research is a Javanese male teacher from Indonesia who is a non-native English speaker and has been teaching English as a foreign language for more than
10 years. This positioning is important to make explicit as it has affected the way I approached and conducted the research.

My identity as an Indonesian teacher of English has shaped this research in two ways. First, because I am Indonesian, I have an understanding of the ‘culture sharing group’ which I explored in the study (Creswell, 2013, p. 90). More importantly, I have an understanding of how the research problems occur in the research setting. Such understandings became my emic perspectives which have provided me with authentic life experiences of the culture sharing group (Creswell, 2013, 2014).

Second, being a non-native English language teacher, and therefore member of a group of teachers who are often seen as less competent by individuals in the local community, I employed a critical advocate perspective in the study (Madison, 2012). I felt that I had a personal responsibility to investigate the research problems and employ the findings to disclose this inequality. Unavoidably, such an aspect has also influenced the way I interpret the findings. With regard to this aspect, I consider my subjective interpretation of the findings and reflection on the research in general as important parts of the study itself (Flick, 2002). Crotty (1998) argues that ‘different ways of viewing the world shape different ways of researching the world’ (p. 66). Thus, this study is my way of viewing and researching the research problems which both informs and is informed by my identity as a non-native, Indonesian teacher of English.

---

3 Emic perspectives refer to my insider views. I employ the perspectives to ‘capture participants’ indigenous meanings of real-world events’ (Yin, 2010, p. 11). I try to understand the issues as participants of the study understand them.
3.3. Ethical considerations

Ethical processes are vital in research as they protect participants and guide them to provide reliable information (Lindorff, 2010). While I have obtained ethical clearance for the study, I considered fully the importance of addressing the ethical issues of this research. With regard to the ethical considerations, I applied Lindorff’s (2010) four core ethical principles – justice, beneficence, respect for persons and conflict of interest for researchers.

The ethical principle of justice requires that ‘particular groups or individuals not to bear the burden in terms of time, energy, discomfort/distress or disclosure, while others receive the benefits’ (Lindorff, 2010, p. 53). Therefore, participation in this study was voluntary. Prior to obtaining the participants’ consent, I introduced the research to the participants and gave them clear preliminary information about the study. I then asked the participants who were willing to participate in the research to sign informed consents (Appendix 1). Before starting each interview or group discussion, I always reminded the participants about the nature of the research and, especially, their voluntary participation.

The beneficence principle is based on ‘a utilitarian framework which views actions as acceptable if they minimise risks of harm and maximise possible benefits’ (Lindorff, 2010, p. 54). Based on this principle, during the research fieldwork I continuously evaluated the ‘probability and magnitude of benefits and harm’ (p. 54). I tried to be sensitive to the participants’ needs and maintained good relationships with them.

The principle of respect for persons deals with the participants’ privacy, confidentiality and cultural sensitivity. Lindorff (2010) contends that such a principle ‘rests on the deontological framework which operates from the foundation that individuals have rights – such as for autonomy and privacy – and to violate these causes a wrong’ (p. 55). In this study I
applied the principle at individual level by assigning pseudonyms to all participants in the research, so that their privacy is respected.

Last, Lindorff (2010) suggests that researchers must avoid an internal conflict of interest. She warns that ‘pressure may be placed upon researchers to interpret material in a particular manner’ (p. 56). This pressure could be in the form of financial gain. In relation to the last principle, this study is purely a personal academic inquiry. It does not involve funding or grants from any organization. Respondents were not paid or otherwise coerced into participating. Thus, there was no conflict between my interest as a researcher and the individuals’ involved in the study.

3.4. Data collection

This section addresses the data collection process of the study. It includes descriptions of the research setting and participants; it also describes the way the empirical data collection was done in the field.

3.4.1. Research setting

Ethnography focuses on culture sharing groups in which individuals interact frequently and develop ‘shared patterns of behaviour, beliefs, and language’ (Creswell, 2013, p. 90). Considering a school as a form of culture sharing group where individuals interact over time and share experience, I conducted the fieldwork of this research at SMADA, a state senior high school in Java.

SMADA is a state senior high school founded in 1950 by the Indonesian Government. The school is located in Malang, the second largest city in the province of East Java, Indonesia.
Demographically, the majority of SMADA students are from Malang. However, the sociocultural background of the students is relatively heterogeneous. As the setting is a public school, the economic backgrounds of the students are diverse. Generally, the academic profile of the students is reflected by the rank of the school in the regional high school entrance test system. There are nine state senior high schools in Malang. In the regional high school entrance test system, the schools were divided into three groups. At the time of the study, SMADA was at the first rank of three schools in group two. Similar to the students, the teachers also had relatively heterogeneous sociocultural backgrounds. At the time of the study, there were 70 full-time teachers who were mostly from Malang or have stayed in the city for a long time.

My decision to choose SMADA as the research setting for this study was based on two factors. First, for the last three years the school has been hiring NESTs. This makes the school relevant for the research as in this study I investigate the way professional identity of ITEs is perceived by various education stakeholders in relation to the strong preference for NESTs. More importantly, the presence of NESTs at the research setting gave individuals at the school opportunities to interact with both NESTs and ITEs. Second, I chose the school because I share language and cultural backgrounds with individuals at the research setting. I was born and grew up in Malang, the city in which the school is located. This aspect is important in ethnography as it allowed me to more easily gain access to the setting and provided me with an interpretive lens in order to understand the participants’ emic perspectives.
3.4.2. Participants

This research involved four groups of participants, which included 178 third-year students, twelve parents, eight other subject teachers and six Indonesian teachers of English. The initial design of the study included native English-speaking teachers. However, at the time of the study, there were no NESTs at the school. Due to this absence, NESTs were not involved in this research. Yet, it does not impact on the focus of the study, which is to explore how ITEs perceive themselves with regard to the perceptions of other education stakeholders.

For selecting the participants, I employed *purposive sampling strategy* (Patton, 2002; Maxwell, 2005; Creswell, 2011, 2013). In such a strategy a researcher ‘selects individuals and sites for study because they can purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study’ (Creswell, 2013, p. 156). The strategy, Maxwell (2005) suggests, can help researchers get in-depth information from a particular setting.

For this study, I used the following selection criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Third year students Have experiences in being taught by NESTs and ITEs More than 17 years old at the time of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Parents of third-year students studying at the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSTs</td>
<td>More than 5 year teaching experience More than 2 years teaching at the research setting Have experience in interacting with NESTs at the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEs</td>
<td>More than 2 years teaching at the research setting Have experience in interacting or working collaboratively with NESTs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fetterman (2010) suggests that prior to recruiting participants, researchers must be familiar with individuals in research settings. Researchers must rely on their judgment to recruit research participants based on previously established criteria. They must also consider the research purposes and questions of the study. More specifically, in ethnography, it is crucial for researchers to identify informants who are most likely to possess emic knowledge of the research domain (Thomas, 1993). Therefore, in this study I started the participant selection process after I felt that I was familiar with individual stakeholders in the school and knew potential participants who might have emic perspectives. To establish naturalness of data collection, I also considered my acceptance into the school community. The selection process of participants started approximately a month after I entered the research setting.

Using the purposive sampling strategy, I employed two techniques for recruiting participants: *direct recruitment* in which I asked participants who meet the selection criteria directly to take part in the study, and *participant referral snowballing technique* in which selected participants recommended other potential participants. As part of my ethical responsibility, I explained ethical aspects of the research to the participants. As Creswell (2013) suggests, I explained five aspects: (1) that they have rights to withdraw from the study at anytime without any adverse consequences, such as their school results or treatment by teachers, (2) the main purpose of the study and research procedures, (3) the confidentiality of the participants, (4) the known risks associated with participation in the research, and (5) the expected benefits from the study.
**Students**

One hundred and seventy eight third-year students participated in the study. At the time of the research, all were more than seventeen years old. While the students were from the same city, their sociocultural and economic backgrounds varied. As the school did not use any English proficiency test as part of the school entrance test, students of SMADA had various English language proficiency levels. Generally, the 178 student participants involved in the study had low English proficiency. Furthermore, they shared the same experience of having been taught by both ITEs and NESTs. In the study eighteen students (nine males and nine females) were interviewed and 160 students were involved in group discussions (further discussed in section 3.5.4. Data collection process).

**Parents**

Twelve parents (six pairs) of third-year students were involved in the study. The majority, nine parents, were from Malang, while three were from other cities. However, all of the parents had lived in the city for a long time. Similar to the backgrounds of the student participants, the parents’ sociocultural and economic backgrounds varied. The parents’ education backgrounds were diverse; generally, their English proficiency was considered to be low.
Table 3. Parents involved in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Aryodamar</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Aceh</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Aryodamar</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Bangil</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Zainal</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Malang</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Zainal</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Malang</td>
<td>Senior high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Samadi</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Samadi</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Malang</td>
<td>Senior high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hardi</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Malang</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Hardi</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Malang</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Darman</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Malang</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Darman</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Malang</td>
<td>Senior high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rahmat</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Malang</td>
<td>Senior high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rahmat</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Malang</td>
<td>Senior high school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other subject teachers**

Eight teachers teaching subjects other than English were involved in the study. Four of the teachers were male and four were female. While most of the teachers had more than ten years teaching experience, all had been teaching at the school for more than five years. Similar to the students and parents, most of the teachers were from Malang. They had various sociocultural and economic backgrounds. Generally, the teachers had Bachelor’s Degrees in Teaching relevant to the school subject which they taught. However, they did not have high English proficiency. All had direct experiences in interacting with both ITEs and NESTs at the research context. The following eight OSTs were involved in the study:
Indonesian teachers of English

At the time of the study, there were six ITEs at the school. All were involved in the study. Five of the teachers were female and one was a male. All of the teachers had more than five years teaching experience. They had been teaching at the research setting for more than three years. Therefore, the teachers could be regarded as having a ‘shared culture’ (Creswell, 2013). The sociocultural and economic backgrounds of the teachers were diverse, although most of them were from Malang. Only two teachers were from other cities, which are close to Malang. Most of the teachers had lived in the city for a long time. While the ITEs had similar education backgrounds (such as a Bachelor’s Degree in English teaching), they had various English proficiency levels. The following ITEs were involved in the study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSTs</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>At SMADA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hermin</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>31 years</td>
<td>Since 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatah</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>29 years</td>
<td>Since 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Since 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>21 years</td>
<td>Since 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henny</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Since 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>Since 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okta</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jafar</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5. ITEs involved in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEs</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>At SMADA</th>
<th>Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>Since 2005</td>
<td>Malang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepti</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13 years</td>
<td>Since 2005</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asri</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Since 2001</td>
<td>Malang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahyu</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16 years</td>
<td>Since 2004</td>
<td>Malang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamik</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Since 1984</td>
<td>Since 1984</td>
<td>Malang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syaifur</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Since 1984</td>
<td>Since 2010</td>
<td>Madura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4.3. My field identity – Being an English teacher at the school

Qualitative research, particularly ethnographic research, is about ‘immersing oneself in a scene and trying to make sense of it’ (Tracy, 2013, p. 3). In such research, the researcher has a responsibility to build relationships and trust in order to elicit the emic perspectives of the participants. The researcher, as Creswell (2013) suggests, should ‘de-emphasize a power relationship’ and ‘empower individuals to share their stories, hear their stories, and minimize the power relationships that exist between a researcher and the participants in a study’ (p. 48). Further, as Chiseri-Strater (1996) proposes, in a research setting, researchers must consider the way they present themselves to their informants and how the researchers think the informants perceive them.

The key fieldwork instrument is the researcher’s self (Reinharz, 2011; Creswell, 2013). Reinharz (2011) proposes that ‘an essential element of the fieldwork process is understanding the relevance and creation of different researcher selves in the research setting’ (p. 9). She further asserts that there are ‘tripartite divisions’ among the researcher’s self which she outlines as researcher selves, personal selves and situational selves (p. 5). The researcher selves, she explains, refer to the selves which are concerned with doing the
research. Personal selves are the selves that a researcher brings to the field. Situational selves are selves which are created in the field. Chiseri-Strater (1996) describes this as the 'fieldworker's persona' (p. 116).

In order to immerse myself in the research setting, to obtain data from the participants, and more importantly to understand their emic perspectives, I created my field identity as a part-time English teacher. During my fieldwork time in the research setting, I was involved in extra-curricular activities which included teaching English outside formal school hours. Such activities gave me opportunities to identify potential participants for the study, as well as to better know and understand individuals at the research setting.

Reinharz (2011) suggests that field identity must be understood, not only as what a researcher brings to or creates in the field, but also who the researcher is when not in the field. Therefore, it is necessary for a researcher to disclose any of the 'non-identities' which may become problematic, particularly in affecting the way a researcher establishes trust and relationship with research participants (p. 13). During my interaction with individuals at the research setting, especially students, I made them aware that I was not a full-time teacher at the school and that I did not have the authority to evaluate their academic achievement. The individuals' understandings of this aspect helped me establish close relationships with both students and teachers.

3.4.4. Data collection process

The data collection process of this study was conducted from November 2012 to March 2013. Before entering the research setting, I contacted the principal of the school through my 'gatekeeper', a senior teacher who formerly worked at the school. I obtained
formal permission to conduct my research fieldwork from the principal after I explained my objectives for entering the school community.

Generally, the nature of the data collection process was both systematic and flexible. Such nature was described by Bazeley (2013) as ‘planned flexibility’ (p. 32). She suggests that:

Planning helps to ensure the research remains purposeful, and that practical considerations impacting on achieving those purposes have been thought through. Having flexibility in design means that it will be possible to adjust specific questions and methods as required on the basis of field experience, and that the possibility of changes has been considered, with these being allowed for as contingencies in the planning phase. (p. 33)

While I designed a research plan prior to going to the setting, in the field I made some adjustments based on my field experience and early data analysis (Bazeley, 2013). One of key aspects which influenced the way I gathered data from participants is the ‘naturalness’ of the research setting (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2004, p. 136). I wanted to obtain research data with little disruption of the participants’ lives. Creswell (2013) argues that a researcher has to ‘respect the daily lives of individuals at the site’ (p. 95). In other words, the research participants should be ‘engaged in ongoing, naturally occurring social interaction’ (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2004, p. 136). In order to maintain such ‘naturalness’ of the research setting, I asked the school principal to help me to develop a close relationship with the research participants. Therefore, I created and played my field identity as a part-time English teacher at the school (my field identity has been described in section 3.5.3).

With my field identity as a part-time English teacher, I immersed myself in the day-to-day life of individuals at the setting. While the individuals in the school community were aware that I was a researcher conducting fieldworks, during fieldwork I emphasized my
identity as a part-time teacher for developing relationships and ‘gaining [the] confidence of informants’ (Creswell, 2013, p. 148).

I started the data collection process after I felt that individuals who could become potential participants for the research were close and comfortable talking with me. For gathering data from the participants, I used two research instruments: semi-structured interviews with all four groups of participants and group discussions with students. All interviews and group discussions were conducted in the participants’ national language, Indonesian. For the interviews and discussions, I prepared sets of questions and procedures (Appendix 2). I used interviews as the primary instrument for data collection because I regarded them as ‘one of the most powerful ways in which we try to understand our fellow human beings’ (Fontana & Frey, 2000, p. 645). Interviews enabled me to explore the ‘world’ of the participants (Bryman, 2004, p. 312).

As presented in the introductory chapter, besides exploring the way the professional identity of ITEs is perceived by various education stakeholders, the research also explored some important issues, one of which is the way the stakeholders conceptualized an ideal English teacher, particularly in relation to the native speaker fallacy, the belief that ideal English teachers are native speakers of English (Phillipson, 1992). It is important to explore the racial aspects of the participants’ concepts of an ideal English teacher because English language nativeness is often associated with racial and physical features (Amin, 1994; Kubota & Lin, 2009). Therefore, in interviews with the eighteen students, I employed a computer-based image elicitation technique using computer software. I used the technique for exploring the students’ concepts of an ideal English teacher, focusing on disclosing the racial aspects of the concepts. Prior to using the technique in the actual data collection process, I conducted a pilot study involving five participants to evaluate the practicality and effectiveness of the technique, and the quality of research data generated (further presented in section 3.5.5).
The student participants were also involved in group discussions. While individual interviews generate individual voices, group discussions ‘give different sort of data, [which] confirm or amplify, [and] encourage the silent voices in interviews’ (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2004, p. 145). Therefore, data from group discussions gave breadth to interview data (O’Reilly, 2013). I consider group data as a product of the collaborative dialogue of participants, rather than a collection of individuals’ voices. Additionally, group discussions can capture the dynamic nature of groups – how individuals share ideas, how ideas are shaped in interaction (O’Reilly, 2013). While I moderated these discussions, the level of moderation was low. I let the student participants interact and bounce their views around spontaneously. I conducted twenty sessions of group discussions with the students during fieldwork, each of which involved eight participants. I applied the same procedure in each discussion. Morgan (in Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2004) labels this fieldwork ‘standardization’. Generally, the data collection process is illustrated by the following figure.

Figure 2. Data collection process – based on Rubin and Rubin’s (2012) ‘responsive interviewing’
Reflecting the nature of the research, which is systematic and flexible, I applied Rubin and Rubin's (2012) concept of ‘responsive interviewing’ to the whole data collection process (p. 42). Therefore, both the interviews and group discussions were continuous, flexible, and adaptable in nature (p. 42). By continuous, Rubin and Rubin mean that a researcher can redesign the study throughout the research process. Flexibility, on the other hand, refers to how a researcher can explore new information offered by individuals in the research setting and test new ideas or procedures as they emerge. Adaptability, Rubin and Rubin propose, allows the researcher to deal with unexpected aspects in research process. Accordingly, the data collection involves continuous early data analysis which contributes to the refinement of research instruments and procedures.

3.4.5. Pilot study – Computer-based image elicitation technique

As has been described in the literature review, the strong preference for NESTs is not only related to the stereotypes around NESTs and NNESTs in terms of professionalism and competency. The issue is also racially inflected in that the hiring practices of English language teachers are often based on perceptions about race (Kubota & Lin, 2006, 2009). There is a strong but unacknowledged assumption among students that race has a close relationship with linguistic competence (Amin, 1994, 2004; Golombek & Jordan, 2005; Kubota & Lin, 2006, 2009). Therefore, having a white complexion can lead to privileged status in ESL employment (Kubota & Lin, 2006, 2009). In relation to such a problematic issue, it is important to explore the racial aspects of the participants’ concepts of an ideal English teacher. In this study, the racial aspects were explored using a computer-based image elicitation technique, which has never been used by any previous research on NESTs and NNESTs. Therefore, prior to the actual data collection process, a pilot study involving five participants was conducted to
evaluate the technique and quality of data generated. This section presents an account of the pilot study.

**Facial images – Image elicitation**

Research dealing with the issue of the strong preference for NESTs commonly uses interviews or questionnaires, or a combination of these two instruments (e.g. Mahboob et al., 2004; Clark & Paran, 2007; Ma, 2012). While such methods can help researchers explore learners’ preferences and their underlying motives, particular techniques which are able to reveal implicit constructs are still needed (Brauer, Wasel, & Niedenthal, 2000). One possible way to investigate the issue and, particularly, to assist in disclosing racial constructs, is by using facial images in research. Such a way is useful in this study as images, like language, are symbolically meaningful and can supplement textual data (Pink, 2001; Ball & Smith, 2002; Mason, 2005). They provide different insights into research (Harper, 2002; Bignante, 2010). Furthermore, images comprise rich meanings which can be further analysed and interpreted. With regard to this study, facial images are valuable since they explicitly reflected the participants’ preferences for English teachers.

One common research technique employing facial images is image elicitation, which is based on the basic principle of using images in interviews and asking participants to comment on them (Harper, 2002; Bignante, 2010). As a visual-based technique, not only does image elicitation generate more information, it also stimulates different responses from participants, since images ‘evoke deeper elements of human consciousness than do words’ (Harper, 2002, p. 13). On the basis of this aspect, image elicitation thus is not a substitutive technique for traditional interviews. Rather, it is an important way to bring different insights into research and triangulate various sources of information (Bignante, 2010).
Facial images used in research are usually standardized pictures taken from available databases such as FERET (NIST, 2003), the Face Recognition Data website (Spacek, 2008), the SCFace - Surveillance Cameras Face Database (Grgic, Delac, & Grgic, 2009) or self-designed sets of photos using actor portrayals. Such sets of images from these databases provide high validity since they have been rigorously evaluated by previous studies. However, the predetermined images have limited value for this study because of two main reasons. First, the faces are not emotionally neutral. This aspect will unnecessarily affect participants’ responses. Second, the available databases have enormous numbers of facial images. FERET, for example, has 1564 sets of images, with an overall total of 14,126. SCFace has 4160 images. Handling such enormous numbers of images is impractical. Although the sets of images can be used by selecting some and leaving others, researchers are likely to face difficult challenges related to equitable and more or less emotionally neutral representations of the image categories in doing the selection.

Besides such sets of images from the available databases, researchers commonly design their own sets of instruments by using actor portrayals. In terms of fitting into specific research purposes, the self-designed sets potentially provide better suitability than standardized instruments. However, in designing the sets of instruments, the researchers need to be meticulous, because the range of facial images is broad, covering such multiple variables as age, gender and ethnicity. With regard to those variables, the range of instruments self-designed by researchers is often limited, especially in terms of age (Minear & Park, 2004). The task of researchers to include such variables evenly is not easy and can be a time-consuming activity.

Since there is no single research instrument or method par excellence (Wilkinson & Birmingham, 2003; Jenkings, Woodward, & Winter, 2008; Creswell, 2012), the impracticality of standardized sets of images and the difficulties in designing research instruments can be
regarded as an opportunity for conducting research differently by employing alternative techniques. Addressing the need for more innovative and practical approaches, I used a computer-based technique with facial image generator software to elicit and explore students’ concepts of an ideal English teacher.

**The software**

This study employed Facegen Modeller, software designed by Singular Inversion (www.facegen.com), for exploring the racial aspects of student’ concepts of an ideal English teacher. The software was developed based on a database of human faces which have been digitized into three dimensional morphable statistical face models (Singular Inversions, 2012). The value of the software lies in its ability to generate infinite numbers of facial images covering different races, genders and ages. It can do systematic parametric manipulation over the generated images. While the first value is the basic feature of the software, the manipulation of the images produced by the software can be done by changing the available control tabs such as the age variable tab and the morph tab.

![Figure 3. A screenshot of Facegen Modeller software]
Facegen Modeller is commonly used in psychological enquiries and has been used extensively as an instrument to create research stimuli. For example, the software has been used as a rendering tool to generate stimuli in a study exploring whether culture affects the participants’ perceptions of emotions rendered on facial images (Khoosabeh, Gratch, Haung, & Tao, 2010). The random generation feature of the software has been employed to produce faces to investigate how co-varying phenotypes and stereotypes bias sex categorization in social contexts (Johnson, Freeman, & Pauker, 2011). Facegen has also been used to create stimuli images for research investigating how anger and happiness on one face perceptually influences others’ emotional expressions (Neel, Becker, Neuberg, & Kenrick, 2012). The software is a viable validated research instrument in the field of psychology (Roesch, Tamarit, Reveret, Grandjean, Sander, & Scherer, 2010).

For the study, I used version 3.4. Facegen Modeller version 3.4 has some control tabs. Generate tab, which is the basic tab, functions to produce a facial image from various races. Five racial categories are available in this version: African, European, South East Asian/Asian, Indian, and all races category which puts the four previous racial categories into one database. The other tabs (e.g. view, camera, shape, colour, genetic, tween, morph and photofit) can be operated to manipulate the generated facial image and produce emotional expressions. The software also has some sub-tabs in each main tab, which give systematic manipulative controls over the generated image. While operating such sub-tabs as gender, age, caricature and asymmetry in manual mode can produce more heterogeneous variations of facial images, the procedure requires prior practices and much time. The sync lock function of the software can change the manual mode to automatic mode, in which users or participants in the research can operate the software easily. By setting the race sub-tab to all races and locking the sync function, the software only requires participants to hit the generate button to produce a facial image randomly from the available race categories.
Subjects of the pilot study

The pilot study involved five participants whom I purposively recruited. Two were males and the other three were females, ranging in age from 25 to 35. All participants were Indonesians studying at an Australian university.

Methodology

The pilot study was focused on evaluating the practicality and effectiveness of computer-based image elicitation and the quality of visual and textual data generated by the technique. Similar to Johnson et al.’s (2011) research, the pilot study made use of only the basic feature of the software, the random generation tool. Prior to the interviews, no control tab of the software was changed. The race sub-tab was set to all races, which covered the four racial categories. The sync function of the software was locked. This procedure allowed the software to generate an infinite number of facial images randomly and automatically, varying in terms of race, gender, and age. Only the generate button could be used by the participants. The other features of the software were not operationalized.

In the pilot study the participants were interviewed for between 30 and 60 minutes. For making close method analysis possible, all interviews were video recorded. I started the interviews by exploring the demographic data of the participants. In the next stage I introduced the software. A brief procedure for using the software was explained to the participants. Then, I asked the participants to operate the software to generate facial images and choose an image which they thought best represented their ideal English teacher. The participants were allowed to hit the generate button as many times as they liked until they picked a facial image. Every time they pressed the button a facial image was generated.
randomly and displayed by the software. When an image had been selected, I took a screen capture of the display. Finally, I asked the participants why they chose the facial image.

![Figure 4. Samples of generated facial images](image)

Two types of analysis were conducted in the pilot study. The first was method analysis to evaluate the process of data collection, particularly to measure if the technique is practical and effective in generating image and textual data. This was done by direct observations during interviews and by reviewing video recordings which captured the overall interactions between interviewees and the researcher. In this analysis, I focused on important aspects of the method: the overall flow of the procedure, the duration of each interview, the time pauses between each picture generated by the participants, and the number of facial images generated in each interview. Results from the analysis of these aspects indicated the viability of the technique. The second analysis was data quality, measuring the richness of data generated by the technique. This was done by collecting the generated facial images, transcribing the interviews and doing content analysis of the transcripts.
Method and data quality analysis

The pilot study yielded important insights; it has shown how the technique worked and the quality of visual and textual data generated by the technique. These two aspects are discussed in this section.

Table 6. Images and textual data generated in the pilot study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Facial images</th>
<th>Reasons for choosing the facial image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Well I think from his appearance, I think... first, he looks like native English speakers, and... he looks nice. He looks quite patient to teach students... but he does not put seriousness, I mean, he concerns on, you know... ok I think he's patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>The face is friendly, friendly face and she looks helpful... can understand deeply, understand our problems, I think. Physically, it does not matter. Yeah, maybe the way she dresses, just like a teacher mmm... she’s polite and humorous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td>I think because of the eyes. They show patient, patient nature an English teacher should be, in my opinion... the teacher should, you know, have a great of ideas and patience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td>He looks kind of friendly, and probably because mmm he looks like a native English speakers, so probably he got the competence and mmm I don’t know, like yeah, nice person and friendly, and probably he’s native English speaker, so he knows how to speak English properly in terms of pronunciation, but of course I will believe that he can give me the knowledge if this person’s having the competence, probably finish his teaching English course of something.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td>She’s beautiful. That is first impression especially when you are a man. That’s one of your motivations I think, too learn English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Computer-based image elicitation using software is a practical technique for revealing the participants’ various racial preferences and disclosing the implicit constructs of their ideal English teachers. When asked to generate a facial image which they thought best represented their ideal English teacher using the software, participants operated the software easily. Generally, the interview procedure ran smoothly with no technical difficulties arising. The time needed to complete the task and the number of pictures generated varied among the participants. P1 spent 29 seconds. He skipped 27 facial images and selected the 28th facial image. P2 needed 1 minute and 5 seconds. She skipped 19 facial images and picked the 20th facial image. P3 spent longer time, which was 2 minutes and 13 seconds. She skipped 74 faces and chose the 75th facial image. P4 only needed 30 seconds to complete the task. She skipped 12 faces and selected the 13th image. Lastly, P5 took the longest time. He skipped 230 faces and picked the 231st facial image in 4 minutes and 51 seconds. The pauses between each image made by the participants varied. The participants sometimes skipped the facial images quickly, but they often paused and observed some images carefully. In the interview stage 367 facial images were produced in 9 minutes and 8 seconds. The total number of facial images generated and the duration of time that the participants needed to complete the procedure indicate that the computer-based image elicitation technique could cover wide varieties and number of images in a relatively short period of time.

All participants picked Caucasian facial images (Table 6); this was shown by the images and race tab/indicator of the software. The images straightforwardly reflect the participants’ racial preferences. The visual representations of the teacher articulate interpretive meanings which, when related to previous studies (e.g. Amin, 2004; Golombek & Jordan, 2005), can be a rich source of analysis and interpretation. The next stage of the procedure in the data collection process explored the participants’ reasons underlying their preferences. The interview question asking why they selected the facial images revealed
participants’ reasons and assumptions. They directly referred to the images which they had generated and mentioned various reasons. This aspect makes the textual data, which covers various motives, highly relevant to the image produced by the participants.

**Conclusions of the pilot study**

The pilot study provided insights into the actual data collection process. Two analyses were conducted to evaluate the technique: method and data quality analysis. The method analysis was based on empirical aspects of the study: the overall flow of the procedure, the duration of each interview, and the number of facial images generated. The results of the method analysis indicate that computer-based image elicitation is a practical method for exploring the racial aspects of the participants’ various concepts of an ideal English teacher. In terms of data richness, the pilot study showed that the technique generated meaningful image and textual data. Furthermore, the textual data are highly relevant to the image data as the participants’ reasons which they outlined in interviews were based on their preferences for the facial images. The two types of data, image and textual data, are meaningful, reflecting the participants’ complex and multifaceted conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher. Based on the pilot study, it can be proposed that the technique, computer-based image elicitation using Facegen Modeller software in interviews, is a viable technique for exploring students’ concepts of an ideal English teacher.
3.5. Data analysis

Data analysis is a process which brings structure and meaning to research data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, 2013; Creswell, 2013, 2014). As described in the previous section, the data analysis of the study is inseparable from data collection process. It is characterized by ‘constant fluidity’ in which I often ‘engage[d] simultaneously in data collection, data analysis, and interpretation of research findings’ (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2004, p. 12). Therefore, the nature of the process is iterative, going back and forth (Given, 2008). In other words, data collection is an important part of data analysis, as data analysis conducted at early stages provided insights influencing the exploration of further data (Given, 2008). Furthermore, the nature of the data analysis process is also critical. Informed by my research paradigm and reflexivity, the analysis is ‘critical of existing social structures, inequalities, injustices and cultural ideologies’ (Carspecken, 2001, p. 21). The data analysis in this study consists of three stages: transcription, abstraction and translation.

Stage 1 – Transcription

Transcription is important in data analysis as it eases the analysis; it also preserves meanings and the depth of the analysis (Bazeley, 2013). I consider the process as an analytic act which is central to the way researchers orientate themselves to data (Gibson & Brown, 2009). Transcription is a process which builds ‘intimate knowledge’ (Bazeley, 2013, p. 73). In the transcription process, researchers make analytic judgments with regard to what to be represented and the way it should be represented (Gibson & Brown, 2009). Additionally, the process of transcribing is a way to work with research data at an intimate level and to get meaning from the data. In this study, I transcribed the voice data which I gathered from the participants myself. I started the transcription process at early stages of the research, as the
data collection process also involved data analysis for refining research instruments and procedures.

**Stage 2 – Abstraction**

The second stage in data analysis process was abstraction of data. I started the process after the transcription process was finished and all voice data were transcribed into text. At this stage, I employed a hermeneutic-reconstructive approach to articulate meanings or themes of the research data. In such an approach, I tried to ‘understand the meaning of typical acts in much the same way that the actors themselves do but to reconstruct or make explicit the cultural themes drawn upon in the construction of routines’ (Carspecken, 2001, p. 11). The hermeneutic data abstraction process has the following features:

1. **Intersubjectivity** – as a researcher, I considered various subjective views so as to understand meaning within the data.

2. **Position-taking** – I took participants’ various positions, trying to understand meanings from the participants’ perspectives. Silverman (2013) suggests that this stage establishes closeness with research data.

3. **Normative reflection** – a researcher carries her or his own personal life experiences. Reflection upon the experience is essential. Therefore, I also considered my experience as an Indonesian teacher of English.

4. **Normative circle** – understanding/comparisons between the norms the researcher is familiar with and the norm that the actors/participants claim as valid.
Using such an approach, I analysed and abstracted the research data using NVivo 9 software. The use of NVivo as computer data analysis software ‘encourages a researcher to look closely at the data, even line by line, and think about the meaning of each sentence and idea’ (Creswell, 2013, p. 202). It ‘ensure[s] a more complete set of data for interpretation than might occur when working manually’ (Bezeley, 2007, p. 3). The software has helped me to work more attentively, thoroughly and methodically. In that sense, it contributed to the rigorousness of analysis (Bezeley, 2007). In the data abstraction process I employed Creswell’s (2013, p. 183) data analysis spiral:

**Figure 5. Data analysis spiral (Creswell, 2013)**
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Using Creswell’s data analysis spiral, the abstraction was also guided by the theoretical frameworks of the study which ‘explicitly inform the design and provide a template for analysis’ (Bezeley, 2013, p. 39). The abstraction of data was done in five stages: *data organization, reading and memoing, describing and classifying data into codes and themes, interpreting the data, and representing and visualizing the data* (Creswell, 2013, p. 191).

1. **Data organization**
   
   At this stage I imported the transcribed research data into NVivo 9 and organized them into manageable units.

2. **Reading and memoing**
   
   Using NVivo 9 software, I read the textual data thoroughly, made notes and formed initial codes.

3. **Describing and classifying data**
   
   Based on the notes and initial codes, I developed ‘patterned regularities’ and themes inductively (Creswell, 2013, p. 190).

4. **Interpreting the data**
   
   At this stage, I made sense of the themes/findings. I related the data to the theoretical frameworks of the research.

5. **Representing and visualizing the data**
   
   I developed sketches, figures and tables to present the themes/findings.

**Stage 3 – Translation**

In this study, data translation is considered as important part of data analysis, because translation of data and its subsequent analysis have consequences for the results of research (Temple & Young, 2004). After the research data had been abstracted and themes had been
developed, the findings were translated from Indonesian language, the language used in interviews and group discussions, to English. In the translation process, I focused on transferring the ‘meaning’ and ‘nuance’ of the findings (Larkin, Dierckx de Casterlé, & Schotsmans, 2007, p. 468). I preserved the emic quality of the findings by maintaining the meanings and perspectives of the interviewees. Lyons and Coyle (2007) propose that checking original transcript thoroughly against the translated version in data analysis adds credibility to empirical findings. Therefore, to ensure translation accuracy, I asked two Indonesian researchers to read both the original and translated transcripts. Subsequently, the translated findings were used as empirical findings of the research.

3.6. Chapter conclusions

This chapter has introduced the research methodology of this study. It has elucidated the ontology, epistemology and paradigm of the research. In the chapter, I have also discussed ethnography as the research design of the study and outlined the process of data collection and analysis. The next chapter will present and discusses empirical findings from interviews and group discussions with students.
Chapter 4
Students’ Perceptions

This chapter presents and discusses empirical findings from interviews and group discussions with student participants. It covers five themes which address the research questions of the study: how students perceived English (4.1), how they conceptualized an ideal English teacher (4.2), how they understood the term 'native English speaker' (4.3), how they perceived NESTs (4.4), and the way the students saw ITEs (4.5).

4.1. Students’ perceptions of English

As described in the introductory chapter, the research explores issues relevant to the way the professional identity of ITEs is perceived by various education stakeholders. One of the issues is how students perceive English, which is reflected by their reasons for learning the language. Students’ various views of English are worth exploring as they are likely to influence the way the students perceive both NESTs and NNESTs (Murray & Christison, 2011).

Empirical findings from interviews with eighteen students and group discussions with 160 students indicate that the students perceived English as an important language to learn, not merely because it is a compulsory subject in the school system, but also because they had various views about English. The findings suggest that the way the students perceived English is influenced by various factors, which will be further elaborated on in this chapter.

Empirical findings in this section are arranged into two subsections: findings from interviews (4.1.1.) and findings from group discussions (4.1.2).
4.1.1. Findings from interviews

Eighteen third-year students were involved in the interviews. As previously proposed, the students saw English as an important language to learn not merely because it is a compulsory subject in the school system, but also because they had various views about English. Five views were identified in the interviews: English as an international language, English as a language that provides job opportunities, English as a language that denotes high social status, English as a language that provides access to knowledge, particularly western knowledge, and English as a language closely related to globalization (Table 7. Students’ views of English – findings from interviews). As some students held more than one view, the number of students is not equal to the total number of views shown in table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English as an international language</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as providing job opportunities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as social status</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as access to knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as closely related to globalization</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*English as an international language*

The most dominant view found among the students is that English is an international language. Ten students in the interviews reported that they learned English because they perceived the language as ‘an international language’. While all ten of the students mentioned
a similar view, their understandings of the term 'English as an international language' are various.

For Venda, Nurafrizal, Billy and Andi, the term 'English as an international language' referred to the dominance of the language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td><em>Everyone needs English, because English is a number one international language in the world. Just look at those social networks or open Google. All things are in English. So, I think English is really important.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurafrizal</td>
<td><em>It's because English is an international language... dominant in life. Also because I like games, comics. That's why... to understand what's in the games, the comics. So, I learn not only because it's a subject... because it's international.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td><em>I like games... and the language in games is English. That's why I have to learn English... because it's an international language. Everything is in English.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andi</td>
<td><em>I previously thought that English is just a subject in my school. Then, I know that it's important because everything is in English, almost everything... games which I play, music I listen to... they are all in English. I think it's because English is an international language.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Venda, Nurafrizal, Billy and Andi related the term ‘English as an international language’ to the dominance of the language, four other students associated the term with the wide acceptance of English:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Previously, I thought I learned English because it’s a school subject and I had to do it, but I realize that we really need English. It’s the standard for international communication, because it’s an international language…. accepted everywhere, in every part of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devi</td>
<td>Because English is an international language... let’s say I want to go to other places, I think it’s going to be hard for me if I don’t speak English, especially if I go overseas. So, I have to speak English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lila</td>
<td>It’s spoken by many people, if not almost all people. So, we have to speak in English, but I still feel that I need to speak two languages. I believe it's important because it’s an international language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muyasaroh</td>
<td>It’s because English is an international language. That’s why I learn it. It's international because it’s used everywhere. People in the world use the language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the eight previous students, Garindra and Tike mentioned 'English as an international language' as their reason for learning English without expressing their understandings of the term:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garindra</td>
<td>I like it... because I like English. My father is an English teacher and he used to play English songs, watch English movies... also because I see English is an international language. That’s why I learn English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tike</td>
<td>I was unaware of English... of the importance. It was just because my parents asked me to study English. But then I realized that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the students’ responses, two understandings of the term ‘English as an international language’ were identified. First, some students outlined ‘English as an international language’ as their reason for learning the language and associated the term with the wide acceptance of English, as shown by the responses of Joshua, Devi, Lila and Muyasaroh. Such an understanding reflects the notion of English as a *lingua franca* (Widdowson, 1998; Sarifian, 2009); English was seen by the four students as a widely accepted language of intercultural communication (Sarifian, 2009). The understanding of the four students seems to be based on their awareness of the functions of English in the context of the research. Second, some students mistakenly related ‘English as an international language’ to the dominance of the language. Their understandings do not reflect the notion of English as a *lingua franca*, as demonstrated by the responses of Venda, Nurafrizal, Billy and Andy; moreover, two students, Garindra and Tike, did not elaborate on their understandings of the term. Such views of the six students suggest that there is a ‘myth’ of English as an international language informing the students’ perceptions of the language. The ‘myth’ refers to the way English is often addressed and mentioned as ‘an international language’ in the context of the research. It implies ‘a construction, as a telling of a particular story about English’ (Pennycook, 2004, p. 26).

As described in the literature review, in non-English-speaking countries there is a widespread belief that English functions as an international language (Pennycook, 1994; Nunan, 2003; Wright, 2004). In Indonesia, English has a special status; it is generally seen as a vehicle of international communication; English is often mentioned as ‘an international language’ (Paauw, 2009). Consequently, ‘English as an international language’ becomes a
pervasive term, which can easily be found in many references and official documents; it is also a term which is commonly mentioned by individuals in the local community.

The way the six students perceived English can be regarded as an effect of the myth, as the phrase ‘English as an international language’ which they mentioned is likely to be taken-for-granted; it is shown by the understandings of the six students which do not reflect the notion of English as a *lingua franca* (Widdowson, 1998; Sarifian, 2009). Rather, their understandings refer to the dominance of English.

**English as providing job opportunities**

The second view identified in interviews with the students is English and job opportunities. Six students perceived English as an important language to learn because they thought it could give them employment opportunities. Such a view is reflected by the responses of Lila, Ananda, Vera, Tike, Hanif and Muyasaroh:

---

**Lila**

*I see it from a job-related perspective. Well, almost all jobs need English or at least use English. That’s why I have to learn it... personally because I want to study international relation in university and get a good job. I believe English can help me get a good job.*

**Ananda**

*All jobs will require us to use English, to speak it... jobs in the foreign ministry or even in companies. We need English for negotiation, for example. That’s why we need to learn English... and that’s why I learn English.*

**Vera**

*I also think that English is important because I need it for my*
future job. If I can’t... I’m afraid it will be difficult for me to find a good job.

Tike

So, I have to learn it... to speak it. If I don’t, I won’t get a good job. Well, that’s what they say.

Hanif

I learn English because I want to be a pilot... and people told me that if I want to be a pilot, I have to speak English. If I don’t, I can’t be a pilot.

Muyasaroh

It’s important for job application... they put it in the test because they think it’s important... or is it a standard?

Such views indicate that, for the students, English is a linguistic capital that can be converted into economic capital in the form of job opportunities (Bourdieu, 1986). They perceived English as having economic utility and being able to provide its users with material profit (Phillipson, 1992). Therefore, students’ learning of the language can be seen as investment, in which they learn English with an expectation that they will get economic return in the form of job opportunities (Norton Pierce, 1995; Norton, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2006a, 2006b, 2010, 2013).

Pennycook (2004) suggests that English ‘deludes many learners through the false promises it holds out for social and material gain’ (p. 26). However, as the six students’ responses show, their views of English do not seem to be ‘delusional’. Rather, the way the students perceived English as providing job opportunities seems to be based on their understandings of the status of English and their awareness of the actual benefits which they can get from learning English. As described in the literature review, many employers in Indonesia use English proficiency as a factor to determine job positions and remuneration in
job market (Lie, 2007); learning English, therefore, does give students job opportunities. The six students’ views reflect an understanding of the discourse of English in Indonesia described by Lie (2007); they were aware that learning English could give them opportunities to get social and material gain.

**English as social status**

The third view identified from the interview data reflects the students’ perceptions of English and the social status of its users in the research setting. Five students perceived English as a language which denotes high social status. Such a view was expressed by Venda, Devi, Dela, Muyasaroh and Rahman:

---

**Venda**

*I learn English because it’s a status... status in the society, status for talking with friends. I am not saying that I don’t like local culture. It’s just that everything that comes to Indonesia, I mean everything around us, is related to English, such as movies, things which we buy. All are in English. So, it’s about status too. Well, if I talk in English, I’m a different person... perhaps, a better one.*

---

**Devi**

*I don’t know why, but English is fun... I am interested in learning it because English is cool. English is a cool language. It’s just... I feel different when I use it.*

---

**Dela**

*Because knowing or speaking other languages besides Indonesian language is so cool. Moreover, if it’s English, it’s cool. English is a cool language.*

*Of course, people will see us differently. I mean students who speak English and those who don’t speak, they are different. Even the teachers see them and treat them differently. If a student can*
speak English well, the teachers... they like him more. People... they will also see the student differently... a good student, well-educated.

Muyasaroh  For some, also for me, it's a sign of being different, being more educated. I think if I speak English, it shows what I am, what I learn, what kind of student I am. You know, people will think differently if we speak in English.

Rahman  It's hard to learn English, to speak the way they do. But, once I can speak like them, that's cool. In the place where I am from, my village, people think that speaking English is good education and good name.

The views of Venda, Devi, Dela, Muyasaroh and Rahman show that they perceived English as language capital which they thought could be converted into social capital (Bourdieu, 1986). In their view, English functions as a sociolinguistic marker denoting the status of its users. English was seen by the students as a form of capital which is closely related to the speakers’ position in the social structure (Bourdieu, 1977). The language was perceived as providing its users with symbolic profits which positioned them higher in the local community. Therefore, not only is English learning an investment in terms of economic aspects, as argued in the previous section, it is also an investment in terms of the learners’ identity. Such views of the students confirm Norton’s (2001) contention, that a second language learner’s investment in a target language is ‘an investment in a learner’s own identity, an identity which is constantly changing across time and space’ (p. 166). Subsequently, language learning is a social practice which impacts on the students’ identities. In the learning process, students constantly organize and reorganize who they are and how they relate to the social context in which they learn the language (Norton, 2000).
Furthermore, the students’ views also suggest that their learning of English involves the process of social imagination. The students expand their identity by creating images of English speakers who have higher status in the society. They created their *imagined identities* as different individuals (Norton, 1997, 2000, 2013).

The views of the students can be related to two factors. First, because English is seen as being able to provide material gain, as demonstrated by empirical findings in the previous section, it is also perceived as denoting social status. Second, the students’ views can also be the implication of the way English is constructed in the local community in general. As Murray and Christison (2011) propose, English is often perceived as a language which indicates high social or modern lifestyle. It is a language which is used as a gatekeeper to prestige positions (Pennycook, 1994). Further, such perceptions of the students can be partly attributed to the influence of media. The pervasiveness of English in the media has shaped the way English is seen by individuals (Murray & Christison, 2011). Such a view is relevant to context of this study. As described by Lie (2007), English in Indonesia has been promoted by ‘MTV-like stations’. Despite the status of English as a foreign language, in the research context it has been socially constructed as a language reflecting the ‘urban lifestyle’ (Lie, 2007, p. 3). Such a discourse of English has impacted on how the students perceived the language.

**English as access to knowledge, particularly western knowledge**

Four students in the interviews perceived English as an important language to learn because they thought that it provides access to knowledge, particularly knowledge from western countries which they regarded as superior. Such a view was reflected by the responses of Novia, Galuh, Alif and Rahman:
Novia

Because it’s the language of knowledge... I think. So, I learn English because if I can use it, read in English, I can read many things from outside Indonesia... not only magazines, but also books, text book, encyclopedia, many things. English is a door to the knowledge of western countries.

Galuh

If I learn in a university, I must find good resources that are written in English. They are better references, than those from Indonesia. So, I learn English because it can help me get the references... I mean understand the references.

Alif

Many products are in English and many good novels are in English or at least translated from English novels. So, we can take the knowledge of western countries.

Rahman

It’s from them... English is from western countries, where there are lots of inventions, research, knowledge... So, I can learn the knowledge.

The views of Novia, Galuh, Alif and Rahman suggest two important points. First, there is a belief among the participants that knowledge is predominantly communicated in English. English was seen by the students as a dominant language with regard to knowledge transfer, as reflected by the responses of Novia and Alif. Such a belief can be related to the image of English as a hegemonic language in the world (Pennycook, 1994). While English is a foreign language in Indonesia, the image of English as a dominant language in the world has influenced the way the students perceive the language. Second, the students’ views indicate that they saw knowledge from non-English-speaking countries and English-speaking countries differently. They regarded knowledge from English-speaking countries as superior, implied by the responses of Galuh and Rahman. Such views of the students confirm the notion that English is situated within a complex discourse (Pennycook, 1994); it reflects the
sociocultural, economic and political power of English-speaking countries (Pennycook, 1994, 1997; Graddol, 2006). As described in the literature review, the sociocultural, economic and political power of the US and UK has a strong influence on Indonesia and unavoidably on Indonesians (Vicker, 2005; Lauder, 2008; Paauw, 2009). The findings indicate that the power of English-speaking countries in general, and the US and UK in particular, has an implication for the way knowledge from English-speaking countries is seen by the students. They perceived the knowledge as superior than that from non-native-English speaking countries, particularly Indonesia, and saw English as giving access to such knowledge.

**English and globalization**

The last view identified in interviews with the students is English and globalization. Novia, Galuh and Alif associated English with globalization. They therefore perceived English as an important language to learn:

---

**Novia**

*We have been told about globalization since we are in elementary school and the need for learning English. That’s why we learn it. I didn’t realize it until I was in junior high school.*

**Galuh**

*English is globalization. It’s a global language, a language which becomes a bridge for us to communicate with people outside, people from overseas.*

**Alif**

*It’s globalization and we are here... and because we don’t want to be left behind.*

---
The views of Novia, Galuh and Alif reflect the ‘collusionary effect of English’ (Pennycook, 2004, p. 26). As argued in the literature review, English has commonly been seen as ‘a simplistic version of globalization’ (p. 26). It colludes with various aspects of globalization, such as socioculture, politics, and economics (Pennycook, 2007). Consequently, English is often perceived by individuals as having a close relationship with globalization (Fishman, 1999; Wright, 2000; Sayer, 2012).

Furthermore, the way Novia, Galuh and Alif associated English with globalization can be related to the image of the language in the research context. Besides being considered an international language, English in Indonesia is often related to globalization. In the context of research, there is a discourse in which English is seen as ‘the linguistic engine of globalization’ (Sayer, 2012, p. 2). English is perceived as a linguistic commodity (Murray & Christison, 2011). Such a discourse has been described by Hamied (2012) and Candraningrum (2008). Hamied proposes that with regard to globalization, English is often perceived as a language that helps Indonesia interact with other countries. On the other hand, Candraningrum suggests a critical view of English and globalization, arguing that English is a colonial tool and globalization is a name which it uses to legitimize its imperialism. Both Hamied’s and Candraningrum's views highlight an important point, that there is a discourse which intertwines English and globalization in the context of research. The way Novia, Galuh and Alif perceived English indicate that their perceptions have been influenced by such a discourse.
4.1.2. Findings from group discussions

Findings from interviews with the 18 students have shown that the students learned English not merely because it is a compulsory subject in the school system. Rather, they perceived English as an important language to learn because they had various views about English. Five views have been identified in the interviews: English as an international language, English as a language which the students thought could provide job opportunities, English as a language that denotes high social status, English as a language which the students thought could provide access to knowledge, particularly knowledge of western countries, and English as closely related to globalization.

The group discussions which involved 160 students in 20 sessions did not generate new themes. Rather, empirical findings from the discussions emphasize the findings from interviews. The following five excerpts show how themes identified in the interviews were also mentioned by participants in the group discussions. As there were 8 participants in each session, in the following excerpts they are coded as P1 to P8.

In session two of the group discussions, some views identified from interview data were mentioned by the participants. Summarizing the discussion, P5 mentioned that students learned English not only because it is a subject in the curriculum, but also for a variety of other reasons:

| P5 | We learn English because it is an international language that we must speak. Secondly, English is a subject in the curriculum. Third, it is because much knowledge is in English. It is also useful for communication with foreigners from various different countries. English is also needed for jobs. If we want to apply for good jobs, we have to be good. Lastly, if we speak English fluently, we look |
more wow.

P6 Yes! It’s more wow! If let’s say we have a friend who speaks English, we think wow... he’s so cool. He’s like ... more than others who don’t speak.

P5 Not only because I want to get good grades. So that I’m not like people from villages.

The following excerpt from session four of the group discussions also shows that the participants had various views which are similar to the views mentioned by participants in the interviews:

P8 It’s more than our self-motivation, it’s because the language is a means of communication with people from other countries. Everyone here in our group wants to go abroad... to western countries. We want to learn their culture, their habits... the way they eat, they dress. That’s why we need English.

P7 Yes, we can do that if we learn English. It’s an international language, used everywhere... in every part of the world. If we can speak it, that means we can communicate with almost everyone... I mean foreigners.

Various views were also mentioned by students in session six of the group discussions, emphasizing views identified in the interviews:
Well, we agree that English can add our knowledge, because it’s actually a way to the knowledge itself. English is a way to learn western culture. If we speak their language, we will be able to learn their culture. That’s cool.

We also think that we need to learn English because it’s an international language. So, if we go abroad, we can talk with people... other things are little things like if we want to have vacation... to other countries, we can use English.

Not too far, to Bali, let’s say. We can use English ... we speak with foreigners from many different countries.

In session 9 one of the participants summarized the discussion. He mentioned some motives for learning English which were similar to the motives found in the interviews:

Because English is important for education, for job... all information today is in English... and when I want to apply for a job, I am sure the company will give me an English test. It's just everywhere, in public places, on food packs, on shampoo bottles... it’s everywhere.

Yes, it's easier for us to find a job if we can speak English. That's like adding our value... speaking English will add our value.

I think English is needed in almost all fields of professions, because it's an international language. That's why I need to learn it, so that I can interact with people from different parts of the world.
Similarly, another excerpt from session 10 highlights the empirical findings from interviews with the eighteen students:

---

P2  
Mmm because *English is an international language.* So, let’s say we want to go to other countries, we can use English for communication. Secondly, it’s also a need... *everything needs English.* *Education needs English,* and so *do jobs.* Some of us learn it because we love learning other language, including English.

P4  
I think if we learn English and we can use it, we can easily get a *good job everywhere.* Moreover, *it’s because English is an international language,* which we can use for communication with *foreigners from other countries,* from everywhere.

---
4.2. Students’ concepts of an ideal English teacher

A central issue explored in the study is students’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher. As proposed in Chapter 2, not only does the exploration of the way students conceptualize an ideal English teacher shed light on the complexity of the native speaker fallacy, it will also reveal the students’ expectations of English teachers (Borg, 2006; Park & Lee, 2006).

Empirical findings from interviews and group discussions with students indicate that the students had various multifaceted concepts of an ideal English teacher. They characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of such aspects as personal quality, pedagogical quality, language, race/native English speaker and experience. It was found that personal and pedagogical qualities are dominant aspects in the students’ conceptualizations of the teacher. However, the findings also show that the native speaker fallacy is present among the students and that there is a racial dimension to the students’ concepts. Some students conceptualized ideal English teachers as white Caucasians; the students recognized the Caucasian facial images which they generated using Facegen Modeller software as native English speakers. Further, the students perceived them as being more attractive. Some other students assumed that because the ideal English teachers look Caucasian, they have good English competence and therefore can teach the language well.

Empirical findings presented and discussed in this subchapter are arranged into two sections: findings from interviews (4.2.1) and findings from group discussions (4.2.2).
4.2.1. Findings from interviews

As described in the methodology chapter, this study employed two techniques for exploring students’ implicit concepts of an ideal English teacher in interviews: the first technique, using Facegen Modeller software for image elicitation followed by exploratory questions, and the second technique, using an open-ended question – *in your opinion, what is an ideal English teacher?* Accordingly, this section consists of two parts. Part 1 presents findings generated by the first technique and part 2 presents findings generated by the second technique.

**Part 1. Findings generated by the first technique**

Findings generated by the first technique, using Facegen Modeller software and follow-up questions, indicate that the students’ concepts of an ideal English teacher are complex and multifaceted, reflected by the students’ various preferences for facial images which they perceived as representing the teacher and various motives they mentioned after making the preferences. Based on the themes of the motives which they mentioned, the students’ concepts of an ideal English teacher can be broadly classified into four categories, as illustrated by Figure 6. Motive 1 (coded M1) represents 12 students who characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teachers’ personal quality, motive 2 (coded M2) refers to 3 students who characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of personal quality and racial aspects, motive 3 (coded M3) includes 2 students who conceptualized the teacher in terms of racial aspect, and motive 4 (coded M4) represents 1 student who characterized the teacher based on racial and experience aspects. Generally, the findings suggest that personal quality is a dominant aspect in the students’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher (M1 and M2 in Figure 6). More importantly, the findings indicate that there is a racial dimension to the students’ concepts (M2, M3 and M4 in Figure 6).
Motive 1 - Personal quality aspect (M1)

As shown by Figure 6, personal quality is a dominant aspect in the students’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher. In the interviews, 12 of the 18 students preferred facial images which they perceived as reflecting various personal characteristics such as funny, humorous, friendly, firm, nice and patient (M1 in Figure 6).

Seven of the twelve students picked the following Asian facial images and expressed their reasons for making the preferences:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rizal</td>
<td><em>Because of his face, I know if he is funny... humorous.</em> <em>Learning English must be fun. If you are too serious, you will learn nothing. It must be fun.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devi</td>
<td><em>It looks firm... It looks like she is firm.</em> <em>If the teacher is too lenient, students won’t get motivated.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galuh</td>
<td><em>Because the face shows that he is friendly.</em> <em>His eyes... not vicious eyes.</em> <em>He is friendly and nice.</em> <em>His mouth also shows the same thing, I think.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dela</td>
<td><em>He looks not so cruel.</em> <em>He looks strict but also looks patient.</em> <em>He is firm.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alif

His eyes and the profile of his face... he looks friendly. Well, compared to the other faces, it seems like he loves giving. This face reminds me of my good teacher.

Ananda

The face shows that she is friendly, and her eyes show her firmness. Yes, she is friendly and firm.

Andi

If I see his face... it’s a balance. He looks serious and relaxed at the same time. It seems that he can teach with ease, but to the point.

While the previous seven students picked Asian facial images, five students in the interviews chose Caucasian faces. However, the five students did not draw their motives from the racial features of the images. Rather, the students chose the faces because they perceived particular personal characteristics in them:
Billy

This guy... it seems that he is smiling, although perhaps he is not. He looks smiling. His eyes are focused. I like friendly teachers, who are always smiling.

Lila

Because of her eyes... the eyes are focused, but they still reflect tenderness. Her lips... as if she is smiling, but it seems that she is still focused. This makes us learn better and enjoy learning.

Hanif

It seems that he is nice and friendly, also from his mouth. From my experience, if I meet this kind of teacher, he can make students feel more comfortable. Students don’t feel awkward for asking questions, for getting involved in class.

Vira

If I see her facial expression, it is nice to see. Some faces show anger, but this face is nice. The face shows patience. It seems that she can understand her students.
The empirical findings indicate that personal quality is a dominant aspect in the students’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher. The teacher was characterized by the 12 students as having such personal characteristics as funny, humorous, friendly, firm, nice and patient. Such personal characteristics are similar to the characteristics identified in previous studies, such as Arnon and Rachel (2007), Barnes and Lock (2013), and Mahmoud and Thabet (2013). Arnon and Rachel (2007), who conducted a study in the field of education, found that such personal characteristics as having sense of humour, being kind-hearted, calm and caring are important perceived features of an ideal teacher. Similarly, Barnes and Lock's (2013) study demonstrates that friendliness, care and patience are personal characteristics which student participants in their study considered as important features of an effective foreign language teacher. Furthermore, students in Mahmoud and Thabet's (2013) study regarded such characteristics as being patient, relaxed, good tempered, fair, helpful, encouraging, respectful, kind, loving and caring as the most important features of a good English teacher.

The characteristics which the students mentioned reflect personal characteristics of good teachers in general. The empirical findings of the study suggest that various factors have contributed to the students’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher, such as students’ belief in a good teaching-learning process – as reflected by the responses of Rizal, Andi, Lila and Rahman, their belief of general personal characteristics which English teachers should
have – as reflected by the responses of Galuh, Dela, Ananda, Billy and Vira, and the students’ learning experience – as reflected by the responses of Alif and Hanif.

**Motive 2 - Personal quality and racial aspects (M2)**

While it is found that personal quality is a dominant aspect in the students’ conceptualization of an ideal English teacher, the empirical findings also indicate that there is a racial dimension to the students’ various concepts of the teacher. Three students preferred Caucasian faces and expressed that they chose the faces not only because they saw certain personal characteristics such as friendliness and kindness as being reflected by the faces, but also because they perceived the faces as being attractive. Two of the three students recognized the facial images which they chose as European; they assumed that because the ideal English teachers looked European, the teachers have good English language competence (M2 in Figure 6).

---

Venda

Well, the impression is... **she looks kind and friendly.** It seems that she likes smiling. I think teachers who like smiling will bring positive influence.

Also **the colour of her eyes is grey.** I don’t know why, but **they look beautiful.**

Why gorgeous? **This looks bulé,** and bulé is standard. **They are all beautiful.** Yes, bulé is always handsome, always more beautiful... more attractive.

---

4 Bulé: as an adjective, the word ‘bulé’ means white. As a noun, the word means an individual who has a white complexion. It has both positive and negative meanings, depending on the contexts in which the word is used.
Novia

I see the face, from her eyes... it seems that she is friendly... and from her smile, her mouth. It seems that she loves laughing... fun.

European are more... more attractive. You know, Asian faces are so common. I mean, If I see the faces, they are all the same. I need different faces.... better faces, much more cool.

Well a face like this, European... European can speak English well. They have good English. Thus, they can teach English well.

Muyasaroh

The face shows patience, firmness, but not too much. It doesn’t look like those who can’t teach. Also... he looks European

European face, yes it’s European face. Why I chose the face? because I think European speak English. They use English every day. That means they are really proficient. I mean just like us when we speak Javanese language every day. We become proficient speakers of Javanese and better teachers, Javanese language teachers.

With regard to personal quality, the way the students conceptualized an ideal English teacher is related to their belief in a good process of learning, that learning English should be enjoyable and ‘fun’, as reflected by the responses of the students. Furthermore, the students’ responses suggest that there is a misconception among the students that native English speakers are white Caucasians, whom Novia and Muyasaroh recognized as ‘European’. Because of such a misconception, the three students perceived the teacher as more attractive physically. Novia and Muyasaroh also thought that because the teacher is from ‘Europe’, the
teacher has good English competence; therefore, the teacher can teach English well, as explicitly expressed by Novia.

Motive 3 - Racial aspect (M3)

The racial dimension of the students' various concepts of an ideal English teacher is shown more evidently by the responses of two students who preferred Caucasian faces and expressed that the only reason they chose the faces was because the faces looked attractive and because they looked 'European' which the participants associated with good English language competence (M3 in Figure 6).

---

Joshua

*Because the face looks European. In Europe... moreover England, English is a daily language. It's so easy for them. I mean because English is their language, they can teach easily... just like teaching in kindergarten, teaching A, B, C, D.*

With a face like this, she looks like those from Europe.

*I am sure her English is good. I am sure she can teach English well.*

---

Tike

*Because she looks bulu. The look... and it’s attractive.*

*It’s because this face is more attractive. You know, it’s much more interesting if white teachers stand before the class. For me, it’s more interesting.... I won’t run away from classes again.*
Similar to the conceptualizations of students’ in the previous section (M2), Joshua’s and Tike’s conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher are based on a misconception that native English speakers are white Caucasian, whom Joshua recognized as ‘European’ and Tike mentioned as ‘bule’.

**Motive 4 - Racial and experience aspects (M4)**

One student expressed that he preferred a facial image because of the racial feature and teaching experience which he perceived from the face (M4 in Figure 6):

Garindra's face... it’s English face. *If he is from England, he must be very proficient. So, it’s much easier for him to become an English teacher. If he’s already spoken the language, he just needs to learn how to teach. That’s much easier... he can learn from experience.*

*Maybe he’s a bit old, but that means he’s an experienced teacher. Perhaps he is also experienced in terms of the language. So he knows more and teaches easily. He teaches better... more enjoyable.*

Garindra characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s experience, which he saw as being reflected by the facial image. Such a view of Garindra is likely to be related to his learning experience. Furthermore, his description of the teacher indicates that the native speaker fallacy has informed the way he conceptualized an ideal English teacher. Garindra recognized the face as an ‘English face’ and assumed that the teacher has good English competence.
Part 2. Findings generated by the second technique

While empirical findings generated by the first technique, using Facegen Modeller software and follow-up questions, indicate that the students conceptualized an ideal English teacher variously in terms of such aspects as personal quality, race and experience, the second technique generated slightly different findings; the findings indicate that the students conceptualized an ideal English teacher in terms of four aspects: pedagogical quality, personal quality, native English speaker and language (Figure 7). Fundamentally, native English speaker aspect in this section is similar to racial aspect in findings generated by the first technique, using Facegen Modeller software and follow-up questions (Part 1). The term ‘native English speaker aspect’ is used because in the second stage, where open-ended questions were used, the students mentioned explicitly that native English speakers are their ideal English speakers.

The findings suggest two different aspects: pedagogical quality and language. They also highlight personal quality as a dominant aspect in the students’ conceptualization of an ideal English teacher. More importantly, the findings indicate that the native speaker fallacy is present among the students. Some students expressed that ideal English teachers are native speakers of English. They mistakenly thought that native English speakers are white Caucasians; the students preferred these speakers as their ideal English teachers because they perceived the speakers as physically attractive. Furthermore, the students assumed that the speakers have good English language competence and therefore they can teach the language well.

Based on the themes of the students’ responses to the interview question, the students’ various concepts of an ideal English teacher can be broadly classified into seven categories (Figure 7): motive 1 (coded M1) represents 2 students who characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s pedagogical quality, motive 2 (coded M2) refers to 7
students who characterized the teacher in terms of pedagogical quality and personal quality, motive 3 (coded M3) represents 3 students who characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of pedagogical quality, personal quality and native English speaker aspects, motive 4 (coded M4) includes 2 students who conceptualized the teacher in terms of pedagogical quality, language and native English speaker aspects, motive 5 (coded M5) refers to 1 student who characterized the teacher in terms of personal quality, motive 6 (coded M6) represents 2 students who conceptualized an ideal English teacher in terms of language and native English speaker aspects, and motive 7 (coded M7) refers to 1 student who characterized the teacher in terms of native English speaker aspect.

Figure 7. Students’ concepts of an ideal English teacher (using an open-ended question)
Motive 1 - Pedagogical quality aspect (M1)

As Figure 7 illustrates, empirical findings generated by the second technique indicate that pedagogical quality is a dominant aspect in the students’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher. Most of the students (14 students) characterized the teacher in terms of the aspect (M1, M2, M3, M4 and M5 in Figure 7). The findings in this part are different from findings generated by the first technique which suggest personal quality as a dominant aspect in the students’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher. The different findings could be attributed to the methodological aspect of the study; the participants could draw such aspects as personal quality, racial and experience from the facial images which they generated using the software, while they could not see such aspects as pedagogical quality and language from the faces. With regard to this methodological aspect, the second technique could be seen as supplementing the first.

Two students, Nurafrizal and Devi, conceptualized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teachers’ pedagogical quality (M1 in Figure 7). The teacher was described by Nurafrizal and Devi as having such pedagogical characteristics as being not too theoretical in teaching, focusing on practices and having the ability to teach innovatively:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nurafrizal</th>
<th>An ideal English teacher is not too theoretical in explaining things. He can give practical examples, such as quizzes. He should give us easy and understandable examples, ask us to explore them. You know if things are too theoretical, we don’t understand and we don’t want to ask questions. That can cause us difficulties.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devi</td>
<td>Ideal English teachers mmm... they must able to innovate in class and can be inspiration for their students. If they teach, they teach with innovation... giving interesting things in interesting ways. That way, their teaching materials won’t make us bored.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the students’ responses indicate, the way they conceptualized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s pedagogy seems to be related to their learning experience. The way Devi and Nurafrizal conceptualized an ideal English teacher reflects Harmer’s (2008) description of the teacher. Harmer proposes that one of the pedagogical characteristics of a good English teacher is having the ability to teach students effectively and interestingly. Furthermore, the pedagogical characteristics which the students reported are similar to characteristics identified in Park and Lee’s (2006) and Kadha’s (2009) research. Park and Lee’s study demonstrated that being skilled in teaching methods and techniques is a characteristic of an effective English teacher which their student participants considered important. On the other hand, Kadha’s study showed that both student and teacher participants involved in the study considered the ability to teach and make classroom interesting for students to be important.

**Motive 2 - Pedagogical and personal quality aspects (M2)**

Consistent with empirical findings generated by the first technique, findings from the second technique indicate that personal quality is a prevalent aspect in the students’ various conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher. Seven of the eighteen student participants characterized the teacher in terms of pedagogical and personal quality (M2 in Figure 7).

Generally, an ideal English teacher was described by the seven students as having the following pedagogical characteristics: teaching with ‘action’, focusing on practices, having an ability to create interactive activities, teaching well and interestingly. In terms of personal quality, the teacher was described by the students as a teacher who has the following characteristics: friendly, not strict, humorous, care about students, patient, motivating and kind. Broadly, such characteristics are similar to the characteristics revealed by the first
technique (see Part 1 - Section 4.2.1). The pedagogical and personal characteristics were mentioned by Billy, Lila, Galuh, Hanif, Dela, Ananda and Alif:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>We don’t need to know the background of the teacher, as long as the teacher is friendly and can build close relationship with students. One more thing, he must teach with actions, involving students in activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lila</td>
<td>The teacher should not be strict. Some teachers are too strict and we are afraid of those teachers. I think an ideal English teacher should focus on practices... speak more... not only writing. So, we can do speaking practices with her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galuh</td>
<td>Friendly... an ideal English teacher must be friendly, especially with students, so that they can enjoy the class. Besides that, she must be able to teach well, able to deliver materials in enjoyable ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanif</td>
<td>I have different ideal English teachers at different levels. Generally, I like them because they care about us, about their students. So, they are not only teaching, but also giving something else. Humorous teachers, care about their students. I know it’s hard to be close to all students. You know, laugh together. That works well, because students like games, like fun. If teachers can make fun, interactive activities, students are willing to open their eyes and pay attention to lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dela</td>
<td>Ideal English teachers... disciplined, but patient. They can teach students too.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ananda

Because English is not our language and it's difficult, the teachers must be friendly. They must teach in interesting ways such as using games or other engaging activities. Good teachers are also nice, friendly... they are close to students and can motivate them.

Alif

He always motivates me, and gives me reasons to study... how to be a successful person. He tells me what my weaknesses are, and often gives practical tests such as reading news and singing.

Generally, the pedagogical characteristics which the students mentioned such as teaching with ‘action’, focusing on practices, having an ability to create interactive activities, teaching well and interestingly are consistent with the characteristics mentioned by Nurafrizal and Devi in the previous section (Motive 1. Pedagogical quality aspect). They are also similar to the characteristics proposed by Harmer (2008) and identified by Park and Lee’s (2006) and Kadha’s (2009) research.

On the other hand, such personal characteristics as friendly, not strict, humorous, care about students, patient, motivating and kind which the seven students mentioned are similar to the perceived characteristics of the teacher as suggested by previous studies (Brosh, 1996; Arnon & Rachel, 2007; Kadha, 2009; Barnes & Lock, 2013; Mahmoud & Thabet, 2013). Student participants in Barnes and Lock’s (2013) and Mahmoud and Thabet’s (2013) research regarded patience as one of important characteristics of the teacher. Friendliness was seen as an important characteristic by students in Barnes and Lock’s study. Furthermore, such a characteristic as motivating students was considered important by participants in
Brosh’s (1996) and Kadha’s (2009) studies. On the other hand, that an ideal teacher must have sense of humour and care about students was suggested by Arnon and Rachel (2007).

Such students’ characterizations of an ideal English teacher seem to be based on their learning experience, similar to the previous two students; they could also be attributed to their expectation of what sort of learning processes they want to experience.

Motive 3 - Pedagogical, personal quality and native English speaker aspects (M3)

Three students in the interviews characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of three aspects: pedagogical quality, personal quality and native English speaker aspects (M3 in Figure 7). Generally, in terms of pedagogical quality, the teacher was described as having the pedagogical ability to teach students effectively and interestingly, and focusing on practices. In terms of personal quality, the students described that the teacher is patient, friendly, fun, motivating and humorous. Furthermore, the students also explicitly stated that ideal English teachers are native speakers of English as they thought that the speakers are attractive, have good English competence, and know American culture. Such findings reinforce the results generated by the first technique, suggesting that the native speaker fallacy, the belief that an ideal English teacher is a native speaker of English, is present among the students. The findings also show that there is a misconception among the students that native English speakers are Caucasians.

---

| Venda | An ideal English teacher... because not all students can use and understand English well, an ideal teacher, I think, should be able to guide students. Interactive... so she’s not explaining things to herself... or just to one or two people. | 132 |
Well, he should be patient and encouraging. If we experience difficulties, he can change our mindset, that the language is not difficult.

I like friendly teachers, who like smiling... and attractive teachers. Attractive... I mean just like bule. Well, bule is more attractive... for me as well as for my friends. So an ideal English teacher should be a native English speaker from abroad.

Novia

First, I like friendly teacher, fun teacher. The teacher must also be conversant... rich of teaching materials. Also practices... the teacher must teach practical things, like speaking.

A good teacher is the one who can motivate students. He inspires us to learn and makes us feel... realize that oh yes, I need to learn this and this.

I want teachers from overseas, because ideal English teachers, I believe, are from Europe. I mean everybody can be a good teacher, but English... not everybody can be a good English teacher. That's why I choose teachers from Europe, because English is spoken there. I believe their English is much better than us.

Andi

First, he must be humorous. He likes jokes. He must have good teaching skills. So that every material can be delivered well by the teacher and understood well by the students.

Also, he must be native [English speaker]... has broad knowledge about American culture.

Generally, the way Venda, Novia, and Andi characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of pedagogical and personal quality is similar to the way students in the previous
sections (Motive 1 and Motive 2) described the teacher; the students’ conceptualizations of the teacher are related to their prior and anticipated ideal learning experiences. Findings in this part indicate that the native speaker fallacy is visible among the students. Native speakers of English were seen as ideal English teachers by the three students because they had attitudes and assumptions about the speakers. First, native English speakers were assumed to have white complexions and were perceived by the students to be physically attractive; therefore, they are preferred as ideal English teachers, as shown by Venda’s response. Second, native English speakers were thought as coming from Europe and having good English competence; therefore, the speakers can teach English, as expressed by Novia. Third, native English speakers were seen as having knowledge about American culture, which the students thought to be important in English learning, as mentioned by Andi. Such conceptualizations of the three students indicate that the native speaker fallacy is assumed to be true by the students.

**Motive 4 - Pedagogical quality, language and native English speaker aspects (M4)**

Two students characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of pedagogical quality, language competence, and native English speaker aspects (M4 in Figure 7). Similar to students in the previous sections (M1, M2 and M3), the two students described an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s pedagogical quality as having an ability to teach students well. An ideal English teacher was also described as a teacher who has good English competence and speaks the language fluently. Furthermore, the students reported that ideal English teachers are native speakers of English. In their view, native English speakers are physically attractive and have good English competence.
Garindra — *Mmm… often use English in class and able to teach the students well, also willing to correct students’ mistakes.*

Certainly, *he must have good English, and only those from England can do that. I mean can have good English from its native country. Ideally, good English teachers are from England, because English is their language. So, ideal teachers are native English speakers, better from England.*

Tike — *A good English teacher must speak fluently. She must also teach well. She can explain things, make things easy to understand. The most important thing is… she must be a native English speaker, white native speaker who is beautiful. That’s more interesting for students.*

The conceptualizations of Garindra and Tike highlight the way an ideal English teacher was characterized in terms of pedagogical quality and native English speaker aspects by students in the previous section (M3); they also show that the native speaker fallacy is visible among the students. With regard to language aspect, the students’ conceptualizations suggest that competence in English is an important perceived characteristic of the teacher; this is consistent with the findings of some previous studies (Brosh, 1996; Mullock, 2003, Park & Lee, 2006; Arnon & Rachel, 2007; Kadha, 2009; Wachidah, 2010; Barnes & Lock, 2013). Similar to the previous students’ conceptualizations, the way Garindra and Tike characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s English competence seems to be related to their learning experiences; it could also be attributed to their expectation of the teacher’s English language competence.
Motive 5 - Personal quality aspect (M5)

One student characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher's personal quality (M5 in Figure 7). Vira mentioned that an ideal English teacher should be able to motivate students. She described the teacher as a figure that can make students aware that English is important:

---

**Vira**

*I think a good English teacher should be able to motivate the students, inspire them, make them aware that English is important. He must also make students understand that if they learn English, they can get a lot of things.*

---

In the interviews only Vira conceptualized an ideal English teacher in terms of one aspect, which is personal quality; the other students characterized the teacher in terms of more than one aspect. The teacher was described by Vira as having the personal characteristic of motivating students. Such a conceptualization of the teacher emphasizes the conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher of students in M2 and M3. Furthermore, the conceptualization is also consistent with the characteristics of the teacher identified by Brosh’s (1996), and Kadha’s (2009) research; these studies demonstrated that ability to motivate students is an important perceived characteristic of the teacher.

Motive 6 - Language and native English speaker aspects (M6)

Two students in the interviews characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of language competence and native English speaker aspects (M6 in Figure 7). Joshua and
Muyasaroh reported that an ideal English teacher has good English language competence. Furthermore, they stated explicitly that the teacher is a native speaker of English.

---

**Joshua**

*I think **good English teachers are those who really understand English. They understand grammar and vocabs very well. Speaking Indonesian language is also a good point.** I mean the teachers have an ability to translate between two languages.*

*Good English teachers must be native English speakers, those who live in Europe or in English speaking countries. I believe their language is good, better than us. Their speaking is real, because English is their mother tongue.*

---

**Muyasaroh**

*Well, at least the teacher doesn't need to open dictionaries. He must be above average.*

*They must be native. **Ideal English teachers must be native speakers of English,** because they use English every day. So, they really master the language... because native English-speaking teachers... English is their basic. They only need to learn how to teach.*

---

With regard to language aspect, such conceptualizations of Joshua and Muyasaroh are similar to those of students in M4; Joshua's and Muyasaroh's conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher are related to their expectation of English competence which the teacher should have.

In terms of native English speaker aspect, the way they characterized an ideal English teacher is similar to how students in M3 and M4 described the teacher. An ideal English teacher is portrayed by Joshua and Muyasaroh as having good English language competence,
consistent with the findings of previous studies which suggest that competence in a target language is an important perceived characteristic of an ideal language teacher (Brosh, 1996; Mullock, 2003; Park & Lee, 2006; Arnon & Rachel, 2007; Kadha, 2009; Wachidah, 2010; Barnes & Lock, 2013). Joshua’s description of the teacher also suggests a different characteristic which has not been mentioned by other students in the study. He expressed that ideal English teachers should also be able to speak Indonesian language, which is his mother tongue; such a characterization seems to be related to Joshua’s experience in learning English.

With regard to native English speaker aspect, Joshua and Muyasaroh's conceptualizations are similar to those of students in M3 and M4. In Joshua's view, an ideal English teacher is a native speaker of English because he saw the speaker as having good English competence and 'authentic' speaking. Similarly, Muyasaroh thought that native English speakers are ideal English teachers because she perceived the speakers as having good language competence. Similar to the conceptualizations of students in M3 and M4, Joshua's and Muyasaroh's conceptualizations are problematic as they suggest that the native speaker fallacy is visible among the students.

**Motive 7 - Native English speaker aspect (M7)**

One student straightforwardly mentioned that ideal English teachers are native speakers of English (M7 in Figure 7). Rahman reported that native English speakers already have English language competence; he believed that the speakers only need to learn teaching skills to be ideal English teachers. Rahman further stated that besides language, native speakers of English also have English-related culture and knowledge. He assumed that because native English speakers were ‘raised in western countries’, they have broader
knowledge and more ‘advanced’ culture. Rahman also mentioned that he preferred native English speakers because he perceived them as physically attractive:

Rahman  

*Ideal English teachers are native speakers of English, because they already have the language. They just need to add teaching skills. That’s easy, I think. On the other hand, language and culture are much more difficult. You have to experience them, live in them, then you can be native English speakers, real native English speakers.*

*Besides that, native speakers of English also have more knowledge. They are raised in western countries. I think their education system is more advanced, better than in our country. So, their knowledge is broader, much broader than us. Their culture is also more advanced.*

*They have white complexion. They are more beautiful, more handsome. I know we really like watching TV. Look, they’re on TV… their skin, eyes. Their hair is blonde. That’s attractive. Well, it’s not a must, but if we can found such teachers, I think the class will be more interesting.*

While Rahman's conceptualization of an ideal English teacher is similar to the descriptions of students in M3, M4 and M6 in terms of native English speaker aspect, it appears to be the most problematic as it is based on only one aspect. Not only does his conceptualization suggest that the native speaker fallacy is present, it also shows that native speakerism, the belief that native English speakers represent western culture, is visible among the students (Holliday, 2006).
4.2.2. Findings from group discussions

Empirical findings from interviews have shown that the eighteen students had various multifaceted concepts of an ideal English teacher. While the first technique revealed that the students conceptualized the teacher in terms of such aspects as personal quality, race and experience, findings from the second technique indicate that the participants’ concepts are based on such aspects as pedagogical quality, personal quality, language and native English speaker aspects. Generally, findings generated by the first and second techniques show that the native speaker fallacy is present among the students and that there is a racial dimension to the students’ conceptualizations of the teacher.

Group discussions which involved 160 students in 20 sessions did not generate any new themes. Rather, empirical findings from the discussions show that the participants conceptualized an ideal English teacher in terms of aspects which were mentioned by the 18 students in the interviews.

Personal quality

Consistent with findings from the interviews, empirical findings from group discussions show that personal quality is a prevalent aspect underlying the students’ various conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher. The following excerpts demonstrate how the students conceptualized the teacher in terms of personal qualities.

In session one of the group discussions two students characterized an ideal English teacher generally as a teacher who can understand students. One of the students stated that the teacher should be humorous:
For us, an ideal teacher is the one who can understand her students... She must be humorous... and she can motivate students.

Yes, some teachers don’t understand us, their students. They don’t know what their students want.

Similarly, students in session three also reported this aspect. One student described ideal English teachers as teachers who are close to students because they have such qualities as ‘friendly, smart, patient, and flexible’:

Yes, good English teachers are friendly. They must be humorous, they love and care about their students.

Good teachers must be smart, patient, and flexible. I mean they are close to students. They can be friends for students. Thus, students can learn English in relaxed ways. If we like the subject, we can learn it easily.

A similar aspect was reflected by one student’s conceptualization in session four. The student described an ideal English teacher as having patience and understanding:

Second, he must be patient, kind to students. If there’s a student who makes a mistake, he doesn’t say harsh things like “what did you say?” He appreciates his students. He must understand that we are still learning the language.
In session thirteen the participants characterized an ideal English teacher as having such personal characteristics as being friendly and able to understand students:

P4  *Friendly, be part of us... close to us*

P5  *Mmm... she can understand us. If students are in bad mood, she doesn’t push learning process.*

Similarly, students in session 20 described an ideal English teacher as a teacher who can understand and care about students:

P2  *Understanding... understand the students and can make lively learning*

P3  *Caring teachers... they can make good learning atmosphere*

P7  *Yes, caring teachers... everything starts from teachers. If we don’t like the teachers, we don’t like the subject.*

**Pedagogical quality**

Students in the group discussions also characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s pedagogical quality. The following excerpts show the way students conceptualized the teacher.
In session 10 an ideal English teacher was described by a student as a teacher who has many techniques to make students motivated. Another student suggested that the teacher must have ‘creative ideas’ in teaching which include making activities for students:

P2  The teacher must be interesting, not boring. She has many ways to make her students keep motivated... motivated for learning English, for example giving rewards... if you get 10, you’ll get a prize or anything.

P8  Yes, interesting in terms of teaching, she must have creative ideas. Like making learning activities for students. So, things in class are fun.

On the other hand, students in session 17 described the teacher generally as able to make ‘English fun’. An ideal English teacher was characterized as having an ability to make ‘learning enjoyable’:

P2  Making English fun, that’s all. She can make learning enjoyable, change students’ perspective about English. You know, students think English is hard, is a burden for them.

One student in session 11 characterized an ideal English teacher as having ‘a lot of teaching variations’:
She has a lot of teaching variations, not only a single style...

Because sometimes we’re so slow. We can’t follow the lessons.

In session 12 ideal English teachers were described by one student as teachers who can explain subjects. The other student reported that the teachers must be innovative in teaching:

They can explain subjects, can make them understandable. They really know about the lessons.

Also, they must be innovative, teaching in new ways such as outdoor activities and games.

Language

Language aspect was also reflected by the students' conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher in the group discussions. The following excerpts show the ways students described the teacher in terms of language aspect.

One student in session 9 described an ideal English teacher as having good English language fluency. He thought that English fluency is important for the teacher:

Mmm fluent... an ideal English teacher must be fluent speaker of English. In theory, we believe that teachers can teach, but for
foreign language teachers, not all teachers in Indonesia can be fluent.

One student in session 10 stated that the teacher must have good English competence, so as to give feedback to students:

P5  She can correct her students’ mistakes. She must speak good English. I mean if she doesn’t speak it, how will she correct the students? If she doesn’t know... I mean we are not sure that she’s right or not, whether her English is real of not.

Similarly, students in session 12 mentioned that an ideal English teacher must have good proficiency in the language:

P1  She must have good English.

P2  Yes, because she’s an English teacher, she must know everything about English.

The view that an ideal English teacher has good English competence was also expressed by two students in session 13. However, one student thought that the teacher must also be able to use two languages, which are the students’ first language and English, to help students understand what the teacher deliver. The student stated that the teacher must not speak fully in English:
Well, he must know all English tenses. His English must be very good. That's a must.

Besides that, he must not speak fully in English, half Indonesian language, so that we can understand. Well, if we learn English but we don't know the meanings of the sentences the teacher says, that doesn't make sense. That just doesn't work, I think.

Native English speaker - Racial

Empirical findings from group discussions also indicate that the native speaker fallacy is visible among the students, which confirms the findings from interviews. The following excerpts demonstrate the way the students conceptualized an ideal English teacher in terms of native English speaker aspect.

Two students in session 2 of the group discussions asserted that an ideal English teacher must be good looking. One student further explained that ‘bule’ looks different and that students are more attracted to native English-speaking teachers who are ‘white’ and have a ‘pointed nose’:

For us, an ideal English teacher must be good looking.

Yes, good looking. If he is a man, he must be handsome. You know, an idol for girls. I think bule is more... they look different. We are more attracted.... boys are more attracted to beautiful female native English speakers, who are white, pointed nose.
Students in session 7 explicitly mentioned that an ideal English teacher should be a native speaker of English. One of the students contended that a native English speaker is ideal because she perceived the speaker as physically attractive. On the other hand, the other student reported that ideal English teachers are native speakers of the language because he thought that the speakers have better English:

---

P2

*An ideal teacher is a native English speaker... because he's handsome.*

P8

*His English is much better. Native English speakers have better knowledge of English.*

P4

*He must know a lot of English words. You know, there are some teachers who often see dictionaries, looking for words.*

---

Similarly, students in session 15 expressed that ideal English teachers are those who are ‘handsome and beautiful’ which one of the students equated to native English-speaking teachers with white complexion.

---

P6

*handsome and beautiful.*

P7

*If the teacher is beautiful or handsome like bule, we become so motivated to learn. We like them, not bored.*
4.3. Students’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’

The third relevant issue explored in the study is the way the student participants understand the term ‘native English speaker’. As proposed in the literature review, ‘native speaker’ is an important concept as it is often perceived as the norm and model for language learning (Murray & Christison, 2011). Socially, the concept is often used as a point of opposition for generating the images of non-native speakers (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001; Davies, 2003; Murray & Christison, 2011). Students’ understandings of the term ‘native English speaker’ were explored by giving an open-ended question – how do you define or understand ‘native English speaker?’ – to the students in interviews and group discussions.

Empirical findings from interviews with the eighteen students and group discussions with 160 students indicate that the students defined ‘native English speaker’ in terms of four aspects: geographical context, language, race and culture. While generally the students’ understandings are consistent with definitions of ‘native speaker’ as proposed by researchers, it is found that there were misconceptions among them. The misconceptions are related to three aspects: geographical context, language and racial aspects.

In terms of geographical context, some students defined ‘native English speakers’ simply as individuals from abroad regardless of the speakers’ first language; furthermore, one student characterized a native English speaker as an individual from England. With regard to language aspect, one student saw a particular accent as an important part of English language nativeness. In relation to racial aspect, a ‘native English speaker’ was defined by some students as an individual who has a ‘white’ complexion.

The empirical findings in this subchapter are arranged into two sections: findings from interviews (4.3.1) and findings from group discussions (4.3.2).
4.3.1. Findings from interviews

Empirical findings from interviews with the 18 students indicate that the students had various understandings of the term ‘native English speaker’ which are reflected by the various definitions they reported in the interviews. The students’ definitions can be broadly categorized into four main themes: geographical context, language, race and culture (Table 8. Students’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’). The students’ understandings are problematic as there were some misconceptions about the term with regard to geographical context, language and racial aspects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Understandings</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Context</td>
<td>From contexts where the language is used as a first language Those from abroad</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Having good language competence Having good pronunciation, good speaking Have a real accent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Those who are white</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Having knowledge of culture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geographical context

Nayar (1994) explains that language nativeness is often associated with nationality or domicile, as individuals acquire a language in particular contexts in which they were born and raised. Empirical findings in this section are consistent with such a view. Eleven of the
eighteen students associated language nativeness with geographical contexts. While their definitions are related to the same aspect, the students understood the term ‘native English speaker’ variously.

**Those from places where English is used as a first language**

Seven of the eleven students defined ‘native English speaker’ as an individual coming from contexts in which English is used as a first language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tika</td>
<td><em>People from countries of the language which we learn. I mean people who come to teach us how to use a language. They must be from the country in which the language is used.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lila</td>
<td><em>Native English speakers... like this, we learn English here in Indonesia, right? Native speakers are those learning English in their own country. I mean English-speaking countries. So, native speakers are those coming from Australia, America, England.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galuh</td>
<td><em>I mean native English speakers are individuals from English-speaking countries. ... they are native speakers of English because they speak English like people from England or America.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andi</td>
<td><em>Native speakers are local people in a certain place. That’s the first thing we must understand. So, native speakers are speakers from certain places or countries. So, let’s say... native speakers of English, they must be from places where English is spoken.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td><em>Native [English] speakers are people from English speaking countries... people who speak English as the first language which they learn from their mother, from the environment too.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td><em>In my opinion native English speakers are speakers of English</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from Europe, especially from England... Britain, because it's the real place where the language originated. English is from that place. So, native speakers are those people.

Muyasaroh

Native is original, real... speaker is someone who speaks. So, native speakers are people who speak their native language... not people from other countries who speak the language. For example, native speakers of English are people who speak English... from English-speaking countries.

The way the seven students defined native speakers of English as individuals coming from contexts where English is used as a first language is consistent with the characteristics and definitions of ‘native speaker’ proposed by Edge (1988) and Rampton (1990). Edge defines ‘native speaker’ as someone who learned a language as a mother tongue or sole language in a social context. Similarly, Rampton proposes that a native speaker of a language acquires the language in a social setting. In their views, an individual’s association with the context is an important part of the individual’s language nativeness. However, it is important to acknowledge that an individual might belong to many social groups and that an individual born in one social group does not necessarily use the language of that group fluently.

*Those from abroad*

Four of the eleven students had problematic understandings of the term ‘native English speaker’. In their view, native English speakers are individuals from abroad regardless of their language backgrounds. Such understandings are reflected by the definitions expressed by Alif, Nurafrizal, Garindra and Vira:
Alif  
*I think native English speakers are people from abroad whom we invite to come here... to Indonesia to speak, to tell their stories.*

Nurafrizal  
*I think native English speakers are people from abroad. They are real native [English] speakers. That's my understanding.*

Garindra  
*A native English speaker is someone who teaches. He is from overseas, from abroad. He is from a Western country.*

Vira  
*Native English speakers are from abroad... from other countries. They are the ones who teach us how to speak a language. They are from their country, come to Indonesia to teach English.*

The understandings of Alif, Nurafrizal, Garindra and Vira of the term ‘native English speaker’ are problematic as they defined individuals who come from abroad as native speakers of English regardless of the language the individuals speak. Because of such understandings, they might mistakenly identify non-native English speakers who come from abroad as native speakers of English.

**Language**

Five students in the interviews defined ‘native English speaker’ in terms of language aspect. The empirical findings indicate that there are three definitions of the concept. First, a native speaker was defined as an individual who has good language competence. Second, a native English speaker was defined as an individual who has good pronunciation or speaking. Last, the speaker was defined as an individual who has a particular accent.
Having good language competence

Venda, Lila, and Ananda mentioned general definitions of the term. They defined ‘native speaker’ primarily based on the language competence of the speaker. In their understandings, a native speaker of a language is an individual who has good competence in the language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venda</th>
<th>Native speakers are simply people who have good language ability, who can use a language very well, use it correctly. That’s their main characteristic and because of that they can be examples for us. We learn the language from them.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lila</td>
<td>Native English speakers must be very fluent. If they are not fluent, they are not native speakers even though they are from English-speaking countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ananda</td>
<td>They have good English proficiency, because they speak the language every day. Native English speaker... they speak English every day. That’s why we can learn from them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The understanding which the three students expressed, that language nativeness is indicated by individuals’ language competence, seems to be close to the definitions of ‘native speaker’ proposed by Rampton (1990), Nayar (1994), and Davies (1991, 2003). Rampton (1992) and Davies (1991, 2003) contend that a native speaker of a language is an individual who possesses comprehensive grasp of the language. Likewise, Nayar (1994) proposes that a native speaker of a language refers to an individual who has phonological, linguistic, and communicative competence of the language.

Furthermore, the way language nativeness is understood by Venda, Lila, and Ananda has an important implication for who conforms to the term ‘native English speaker’. As the
three students defined the term solely based on language competence and did not associate
language competence with particular geographical contexts, they might recognize individuals
who do not come from places where English is used as a daily language and do not use the
language as a first language as native speakers of English. On the other hand, they might
recognize individuals who do not come from English-speaking countries, but have good
English language competence as native speakers of English.

*Good pronunciation, good speaking*

While Venda, Lila, and Ananda defined a native English speaker in terms of the
speaker's English language competence in general, Devi was more specific in understanding
the concept. She defined native English speakers as individuals who have good speaking and
pronunciation. Interestingly, Devi further explained that in her point of view native speakers
can be from any contexts, not only from English-speaking countries:

Devi  *They can teach us pronunciation because they know how to
pronounce English words. Native English speakers are people who
have good pronunciation, good speaking... no matter where they
are from, as long as they can speak English well, they are native
English speakers.*

Similar to the understandings of the previous three students, the way Devi defined a
native English speaker as an individual who has good English speaking and pronunciation has
an implication for how she recognizes a native speaker of English; she could recognize
individuals from non-English-speaking countries who have good English speaking and
pronunciation as native speakers of English. Such an understanding is unproblematic if Devi
is aware that English has many varieties and if she has sufficient knowledge of English which she can use as a basis for defining a native English speaker. Otherwise, Devi could recognize native English speakers as non-native speakers of English.

**Have a ‘real’ accent**

Language nativeness is often mistakenly valued by the presence or absence of an accent (Lippi-Green, 1997). One student in this study saw a particular accent as part of English language nativeness. Billy reported that native English speakers are individuals who have ‘a real accent’. In his understanding, native speakers of English are individuals who have an accent ‘like those from England’ – those whom he saw as speaking ‘British style’. Interestingly, Billy did not state that the speakers must be from the UK. Giving an example of a native English speaker, he mentioned his previous English teacher who was from Poland. He perceived the teacher as a native speaker of English because to Billy ‘he sounded British’:

| Billy | Native English speakers are those people who have a real accent... English accent, like those from England... British style. There was one native English teacher at the school. He was from Poland. He spoke a bit British. I don’t know what he was talking about, but he sounded British. It did not sound clear though. I think he’s like from England. |

The way English language nativeness is defined based on a particular accent is problematic for two main reasons. First, English has many varieties and native English speakers have various accents (Crystal, 2003; Graddol, 2006; Karchu, 2006). More importantly, an accent does not indicate competence. An English language user who has a British accent or in Billy's term 'British style' does not necessarily have good language
competence. With his understanding, Billy might mistakenly categorize native speakers of English as non-native speakers if the speakers do not speak ‘like those from England’ or do not have certain accents which Billy considers to be native. Problematically, he perceived his English teacher who was a Pole as a native English speaker because Billy thought the teacher spoke ‘British style’.

**Race**

While race is an intricate concept, it is often associated with language nativeness (Curtis & Romney, 2006; Kubota & Lin, 2006; Shuck, 2006; Romney, 2010). With regard to racial aspects, the findings of this study indicate that there are misconceptions about ‘native English speaker’ among the students. Four students in the interviews indicated that they had problematic definitions of the term. They perceived individuals’ racial features as being part of the individuals’ English language nativeness.

**Those who are white**

Kubota and Lin (2006), Aboshiha (2013), and Holliday (2009) contend that nativeness in English is often valued from individuals’ ‘whiteness’. The empirical findings of this study confirm such a view. Two students, Nurafrizal and Dela, defined native English speakers as individuals who have ‘white’ complexions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nurafrizal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Native English speakers are those who are white.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Those European... coming from Europe or at least look like Europeans.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Native English speakers are... those people who are white... they have white complexion. They also speak real English... different kind of English. It's different from English that we speak here in Indonesia

While Nurafrizal and Dela associated ‘white’ complexion with English language nativeness, Novia mentioned that nativeness of English can be recognized from individuals’ hair. She expressed that native English speakers commonly have blonde hair. Further, she stated that the eyes and complexion of native English speakers are different from non-native speakers of English:

Sometimes we can see... from the speakers’ hair. The hair is different... commonly they are blonde, although sometimes some of them have black hair. But their eyes are different from us... eyes and complexion. I think they are different.

The way students mistakenly understood the term ‘native English speaker’ causes a problem which Galuh identified. Previously, Galuh stated that individuals from Indonesia can be native speakers of English if the individuals are born in English-speaking countries. However, Galuh thought that ‘they are not really native’ because, as she describes, they do not ‘look native’:

But it's a bit complicated, because they are not really native. I mean they don't look like native [English] speakers. If they come
Such understandings of the students are problematic as racial characteristics do not indicate language nativeness. Furthermore, their misconceptions exclude native speakers of English who do not have particular racial features which the students mentioned. With regard to previous research, such findings are similar to the findings of Amin’s (1997) and Liu’s (1999) studies. Participants in Amin’s and Liu’s research also had an assumption that native speakers of English are ‘white’ individuals.

**Culture**

Two students in the interviews expressed their understanding that knowledge of language-related cultures is an important part of language nativeness. Hanif and Novia thought that along with English language competence, knowledge of cultures related to English contributes to individuals’ English language nativeness:

---

**Hanif**

*They know their own habits more, their culture... because native English speakers, I think... not only do they speak English, they must also know the habits, their culture.*

---

**Novia**

*People who understand culture, who know their language and culture very well. So, native [English] speakers must know both English and the culture of English. In my schools, there are some teachers from overseas, but I don’t think they are native enough.*
The understandings of Hanif and Novia are in line with Rampton’s (1990) and Nayar’s (1994) notion about language nativeness. Language nativeness involves acculturation, in which individuals grow up in the speech community and acquire culture (Rampton, 1990; Nayar, 1994). Consequently, native speakers of a language have internalized knowledge of cultures related to the language (Medgyes, 1992, 1994; Phillipson, 1996).

4.3.2. Findings from group discussions

Empirical findings from interviews with the 18 students have shown that they had various understandings of the term ‘native English speaker’. The students defined a native English speaker in terms of four aspects: geographical context, language, race and culture.

It is found that there were misconceptions among the students with regard to geographical context, language and racial aspects. Generally, the understandings of students in group discussions are similar to students in the interviews. Misconceptions related to geographical context and racial aspects were also found in the discussions.

Geographical context

Consistent with findings from the interviews, empirical findings from group discussions indicate that there are misconceptions among the students in relation to geographical aspects. A native English speaker was defined by some students in the group
discussions simply as an individual coming from abroad:

In session two of the group discussions two students expressed that native speakers of English are people from abroad:

---

P3  *They are people from abroad, not from Indonesia*

P5  *Foreigners who come to our school... must be from abroad. They do not have to be from America or Australia, as long as they are from abroad.*

---

Similarly, a student in session six reported that native speakers of English refer to individuals from other countries. Further, he mentioned that the speakers can be from any country:

---

P4  *Native English speakers are people from other countries who come here, to our school to teach English. They can be from any country ... not from Indonesia, not Indonesian teachers of English*

---

A similar understanding was expressed by two students in session ten. The students asserted that native English speakers are individuals from other countries who come to their school to teach English:
Native English speakers are people coming to the school to teach English. They are from abroad. Because they teach English, they must be from abroad.

Yes, I agree. They are from other countries, come here to teach English. They must be from overseas... from other countries.

Language

With regard to language aspect, the understandings of students involved in group discussions of the term 'native English speaker' are similar to the understandings of students in interviews. Generally, a native English speaker was defined as an individual who has good competence of English.

Students in session one reported that native speakers of English are individuals who have good English language competence:

They have good English.

Native speakers of English are people who have good English. They know everything about English. They know how to use English... to speak English.

Yes, they have knowledge of English, the language... how to use English.
A similar understanding was expressed by students in session eleven. The students mentioned that native speakers of English have good English competence:

---

P2  
*They can be from anywhere. They have good English... know English well.*

P7  
*They can speak English, because they have good English. Native English speakers know English well.*

---

The understanding that native speakers of English referring to individuals who have good competence of English was reflected by the definitions which two students indicated in session fifteen of the group discussions:

---

P8  
*Native English speakers are people... those who have good English.*

P2  
*Native English speakers have good English. They know English... have knowledge of English. Therefore, they can use the language every day. Like my teacher, she is a native speaker of English. She knows English.*

---

**Race**

Empirical findings from group discussions also reveal that there are misconceptions among the students related to racial aspects. Some students saw physical/racial features of individuals as reflecting the individuals’ English language nativeness. In the students’ view, a native English speaker is an individual who has a white complexion.
A student in session two expressed that most native English speakers have a white complexion:

P6  Not all... but most of them have white complexion. They have white skin. Native English speakers have white complexion.

The misconception that native speakers of English are individuals who have a white complexion was also expressed by two students in sessions twelve:

P5  Native English speakers are bule. They are white... pointed nose, handsome

P3  Yes, I like that native English speaker. They are white, have white skin, handsome. That is why we like being in their class.

Three students in session eight mentioned that native English-speaking teachers are 'bule' – individuals who have white complexion:

P8  They must be from abroad... and they have white skin. Native English speakers are bule. They are white... handsome

P2  Yes, bule... like those teachers. We have here... the teachers. They are bule, native speakers of English.

P6  No, local teachers... I mean native English-speaking teachers. Those bule, white, pointed nose...
Culture

The understanding that native speakers of English have knowledge of cultures related to English which was identified in interviews with the eighteen students can also be found in group discussions.

Two students in session ten reported that native English speakers have knowledge of English-related cultures:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>They know their culture... English culture, which they get from their countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>Yes, because they are from English-speaking countries. Native English speakers must know their culture... with English. If they do not know... not sure, maybe they are not native English speakers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar understanding was expressed by students in session six of the group discussions:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>Native English speakers are people from abroad, speaking English and they know the culture of English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>Like teachers here... they are native because they know the culture of English. Some of them are from the US... they know the culture well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. Students’ perceptions of NESTs

Exploring the way students perceive NESTs is important in this research since NNESTs are often compared unfavorably to NESTs. As described in the methodological chapter of the thesis, the students involved in this study were third-year high school students who had experiences of being taught by both NESTs and ITEs at their school. Generally, the students did not have high English proficiency.

Empirical findings from interviews with eighteen students and group discussions with 160 students indicate that the way the students perceive NESTs is complex and multifaceted. The students had various perceptions of the teachers which had been shaped by their direct experience of interacting with NESTs and informed by the fixed stereotype of these teachers as ‘superior’ teachers. The findings suggest that, despite the students’ direct interaction with NESTs, there is ‘a regime of truth’ – a set of rigid stereotypes of the teachers which ‘needs no proof’ and ‘can never really, in discourse, be proved’ – among the students (Bhabha, 1983, p. 18); it is ‘a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always in place, already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated’ (p. 18). Furthermore, as the findings indicate, the rigid stereotype of NESTs seems to be related to the disparity of power between English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries. The unequal images of English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries contribute to the construction of the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers.

The findings in this subchapter are arranged into two sections: findings from interviews (4.4.1) and findings from group discussions (4.4.2).
4.4.1. Findings from interviews

Empirical findings from interviews with 18 students indicate that the students perceived NESTs variously in terms of six aspects: language, culture, pedagogy, personal quality, physical/racial and roles (Table 9. Students’ perceptions of NESTs). Generally, the students’ perceptions of NESTs tend to depict a homogeneous positive image.

Table 9. Students’ perceptions of NESTs – findings from interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Having good English competence</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using ‘real’ English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking ‘real’ accent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Having interesting culture (better, modern, advanced)</td>
<td>Having different culture</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not knowing local culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Focusing on students</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practical in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using ‘European’ system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal quality</td>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/racial</td>
<td>Physically attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bule (white) - real English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language

An aspect which is often used by students as a point of reference for valuing NESTs is the teachers’ language (Mahboob, 2004; Braine, 2010). Language is the most dominant aspect in the students’ perceptions of NESTs. Twelve students valued the teachers in terms of this aspect. Generally, NESTs were seen by the students as having good English competence, having good speaking, using ‘real’ English and speaking with a ‘real’ accent. The way the students perceived NESTs in terms of language aspects indicates that there is a rigid
stereotype of NESTs as better teachers among the students, which has influenced the students’ perceptions (Braine, 2010; Murray & Christison, 2011).

**Having good English language competence**

Two students, Venda and Garindra, saw NESTs as having good English language competence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venda</th>
<th>They are better teachers because their language is better. Language for English teachers is so important. It's like mathematics for mathematic teachers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garindra</td>
<td>They are much better in using the language, of course because they are native English speakers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The way Venda and Garindra saw NESTs is similar to the way participants in Mahboob’s (2004), (2002), Benke and Medgyes’ (2005), and Chun’s (2014) studies perceived the teachers. Generally, the participants of the studies saw NESTs as having good English language competence. Such perceptions of Venda and Garindra seem to have been influenced by the stereotype of NESTs as better teachers in terms of language competence. Because the student participants involved in this study did not have high English proficiency, their evaluations of the teachers’ language might not be valid. Rather, their perceptions are likely to have been shaped by their prior knowledge, including the stereotype of NESTs as better language users.
Having good speaking competence

While Venda and Garindra had general perceptions of NESTs in terms of language aspect, Billy and Novia were more specific in their evaluations of the teachers; they perceived NESTs as having good speaking competence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Billy</th>
<th>Well, students think native English-speaking teachers have good speaking. We can understand their speaking and we know what they told us.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native English speakers... of course we have to really think about what they say, we focus on what they say... to understand them. But, they have good speaking... it’s difficult, but challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novia</td>
<td>Native English-speaking teachers are different. The way they talk is different, the tempo is also different. Indonesians are slow, slower. They are fast, fluent. Although sometimes it’s too fast and we don’t understand what they say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native English-speaking teachers are better for speaking... if it’s speaking native speakers are better. They are better, because in practice we want to be like them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The views of Billy and Novia are similar to the views of participants in Mahboob’s (2004), Benke and Medgyes’ (2005), Sung’s (2014), and Walkinshaw and Oanh’s (2014) studies. Students in Mahboob’s research indicated the teachers as having better oral skills. Related to such skills, students in Benke and Medgyes’ study perceived NESTs as being better in teaching conversation. On the other hand, students in Sung’s and Walkinshaw and Oanh’s research saw NESTs as good models for pronunciation and language use.
Furthermore, similar to Venda’s and Garindra’s perceptions presented earlier, the perceptions of Billy and Novia are likely to have been influenced by the stereotype of NESTs as better teachers in terms of language. Although Billy and Novia had been taught by NESTs and therefore had experiences in interacting with the teachers, they did not have high proficiency of English, similar to Venda and Garindra. Their evaluations of the teachers’ language seem to be based on their assumptions.

**Using ‘real’ English**

Luk and Lin’s (2007) and Mahboob’s (2004) studies have revealed that there are misconceptions related to the authenticity of the NESTs’ language. Luk and Lin (2007) revealed that the participants thought that NESTs use ‘more standard’ English (p. 32). In Mahboob’s (2004) study, NESTs were seen by the participants as using ‘truth pronunciation’ (p. 141). Similar to the findings of such studies, the findings of this research indicate that the students perceived NESTs as using ‘real’ English, as indicated by the responses of Devi, Dela, Andi and Alif:

---

**Devi**

The language... is different from real English from English-speaking countries. We have learned English, but talking to native English speakers is different. It’s much better. Taught by real speakers is much better than by Indonesians. The language is real.

**Dela**

Native English speakers’ English is real, original, although sometimes it’s a bit fast and the vocabs are different. I think they teach real English.

**Andi**

What they bring is authentic English, real one. They teach clearly, practical English. They focus on practical English, rather than theories.
So, we can interact with them, try to speak using real English... like, hey what's your name? na... do you have a boyfriend? Like that... it's real, just like natural conversation.

Well, we can do it with local teachers, I mean speaking. But we do want to speak authentic English... having conversation with real native English-speaking teachers, those from overseas. Talking to people from overseas is different from talking to Indonesians.

Such a view of Devi, Dela, Andi and Alif reflects their assumptions about NESTs’ English language, which is likely to be informed by the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers, particularly with regard to language.

**Speaking with real accents**

Three students in the interviews perceived NESTs as speaking with real accents, which they thought indicated the authenticity of the teachers’ language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nurafrizal</th>
<th>Their accent is... you know, when they read something, I think native English-speaking teachers are better because they speak real English every day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Native speakers’ accent is real... real from places in which the language is spoken. So, it's real English. Yes true, they are better because they have real English. Moreover, if they come from European countries, their English is real, better, real English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lila

A good thing about native English-speaking teachers is... we can learn their language. Well, in our school the language is more like American, while I like British accent. You know in national tests, different styles and accents are used. When we have native English speakers in the school, we know various real accents... because they bring their own accents.

Similar to the perceptions of Devi, Dela, Andi, and Alif, the way Nurafrizal, Joshua, and Lila perceived NESTs as speaking with ‘real’ accents is based on their assumptions about NESTs’ language. Their perceptions are likely to have been influenced by the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers.

Culture

Kramsch (2013) proposes that NESTs are preferred by many school systems because of the ‘authentic relationship’ of the teachers with the target language and cultures (p. 58). Empirical findings of this study suggests that students’ preference for NESTs is not only related to their views of the relationship of the teachers and English-related cultures, but also based on their views about the cultures. Four students perceived NESTs as having interesting, more modern and advanced cultures. Furthermore, three other students perceived the teachers negatively as not knowing students' local cultures.

Having interesting culture

Four of the seven students saw NESTs as having ‘interesting’, ‘more modern’ and ‘advanced cultures’:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alif</td>
<td>Well, teachers from overseas often talk about life in their countries, so not only about tenses. <em>Their culture is very interesting.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>It’s interesting to be taught by native English-speaking teachers. <em>They have interesting culture. They can teach us the culture... so we know the culture, the way they talk, the style of their language.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lila</td>
<td>We like them because we can share anything. When the class is over, they usually tell us about their culture or anything from their country. <em>That’s interesting because their culture is better, much more modern.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahman</td>
<td><em>They talked about their culture. That’s very interesting for me... and for my friends. It’s because we don’t know their culture. So, it’s very interesting to know. It’s also interesting because the culture is so different. I mean what they have is more modern.</em> <em>Their culture is advanced.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous studies (Mahboob, 2004; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014) have demonstrated that NESTs are more preferred with regard to their knowledge of cultures related to English language. NESTs are often perceived by students as having more awareness and better insights into the cultures of English-speaking countries (Mahboob, 2004; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014). Such perceptions were not reflected by the responses of these four students. Rather, in this study, NESTs were seen by the students as having ‘interesting, more modern and more advanced’ culture. This suggests that the students’ preference for NESTs is not only founded upon the view that the teachers have knowledge of English-related cultures, but also upon the students’ disparate views of the cultures of English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries. Such a view reflects Bhabha’s notion of how stereotypes operate. Bhabha (1983) suggests that the operation of stereotypes ‘demands an articulation of forms of
differences’ (p. 19); the differences include cultural differences. The way the students saw their local cultures and the cultures of NESTs contributes to the strong preference for NESTs.

Such a view of the students can be attributed to sociocultural, economic and political discourses related to English. English is situated in larger discourses, reflecting the power of English-speaking countries (Pennycook, 1994). The image of the countries has informed the way the students perceived NESTs.

**Having different cultures, not knowing local culture**

While the previous four students shared their perceptions that NESTs have ‘interesting, better, more modern, and more advanced culture’, three students expressed different views. The three students perceived NESTs as both as having different cultures and not knowing local culture:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurafrizal</td>
<td><em>It’s just we are not connected. The teachers and students from here are not connected. I know they use English every day. I also know they have learned things before they came here, but it’s not enough. They must learn local culture more.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andi</td>
<td><em>Perhaps their weakness is they need to adapt to local culture, because they don’t know about it. I mean the culture of Indonesian students. Well, Indonesia is different, the culture is different. The students are also different. They need to know that and adapt.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanif</td>
<td><em>Usually native English speakers talk about their countries. But sometimes they are a bit less interesting, perhaps because their different culture. Indonesians are like this, we are different. Sometimes we, the students, get confused. Why like this? Why like that? They don’t know our culture.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the students’ responses indicate, the perception of Nurafrizal, Andi, and Hanif seems to be based on their experience in learning English with NETs at their school.

**Pedagogy**

Six of the eighteen students valued NESTs in terms of the teachers’ pedagogy. The teachers were perceived by the students as focusing on students, being practical in teaching, and using ‘European system’.

**Focusing on students**

With regard to pedagogy aspect, NESTs were seen as giving more focus on students by Galuh, Ananda, and Vira:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galuh</td>
<td><em>They [local English teachers] just come to school, teach anything... just target for that day. Native English-speaking teachers are different. They really make students understand.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ananda</td>
<td><em>I like that they prioritize students. They always want to know, get close to the students before teaching. That’s why they are different. They can attract the students.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vira</td>
<td><em>I also like the way they teach students. Sometimes students don’t understand... and they approach the students.... explain to the students.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Being practical in teaching**

While NESTs were seen as focusing on students by Galuh, Ananda, and Vira, the teachers were perceived as being practical in teaching by Tike and Novia:

---

**Tike**  
*At first, the impression is... they are good. Then, I know that they are really good. As fas as I know, they don't teach theories. They use games, divide us into groups and ask us to do something. It's practical.*

*Well, they are more creative in teaching, more lively.*

---

**Novia**  
*They teach clearly, practical. They focus on practical English, rather than theories.*

---

Such perceptions of the students are different from the perceptions of participants in Mahboob's (2004) research. Student participants in Mahboob's study reported that NESTs lacked teaching methods. However, the perceptions are similar to the views of participants in Law's (1999) and Ma's (2012) research, where students perceived the teachers as being practical in teaching and not textbook bound.

Such perception differences are likely to be related to different interaction experiences which the students had with their NESTs; the student participants in the studies might have been taught by NESTs who had different teaching styles. This explains why the study generated empirical findings which are different from previous studies (Law, 1999; Ma, 2012). Perceptions of NESTs’ pedagogical aspect seem to depend on the students who perceive the teachers, the teachers being perceived, and the particular contexts where the interaction takes place. Tike and Novia might have had the same experiences as student participants in Law's (1999) and Ma's (2012) studies.
Using ‘European system’

While the previous five students’ perceptions of NESTs seem to be predominantly shaped by their interaction experiences with the teachers, Venda’s perception of NESTs is influenced by ‘native speakerism’ – the belief that NESTs represent western culture from which the ideals of teaching methodology come (Holliday, 2006). Venda explicitly stated that the teachers employed ‘European system’ which she thought ‘better’ than the system used by local teachers in her school:

Venda

I think all native English-speaking teachers use one way for teaching. They apply European system, better system in which if students don’t understand, they chase the teacher, not the other way around. You know here teachers have to chase the students. It will be better if we apply their system here, so that we can learn to be responsible for our own learning.

Personal Quality

Four students in the interviews perceived NESTs in terms of the teachers’ personal quality. The teachers were seen as disciplined and tolerant by the students.

Disciplined

Native English-speaking teachers were seen as disciplined by Nurafrizal, Galuh and Vira:

Nurafrizal

Their discipline, that is good to be applied in the school. Well if they become our teachers, they are disciplined.
Galuh  
*Native English-speaking teachers are disciplined.* Perhaps they are a bit uncommunicative in school. You know, during school breaks they don’t talk to students. Like when some students sit under the school gazebo, they just passed... without asking anything. I think that’s because they are disciplined.

Vira  
*They can manage time effectively, appreciate the time.* Being disciplined is more important.

*I like their discipline. Most of them are disciplined in teaching... like if we have assignments. If it is time to submit, we have to submit it... no excuse.*

**Tolerant**

While Nurafrizal, Galuh, and Vira saw NESTs as having discipline, Garindra perceived the teachers as being more tolerant. He asserted that it was probably because the teachers were foreigners:

Garindra  
*They are more tolerant with people around them, with students who have various behaviours. I think because they are foreigners here.*

The four students’ perceptions of NESTs in terms of the teachers’ personal quality are likely to derive from the students’ experience in being taught by their NESTs at their school; the perceptions stem from their personal impressions of the teachers. As such perceived characteristics as disciplined and tolerant are personal, they cannot be attributed to all the members of a particular group of teachers. Different students or participants will have
different perceptions of the teachers.

**Physical/Racial Aspect**

Three students in the interviews perceived NESTs in terms of physical/racial aspects. Two students saw ‘white’ teachers as physically attractive and one student thought that the teachers’ ‘white’ complexion related to English language competence.

**Physically attractive**

NESTs were perceived as physically attractive by Devi and Muyasaroh:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Devi</th>
<th>They are more attractive, more attractive. The way they teach is also different.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muyasaroh</td>
<td>I feel that native English speakers with faces like this... I do respect them, appreciate them because my aspiration, one of things I want in life, is to talk with westerners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Devi and Muyasaroh’s view reflects the notion of the teachers as ‘an attractive exotic other’ (Kramsch, 2013, p. 58); it is based on the misconception that native English speakers are ‘white’ Caucasians. This finding is consistent with Amin’s (1994) research which revealed that NESTs are often stereotyped as having particular physical/racial characteristics such as a ‘white’ complexion.
They are white, real English

In contrast to Devi and Muyasaroh, Dela drew her perception from her assumption about the physical appearance of NESTs and associated this to the teachers’ English language competence. She thought that NESTs have a white complexion and assumed that because the teachers are ‘bule’, their English is authentic:

Dela Those teachers talking, they are bule, real bule. So, it’s real English. While local teachers, their English is accented by local languages, Indonesian.

Dela’s view is similar to the view of participants in Amin’s (2004) study who thought that whiteness indicated competence of English language.

Role – professional teachers

Two students saw NESTs as playing a particular role in school. Galuh and Muyasaroh perceived these teachers as ‘professional’:

Galuh I think local teachers are like parents. They are our parents in the school, while native English-speaking teachers are our mentors. They just teach us knowledge, but they teach us professionally. Mentors teach us differently. They teach us professionally... teach us until we really understand.

Muyasaroh I think native English-speaking teachers are better, because they have passed a lot of tests before they become teachers. You know, teachers here are different... I think native English-
While both Galuh and Muyasaroh asserted that NESTs are ‘professional’ teachers, their perceptions of the teachers are different. The way Galuh saw NESTs is based on his experience of learning and interacting with his teachers. On the other hand, the response of Muyasaroh indicates that her perception of NESTs is related to her assumption that her teachers were more qualified, having passed a lot of tests before becoming English teachers.

4.4.2. Findings from group discussions

Findings from interviews have shown that the eighteen students perceived NESTs variously in terms of six aspects: language, culture, pedagogy, personal quality, physical/racial and roles. The students’ perceptions of the teachers, as the findings indicate, tend to depict a homogeneously positive image of the teachers.

Three similar aspects emerged in the group discussions, which are pedagogy, language and physical/racial aspects. One new theme was identified from students’ responses, which is the aspect of knowledge.
Table 10. Students’ perceptions of NESTs – findings from group discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Not monotonous</td>
<td>Not knowing teaching methods appropriate to local students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Good English competence</td>
<td>Do not understand Indonesian language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/racial</td>
<td>Physically attractive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Having broad knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedagogy**

While NESTs were seen by students in interviews as focusing on students, practical in teaching and using ‘European’ systems, they were seen as not monotonous and as practical in teaching by students in group discussions. However, the teachers were also perceived negatively by students as not knowing teaching methods appropriate to local students. The following excerpts show how the students perceived the teachers in terms of pedagogy aspect.

**Not monotonous in teaching**

In session thirteen, students mentioned that NESTs are not monotonous with regard to their teaching methods. The students reported that they felt more relaxed with these teachers:

P1  *They can explore the way we speak English and they are not monotonous in teaching.*

P4  *We’re more relaxed with native teachers*

P6  *Yes, not only learning school materials*
Practical in teaching

A student in group discussion session ten perceived NESTs as practical in their teaching. Such a perception of the student corroborates the views of Tike and Novia in the interviews:

---

**P7**

*We can easily forget theories. Native English-speaking teachers do practices that are much easier. We learn how to speak English over time, through practices. We get used to speaking. We need practices, not just theories.*

---

Not knowing appropriate teaching methods

While in the interviews generally NESTs were perceived positively by students, in group discussion sessions six and eight some participants asserted that the teachers’ way of teaching was not appropriate to the local school system. One student in session six stated that sometimes the teachers are too fast. He saw this as a weakness and shared his view that the teachers do not know appropriate teaching methods that can be applied in the local school system:

---

**P3**

*Perhaps their weakness is sometimes they are too fast, and they don’t really know teaching methods which are suitable for Indonesian school system.*

**P4**

*The method is... they only teach anything from their countries. Perhaps when they come to this place, they have certain purposes such as sharing things from their place.*
A similar view was expressed by a student in group discussion session six. The student mentioned that NESTs' way of teaching is different from ITEs':

\[
\text{P7} \quad \text{Their way of teaching is different from Indonesian teachers.}
\]
\[
\text{Sometimes they are a bit too fast. We don't understand.}
\]

---

**Language**

In the interviews, NESTs were generally perceived positively by students as having good English competence, good speaking, using 'real' English, and speaking with a 'real' accent. However, in group discussions students' perceptions are more various. NESTs were seen as having strengths and weaknesses with regard to language aspects.

**Good English competence**

Similar to those students in interviews, some students in group discussions perceived NESTs as having good English language competence. A student in session three asserted that NESTs were preferred by students because the teachers speak fully in English. He shared his belief that students can learn better and faster by communicating with the teachers:

\[
\text{P7} \quad \text{We choose native English-speaking teachers because they speak fully in English. We can communicate with them fully in English. That way, we can learn faster and our English can be better.}
\]
Two students in session nine of the group discussions contended that NESTs have good language competence because they are from English-speaking countries and that the language is their mother tongue:

---

P5  
*Because they are from their own countries... from where they are from, they speak their own language, their mother tongue.*

P6  
*Yes, not from here, from overseas.*

---

**Using ‘true’ and ‘accurate’ English**

While in interviews NESTs teachers were seen as using ‘real’ English by three students, the teachers were perceived as using ‘true’ and ‘accurate’ English by some students in group discussions. In session ten a student asserted that NESTs’ language is ‘true’ and that they can learn ‘correct’ English from the teachers. Another student in the group agreed with the view and contended that the language used by native speakers is ‘right’ and ‘accurate’:

---

P8  
*Because they are native English speakers, I am convinced that what they say is true English, that their English is not reversed... up side down. You know, when I was in junior high school I often made mistakes... reversed English. From native English-speaking teachers, we can learn how we pronounce words correctly, such as pronouncing flower and flour. The two words are different and they can say them differently. Their speaking is much clearer.*

P6  
*We believe that native English speakers must be right, accurate. They speak with accents such as British or American...*
**Not understanding Indonesian language**

While findings from interviews indicate that NESTs were perceived positively by students with regard to language aspects, findings from group discussion show that some students saw NESTs as having weaknesses. The teachers were perceived negatively by the students for their lack of understanding of Indonesian language.

A student in session ten reported that although the teachers have good English, they do not understand Indonesian language well. The student recognized this as a weakness and thought that it could cause misunderstandings:

---

**P3**

*We prefer native English-speaking teachers because their English is much better than local teachers, and their pronunciation is accurate. However, they also have a weakness. They don’t understand Indonesian language. Not all students understand English. Sometimes they don’t know a word or two. If the teachers can’t understand Indonesian, they can’t help students. I think they are the only ones that can translate. If they can’t, we might have different understandings.*

---

Two students in session four also had similar perceptions. They shared their experience of having miscommunications with NESTs and saw the teachers’ inability to speak Indonesian language as a weakness:

---

**P1**

*But sometimes we don’t understand what they say. If that happens, we just keep silent and we don’t say anything. So, they don’t know what we mean to say. We get stuck.*

**P3**

*Yes, we just laugh, because we don’t know... It’s miscommunication.*
Physical/racial Aspect

Similar to findings from interviews, findings from group discussions indicate that the way the students perceived NESTs is problematic in that they valued the teachers in terms of their physical/racial aspects. The view of Devi and Muyasaroh in interviews that NESTs are physically attractive is also highlighted by some students in group discussions.

Physically attractive

Some students in group discussions associated individuals’ physical/racial characteristics with English language ‘nativeness’. They assumed that NESTs have ‘white’ complexions. Therefore, as the students asserted, they are physically attractive.

Students in session one explicitly stated their understanding that NESTs are ‘white’. They assumed that such a physical/racial feature of the teachers is better than their own.
One student in session four also expressed a similar thought. He perceived NESTs as ‘handsome and beautiful’:

---

P7  
*We think that native English-speaking teachers... the plus is they are handsome and beautiful, good looking.*

---

Similar views were expressed by students in session eight of the group discussions. The students thought that NESTs are ‘handsome’ because they are ‘white... beautiful, with a pointed nose’:

---

P2  
*But they are handsome.... We are attracted.*

P4  
*If they are not, we are not attracted.*

P5  
*You know, like those white... beautiful, with a pointed nose*

---

**Knowledge**

Interestingly, a new theme was identified in group discussions with the student participants. The students saw NESTs in terms of their knowledge. The teachers were perceived as having broad knowledge.

**Having broad knowledge**

Four students in four different sessions of the group discussions reported that NESTs have broad knowledge. In session four one student compared NESTs to ITEs. He mentioned
that NESTs’ knowledge is broader than the knowledge of local teachers:

P3  *Their knowledge is broader than teachers in our school and their English is much more fluent. So, we can understand.*

A similar view was outlined by a student in session seven. She asserted that besides having good English, NESTs have broader knowledge:

P5  *Their strengths are they have good English that motivates us to learn their language, and they have broader knowledge.*

A student in session fourteen expressed that the teachers are ‘more knowledgeable’ because ‘they read in English’:

P3  *We usually ask them, where they are from. We get much knowledge from them, because they know many things. They are more knowledgeable. We believe that they know lots of things because they read in English... of course their knowledge is better, broader.*
4.5. Students’ Perceptions of ITEs

Section 4.4. has shown that students’ perceptions of NESTs tend to depict a positive image of the teachers. The students’ perceptions of ITEs, which are presented and discussed in this section, reflect a heterogeneous image of ITEs. ITEs were perceived by the students in terms of various aspects as having both strengths and weaknesses. This subchapter is arranged into two sections, presenting findings from the interviews (4.5.1) and group discussions (4.5.2).

4.5.1. Findings from interviews

Findings from interviews indicate that the students had various perceptions of ITEs. They valued ITEs in terms of six aspects: language, culture, pedagogy, L2 learning experience, knowledge and roles (Table 11. Students’ perceptions of ITEs – findings from interviews). The findings suggest that the way the students perceived ITEs had been informed by various factors, such as the students’ experiences in learning English with both NESTs and ITEs, and the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers. In their perceptions of ITEs, the students saw NESTs as a yardstick or a good standard against which to assess ITEs.
Table 11. Students’ perceptions of ITEs – findings from interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Sharing the same mother tongue with students</td>
<td>Having low English competence Having different English – not so English Speaking accented English</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Sharing local culture with students</td>
<td>Not having knowledge of English-related cultures</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Knowing teaching materials and students’ needs</td>
<td>Too focused on the curriculum Theoretical in teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 learning experience</td>
<td>Having experience in learning English as a second language Close to students</td>
<td>Second language learners (similar to students)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Having less knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Like parents - not professional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language**

Language is the most dominant aspect in the students’ perceptions of ITEs, similar to their perceptions of NESTs. Fourteen students in interviews valued ITEs in terms of their language. The teachers were seen positively by the students as sharing the same mother tongue with students and negatively as having low English competence and speaking accented English.

**Sharing a mother tongue with students**

ITEs were perceived positively by six students as sharing the same first language with them. In the views of the six students, the shared mother tongue helps them learn English. Such perceptions were reflected by the responses of Novia, Joshua, Muyasaroh, Lila, Andi and Venda:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novia</td>
<td>Sometimes we feel that native speaker are too fast and we don’t understand what they say. What did they say? Indonesian teachers speak our language too. They can help us get the understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Local teachers... their strength is they are bilingual. They can speak two languages. It's useful for students who don’t really understand English. If they don’t understand, the teachers can explain using Indonesian language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muyasaroh</td>
<td>They also speak Indonesian language. That's good because the teachers can help us whenever we get problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lila</td>
<td>They use Indonesian language and we speak Indonesian language. Let’s say we have difficulties, if we have questions related to English, we can ask them using Indonesian language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andi</td>
<td>We can understand Indonesian teachers more easily because they know how we talk, because they are from Indonesia. We also understand local teachers more easily. We are close to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td>I think Indonesian teachers are more connected to us, close... because we eat the same kind of food... because we share the same language and culture...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such perceptions of the six students is based on their awareness of characteristics which ITEs have; they could also be related to the students’ experience of being taught by ITEs. Furthermore, the view of the six students that ITEs share the same mother tongue with students is consistent with the views of participants of previous studies (Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Moussu & Braine, 2006; Ling & Braine, 2007; Chun, 2014; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014). Benke and Medgyes’ (2005) study demonstrated that NNESTs were perceived by students as having ability to supply the first language equivalent of the target language. On the other
hand, Moussu and Braine (2006) reported that teachers’ and students’ shared language was one important variable which influenced the way students saw the teachers. Similarly, Ling and Braine’s (2007), Chun’s (2014), and Walkinshaw and Oanh’s (2014) research shows that students saw NNESTs positively because they can use students’ mother tongue in teaching.

**Having low English competence**

In terms of language aspect, ITEs were also seen negatively as having low English competence by seven students. Such an image of the teachers was reflected by the views of Dela, Lila, Joshua, Devi, Rizal, Billy and Vira:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dela</th>
<th><em>Most Indonesian teachers still use Indonesian language. They use it much... more often than English. Perhaps that’s because their language is not enough. Perhaps they don’t have enough English.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lila</td>
<td><em>But the problem is, they don’t know, because they don’t have enough English.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td><em>But sometimes it’s also still difficult, because the teachers’ vocabulary is hard. I mean their vocabulary is not enough for the explanation.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devi</td>
<td><em>Indonesian teachers are not challenging. I think because they use simple language. They use too simple vocabularies, easy vocabs.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rizal</td>
<td><em>The thing which I concern most is... when explaining, sometimes their sentences are incorrect. They often make mistakes. The grammar is often incorrect. We often get so confused. In the test... we knew we had answered the questions correctly, but they still thought that our answers were wrong. We checked, and the answers were correct.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Billy

*I think* they should not correct us, because that can cause misunderstandings. They should not do that because English is not their language. Let’s just say that both the students and the teachers are correct because we are the same. *English is not our language.*

Vira

*I don’t mind with their English, because I’m still learning it now… at my level now. But when I achieve a higher level, I want native English-speaking teachers because they can give me more, give me better English. I am not really convinced that local teachers’ English is correct… that they can teach high-level English. Can they?*

The perceptions of the seven students are similar to the views of student participants in Benke and Medgyes’s (2005) and Ling and Braine’s (2007) studies. Participants in Benke and Medgyes’ research perceived NNESTs as using their first language excessively. Likewise, Ling and Braine’s study demonstrated that their participants saw the teachers as having limited use of English. While some students in the previous section perceived ITEs’ ability to speak students’ first language as a strength, students in this section saw the teachers’ use of the first language as a weakness, indicating ITEs’ perceived insufficient English competence. Although such perceptions of the seven students are consistent with the stereotype of NNESTs as less competent users of the language, they do not seem to be shaped solely by the stereotype; the empirical findings show that the students’ perceptions are related to their learning experiences.
**Using different English, not so English**

Another negative image of ITEs reflected by the students’ perceptions is ITEs as teachers who use ‘different English’, a language which one of the students described as ‘not so English’. Such a view is expressed by Novia, Garindra, and Ananda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>However,</em> because Indonesian language is their mother tongue, because they speak Indonesian, <em>their English is different.</em> Their speaking is so different. We get problems when we take real test, because the teachers' English is different.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>They speak Indonesian language, and that can help us learn English... but because Indonesian is their language, their English is not so English. Their English is Indonesian. It's a weakness.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garindra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>It really depends on their experience. Because they've never been in English-speaking countries, they don’t know how to speak English correctly.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Because they never go there, just stay in Indonesia, I am not convinced... I am not sure if their English is correct or not, whether it's authentic or not. If they learn only from books...</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ananda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Local teachers, I think they are good... just good, although sometimes I don’t understand what they are saying. I watch lots of movies and I know good English. I wonder why their English is not like that on TV, on movies or songs. It seems that their English is local... perhaps local English?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such perceptions of the students derived from the way they compared ITEs to NESTs; the students saw NESTs as a good standard in terms of language. Because of such a view, ITEs’ English was rated by the students as ‘not so English’.
Speaking accented English

Besides being seen as using different English, ITEs were also perceived negatively by four students as speaking accented English. Such a view was expressed by Joshua, Andi, Dela and Alif:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td><em>Indonesian teachers are accented... heavily accented</em>... <em>Indonesian English is not really English. So, the teachers are not good examples for speaking. They teach us grammar, teach us the theories, but not for speaking</em>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andi</td>
<td><em>It’s hard to explain, but they are different. Their accent is different from native English-speaking teachers’ accent.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dela</td>
<td><em>Local teachers, their English is accented by the local language, Indonesian. Native speakers’ English is real, original, although sometimes it’s a bit fast and the vocabularies are difficult.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alif</td>
<td><em>Like local teachers... their English is heavily accented. They have <em>Indonesian accent</em>, It’s not like English spoken by native speakers.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liang (2002) found that accent was not a prime variable in students’ perceptions of NNESTs. Unlike Liang’s study, the findings of this study show that accent is a variable based on which the four students perceived ITEs. The teachers were seen negatively by the four students as speaking accented English.

Furthermore, the findings in this section indicate that native speakerism is present among the student participants (Holliday, 2006). The students’ perceptions of ITEs are related to their views of NESTs. As shown by the responses of Andi, Dela and Alif, NESTs’
accents were seen by the students as a good standard or a yardstick against which to value ITEs, particularly with regard to ITEs’ language.

**Culture**

ITEs were valued in terms of cultural aspects by six students in the interviews. Three students perceived the teachers positively as sharing the same cultural background with the students. On the other hand, the other three students saw ITEs negatively as not having knowledge of English-related cultures.

**Sharing local culture**

ITEs were perceived positively by Venda, Garindra and Tike as sharing the same culture with local students:

| Venda | *I think the closeness between students and Indonesian teachers… between students and native English speakers… is different.*
|       | *I think Indonesian teachers are more connected to us because we share the same culture.* |
| Garindra | *Indonesian teachers… their strength is because they are from Indonesia and they know the characteristics of Indonesian. So, they know how to teach Indonesians and they are more connected to local students.* |
| Tike | *We are accustomed to them. I mean if we talk to Indonesian teachers, it's not difficult for them to understand us. I think it's because we are similar. I mean they are Indonesians, just like us, their students.* |
The way Venda, Garindra, and Tike saw ITEs as sharing the same culture with local students seems to be related to their learning experience and awareness of characteristics which ITEs have.

**Not having knowledge of cultures related to English**

While ITEs were perceived positively by the previous three students as sharing the same cultural background with local students, the teachers were seen negatively by Rahman, Ananda and Hanif as not having knowledge of cultures related to English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rahman</th>
<th>I am learning English not only because it’s English, not only for the language, but also because of the culture... English culture. That’s why I prefer native English-speaking teachers, because local teachers don’t really know about English culture. They teach English... just the language, not the culture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>It’s just they have better cultures. That’s what they bring... native English-speaking teachers bring. That’s what the teachers, local teachers, don’t have.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ananda</td>
<td>Most of them don’t know about the culture... like shaking hand or kissing the back of hand? Native English-speaking teachers are more modern, while teachers here are traditional. What I love from native English-speaking teachers is they have the culture from their countries. That’s what makes them interesting for students. Our teachers don’t have it. They just know local culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanif</td>
<td>They know English, but that’s not enough for teaching. The problem is most of them never stay or live in English speaking countries, so they don’t really know about the culture of English. They don’t have the knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I think all students want to learn both the language and the culture, because they are very important. How can we talk to foreigners using English if we don’t know their culture?

The way Rahman, Ananda and Hanif perceived ITEs as not having knowledge of cultures related to English seems to be based on the belief that learning cultures related to English is an important part of English learning. The students were aware that ITEs have less knowledge of the cultures. Because of the belief, they valued ITEs negatively. Such a view of the students is likely to contribute to the preference for NESTs. As the students thought that English-related cultures are important and that NNESTs have less knowledge of the cultures, they prefer NESTs. Furthermore, the responses of Rahman and Ananda indicate that they perceived cultures from English-speaking countries and non-English-speaking countries differently. Rahman saw the cultures of English-speaking countries as ‘better cultures’ and Ananda perceived them as ‘more modern’. This suggests that the disparity of power between English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries, particularly Indonesia, has influenced the way the students perceived ITEs.

In relation to previous research, the findings confirm Mahboob’s (2004) study. Similar to findings of this study, the results of such a study showed that NNESTs were perceived as having fewer cultural insights by students and teachers in Mahboob’s research. The findings of this study indicate that the native speaker fallacy is complex and multifaceted, involving various factors. NESTs are preferred not only because of their language competence, but also because of their association with cultures related to English.
Pedagogy

Four students perceived ITEs in terms of the teachers’ pedagogy. ITEs were seen positively by two students who reported that they knew more about local English teaching materials and what students need. On the other hand, the teachers were also perceived negatively by another two students as giving too much focus on the curriculum, being too theoretical in teaching, and giving too much emphasis on grammar.

Knowing teaching materials and students’ needs

ITEs were perceived positively as knowing more about local materials and local students’ needs by Rizal and Novia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rizal</th>
<th>I’d rather be taught by local teachers, because they know our English learning materials and they know what we need... although I know native speakers speak better, know English better.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novia</td>
<td>If they [native English-speaking teachers] explained about school materials, we do not really understand. Perhaps they think differently. They think we need this and that. Indonesian teachers are better for that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, such views of Rizal and Novia are similar to the views of student participants in research conducted by Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) and Chun (2014). In the studies, NNESTs were seen by the students as being more sensitive to students’ needs. These views of Rizal and Novia are likely to be related to their experience of being taught by ITEs; they could also be attributed to the students’ awareness of the fact that ITEs have more experiences in working in local schools and under the Indonesian education system.
Too focused on the curriculum and theoretical in teaching

While ITEs were perceived positively in terms of their pedagogy by Rizal and Novia, the teachers were seen negatively by Billy and Vira as giving too much focus on the curriculum and being too theoretical in teaching:

---

**Billy**  
*I think local English teachers in Indonesia are quite good. We understand them, but *they're too focused on the curriculum*. They teach English as a school subject, not English for communication. You know, we need that when we meet those people who speak in English, those people from English-speaking countries.*

*It is not only about books, not only about the curriculum. *Why don't they do practical things?* Why don't they speak and do more practices? Perhaps it's because they can't speak English like native speakers.*

---

**Vira**  
*The way they teach... I am not sure if they can teach. I've been taught English by many teachers... from elementary school. What I feel about English teachers here is that they are so boring. *They teach using the same way, the same method... teaching grammar, again and again. It's just so boring.*

---

Billy’s and Vira’s perceptions are related to their experiences of being taught by ITEs. However, what Billy asserted implies that the way he valued ITEs has been influenced by the way he saw NESTs. He perceived NESTs as a good standard in terms of speaking and valued ITEs against NESTs. Billy thought that ITEs’ inability to speak English like native speakers contribute to the teachers’ way of teaching, which he saw as too theoretical. On the other hand, Vira’s response does not suggest that she saw NESTs as a standard. Nevertheless, she perceived ITEs negatively as monotonous in teaching and too focused on teaching grammar.
While previous research (Mahboob, 2004) suggest that NNESTs have a perceived strength in teaching grammar, in this study the teachers were seen negatively by Billy and Vira as being too grammar-focused. The findings of this study are similar to Ling and Braine’s (2007) research which revealed that NNESTs were seen negatively by students as being examination-oriented. It is important to acknowledge that ITEs work in a school system which requires them to deliver certain materials under the national curriculum and meet particular education targets such as national tests. Such factors are likely to influence the way ITEs teach students and unavoidably the way students perceived the teachers.

**L2 Learning Experience**

Three students in the interviews valued ITEs with regard to the teachers’ experiences in learning English and their identity as second language learners. ITEs were seen positively by Nurafrizal and Muyasaroh as being close to students as they have similar learning experiences. On the other hand, the teachers were perceived negatively by Venda as being second language learners, whom she thought to be similar to students and different from native speakers of English.

*Close to students and understand students more*

Nurafrizal and Muyasaroh perceived ITEs as having experiences in learning English as a second language, which made them feel that the teachers are close to students and understand them more:

---

Nurafrizal: *They are close to students... I mean very close. They can build a relationship because they had been like us. They were once...*
**Students learning English as a foreign language, just like us.**

Muyasaroh  
*Indonesian teachers can understand us more, because they were just like us. I mean they were once Indonesian students who learned English in Indonesian schools. Teachers from other countries are different. Students here are so naughty. Indonesian teachers, I think they understand us. They’re fair.*

---

Such views of Nurafrizal and Muyasaroh seem to be related to their learning experience with ITEs. Their views accentuate the views of participants in Mahboob’s (2004) research. In Mahboob’s study, NNESTs were seen by student participants as having second-language learning experiences. The students had positive views with regard to their teachers’ experience in learning English.

*They are just like us*

While ITEs were seen positively by Nurafrizal and Muyasaroh as having experiences in learning English as a second language, the teachers were perceived negatively by one student with regard to their identity as second language learners:

Venda  
*But, still native English-speaking teachers are better because they are native speakers. Local teachers here... they are just like us. They also learn English. Even though we call them teacher, but they are like us. They are learning English. Perhaps they are called teachers because their English is better than us, because they have been like us, just like me... going to school. So, we are alike. We learn English.*

---
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The way Venda saw ITEs shows that ITEs’ experience in learning English as a second language and their identity as English language learners do not necessarily lead to students’ positive perceptions of such aspects, and their identity in general. As Venda’s response indicates, students might see such aspects as weaknesses, rather than advantages. Furthermore, it seems that Venda’s perception had been influenced by her view of NESTs as superior teachers. The finding suggests that the native speaker fallacy can also inform students’ views of NNESTs’ experiences in learning English, and more importantly the teachers’ identity as second language learners.

**Knowledge**

One student valued ITEs in terms of their general knowledge. The teachers were perceived negatively as having less knowledge compared to NESTs.

**Having less knowledge**

Ganu saw ITEs as having less knowledge compared to NESTs, because he thought that English-speaking countries have better education. He further added that ITEs can be as good as NESTs if they learned in English-speaking countries:

---

Ganu

*Their knowledge is of course less than native English-speaking teachers because they learned in Indonesia. Why native English-speaking teachers have more knowledge? It’s because they learned in the west, in English speaking countries. There, they have better education, better lives, while here is so different.*

*If our teachers can learn in the west, I believe they can be as good as native English-speaking teachers.*

---
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Ganu perceived English-speaking countries, which he relates to ‘the west’, and non-English-speaking countries differently. He associated English-speaking countries with ‘better education, better lives’. It seems obvious that such a view influenced the way he perceived ITEs. Because he thought that ‘the west’ has better education and that individuals learning in English-speaking countries have more knowledge, he perceived ITEs as having less knowledge. Such a view gives NESTs privilege; as they learned in English-speaking countries, they are seen as having more general knowledge. The way Ganu perceived ITEs negatively as having less knowledge could be attributed to the image of ‘the west’ – as equivalent to English-speaking countries. The sociocultural, economic, and political power of English-speaking countries can inform the views of English learners, particularly in contexts where English is used as a second or foreign languages (Pennycook, 1994). Ganu’s perception suggests that such a power can shape the way individuals perceived NNESTs.

**Role - not professional**

Besides valuing ITEs in terms of the teachers’ knowledge, Ganu also evaluated ITEs with regard to the role which they play at school. ITEs were seen by Ganu as being parents at school, while NESTs were seen as being mentors. Because of such perceived roles, Ganu saw ITEs as less professional:

---

Ganu  

*I think local teachers are like parents. They are our parents in school, while native speakers are mentors, not parents. They really teach us professionally. If they act like parents, you know they tolerate students who can’t follow the lessons.*

*I think they are not professional... They don’t make students understand what they teach. Native English speakers are more*
The way Ganu saw ITEs with regard to the teachers’ role seems to be based on his experience in learning English with ITEs and NESTs. Although Ganu’s experience seems a dominant factor influencing his view, the stereotype of NESTs as superior, more professional teachers is likely to have informed his perceptions.

4.5.2. Findings from group discussions

Findings from interviews have indicated that the students perceived ITEs variously in terms of six aspects: language, culture, pedagogy, L2 learning experience, knowledge and roles. The students saw ITEs as having strengths and weaknesses with regard to these aspects. It is found that the way the students perceived ITEs had been informed by various factors, including the experience of the students in learning English with both NESTs and ITEs, and the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers. NESTs were seen by some students as a yardstick for valuing ITEs.

The group discussions did not generate different themes. Rather, findings from the group discussions indicate that, generally, the students perceived ITEs in terms of two aspects: pedagogy and language.
Table 12. Students’ perceptions of ITEs – findings from group discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Sharing the same mother tongue with students</td>
<td>Having low English proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking accented English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Too focused on the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Giving less practical things, too theoretical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language**

In terms of language aspects, ITEs were perceived by students in group discussions positively as sharing the same mother tongue with students. On the other hand, the teachers were also seen negatively as having low English proficiency.

**Sharing mother tongue with students**

The view that ITEs share the same first language which was outlined by students in interviews was also expressed by students in group discussions. Students in session one reported that they can communicate easily with ITEs and that the teachers can help students when the students face difficulties in their learning:

P3  
*They communicate easily with us because they know our level.*  
*They know where we are. So, we don’t push ourselves to speak English all the time. Sometimes we use Indonesian language.*

P5  
*Yes, I think that helps us when we find difficult words. If we don’t understand, the teacher can explain the words using Indonesian language. We can get clear meanings of the words.*
A similar view was expressed by a student in session two. The student stated that because both ITEs and students come from the same context and share the same mother tongue, they can understand each other:

P7  *Because we are both from Indonesia, we can understand each other easily. Let's say if we have difficulties in speaking, if we want to speak and we don't know how, we can tell the teacher about the problems in Indonesian language, and the teacher will help us.*

A student in session eight asserted that NESTs’ language is too advanced for students. The student reported that he can understand ITEs more as the teachers speak his first language:

P6  *Sometimes we don’t understand native English speakers because their language is too high for us. We can understand local teachers more. They speak our language too.*

A similar view was held by a student in session fourteen. She asserted that students can understand ITEs’ spoken English more easily as the teachers shared the same mother tongue with their students:

P4  *How they speak is much clearer, perhaps because they speak the same language. Sometimes I don’t understand what the native English-speaking teachers say, because they speak fast and so English.*
Students in session fifteen reported that they preferred to be taught by ITEs because the teachers speak two languages. The students asserted that they understand ITEs more than NESTs:

---

**P8**

*Indonesian teachers, we choose them because they use English and Indonesian. At least students know what they teach. If we talk with native English speakers, we sometimes don’t understand.*

*Too fast, I think. We don’t understand.*

---

**Having low English proficiency**

Similar to students in interviews, some students in group discussions perceived ITEs negatively as having low English proficiency. The students’ perceptions are likely to be related to their learning experience. However, it seems that they also are informed by the stereotype of ITEs. As the students did not have high English proficiency, their evaluations of ITEs’ English might not be plausible.

A student in session twelve reported that despite ITEs’ shared first language, the teachers do not have sufficient English language competence, which the student stated as ‘knowledge of English’:

---

**P5**

*If students are not fluent, if they face difficulties in learning English, they can ask in Indonesian. But the teachers don’t have enough vocabularies and knowledge of English*
A similar view was mentioned by a student in session thirteen. She stated that while ITEs know more about local students, they have low English language competence:

P8  

*They know the students more, because we use one language, we are from the same place. But, local teachers sometimes they don’t understand English. Lots of things about English and often they don’t know.*

---

**Speaking accented English**

The view that ITEs speak accented English was also reported by students in group discussions. One student in session three stated that most ITEs’ have accented English which she described as ‘not English yet’. The student also wanted to speak like a native speaker of English:

P1  

*Yes, most of them... their English is accented. It sounds like Indonesian language, not English yet. Actually, we hope that they sound like native English speakers, because in the future we will use English for communication with foreigners.*

---

Similarly, one student in session five also reported that ITEs’ English is accented. According to this student, because the teachers’ language is accented, it is ‘not authentic’. On the other hand, she perceived native speakers' English as ‘real’ and being ‘a good example for students’:
Indonesian teachers are not used to speaking with foreigners, those speaking fluently. I think if students do speak with native speakers, they will get used to... speak better

I do think the same, because their English is not authentic. It's not... because it's accented. It's so different from English spoken by native speakers, which is real, which is a good example for students.

Similar views that ITEs' spoken English is accented and that their English is inauthentic were also reflected by the responses of students in session eight. One student reported that students need NESTs to show them how to speak English. Another student in the group agreed that NESTs’ English is ‘real English’. Furthermore, another student stated that ITEs’ English is accented with a 'heavy Indonesian accent':

You know, Indonesian students’ English is not good. We need Indonesian teachers to teach us. If students’ English gets better, we need native English-speaking teachers to show us how English is spoken. So we understand how they speak English.

Yes, because their English is real English, while Indonesian teachers’ English is...

Their English is accented... heavy Indonesian accent

Similarly, a student in session 13 mentioned that while native speakers speak English fluently, ITEs speak with heavy accents:
They speak with heavy accent... their English is accented. Native speakers speak much more fluently.

A similar view was mentioned by a student in session sixteen. The student stated that ITEs 'speak differently'. He thought that the way ITEs pronounce words was different from NESTs:

They sometimes speak differently... pronounce words differently from native English-speaking teachers.

Pedagogy

Besides the language aspect, ITEs were also perceived negatively by students in group discussions in terms of pedagogy. The students saw ITEs as being too focused on the local curriculum and too theoretical in teaching.

Too focused on the curriculum, to books

With regard to their pedagogy, ITEs were seen as textbook-bound by a student in session four of the group discussions. The student had the view that, because of the way the teachers teach students, ITEs are ‘boring’:

But, they are boring. Teaching just like that... just open their books and give us assignments. We learn just because we need the score.
Focus on theories

That ITEs focuses on theories in their teaching was also expressed by some students in group discussions. In session ten some students suggested that the teachers should give more practices to students:

---

P2
They way they teach... unconsciously, they ask us to focus on theories, and our learning is limited to that.

P5
They should teach and do more practical things. We need practical English more than just theories.

P4
There should be more practices than theories.

---

A similar view was expressed by students in session eleven. One of the students stated that ITEs focus on theories in their teaching. The other student mentioned that students need both theories and practices:

---

P4
Most Indonesian teachers are too focused on theories, than practices. We know we have to know the theories.

P8
Yes, they'd better do both, theories and practices. How to use English in real life... how to apply the theories, how to interact with other people... that's still rare.
4.6. Chapter conclusions

This chapter has presented and discussed findings from interviews and group discussions with student participants, covering five themes: how the students perceived English (4.1), how they conceptualized an ideal English teacher (4.2), how they understood ‘native English speaker’ (4.3), how they perceived NESTs (4.4) and the way the students saw ITEs (4.5).

Based on the findings, it has been argued in the chapter that the students’ views of English are influenced by various factors, including the ‘myth’ of English as an international language, their awareness of the status and functions of English in the local community, the pervasiveness of English in the media (particularly in the context of the research), the power of English-speaking countries and the way English is often associated with globalization. Consequently, the students perceived English as an important language to learn, not merely because it is a school subject, but also because they had various views of English, including English as an international language, English as providing job opportunities, English as social status, English as access to knowledge and English as closely related to globalization.

Next, this chapter has demonstrated that the students had various multifaceted concepts of an ideal English teacher. They characterized the teacher in terms of personal quality, pedagogical quality, language, race/native English speaker and experience. While personal and pedagogical qualities are dominant in the students’ conceptualizations, the findings also show that the native speaker fallacy is present among the students and that there is a racial dimension to the students’ concepts. Some students conceptualized ideal English teachers as ‘white’ Caucasians, whom they recognized as native English speakers. Other students assumed that because the teachers looked Caucasian, they have good English language competence and therefore can teach the language well.
The chapter has also indicated that there were misconceptions among the students with regard to the term ‘native English speaker’ which are related to three aspects: geographical context, language and racial aspects. In terms of geographical context, a ‘native English speaker’ was defined by some students as individuals from abroad regardless of the speakers’ first language. With regard to language aspect, one student saw a particular accent as an important part of English language nativeness. In relation to racial aspect, some students defined a ‘native English speaker’ as an individual with a ‘white’ complexion.

With regard to the way the students perceived NESTs, the study has shown that the students’ perceptions are complex and multifaceted, but overall depicting a positive image of NESTs. Their perceptions have been shaped by their direct experience of interacting with NESTs and informed by the rigid stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers. Furthermore, as the chapter has demonstrated, the disparate images of English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries contribute to the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers. The rigid stereotype of NESTs is related to the disparity of power between English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries.

Last, the students had various perceptions of ITEs, reflecting a heterogeneous image of ITEs as English teachers who have strengths and weaknesses. It was found that the way the students saw ITEs has been informed by various factors, including the students’ experiences in learning English with both NESTs and ITEs, and the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers. In their perceptions of ITEs, the students saw NESTs as a good standard against which to assess ITEs. It is obvious that the students’ perceptions of ITEs have also been informed by the disparity of power between English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries.
Chapter 5
Parents’ Perceptions

This chapter presents and discusses empirical findings from interviews with six pairs of parents of the third-year students involved in the study. As described in section 3.5.2., the parents’ education backgrounds were diverse. Generally, they did not have high English language proficiency. The chapter consists of five themes: how the parents perceived English (5.1), how they conceptualized an ideal English teacher (5.2), how the parents understood the term ‘native English teacher’ (5.3), how they perceived NESTs (5.4), and the way the parents perceived ITEs (5.5).

5.1. Parents’ perceptions of English

Empirical findings from interviews with the twelve parents indicate that generally the way they perceived English is similar to the way the student participants saw the language (see 4.1). The parents perceived English as an important language for their children not merely because it is a compulsory subject in the school system. Rather, they had various views about English. While there are five views identified in interviews and group discussions with the students, in interviews with the parents four views were identified: English as a language that provides study or job opportunities, English as a language that denotes high social status in the local community, English as an international language, and English as access to knowledge (Table 13. Parents’ views of English).
**Table 13. Parents’ views of English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English as providing further study or job opportunities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as social status</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as an international language</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as access to knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**English as providing further study or job opportunities**

Unlike empirical findings from interviews with the student participants which indicate that the most dominant motive underlying the students’ view of English as an important language to learn is English as an international language (see 4.1), empirical findings from interviews with the parents indicate that the most dominant motive underlying the parents’ view of English as an important language for their children to learn is English as a language which provides study or job opportunities. Such a view was reported by Mrs. Aryodamar, Mr. Darman, Mr. Rahmat and Mr. Hardi:

Mrs. Aryodamar  
*My daughter wishes to study abroad, to study in other countries just like her aunty. Her aunty is studying international relation. English is the way.*

Mr. Darman  
*I also think that if my child wants to study abroad in western countries, he must be able to use English. I think as parents we need to learn English. At least we can teach our children, if we can use it.*
Mr. Rahmat

They can work overseas because they can communicate easily. English is the door for that... for getting a good job, getting good salary.

Mr. Hardi

So, my child must speak English. I think English will also help him to get a good job. It’s my experience.

I mean, my child has to learn English and speak it, so that he can get a good job easily. If you speak English, you will be paid in dollar. If you speak Bahasa Indonesia, you will be paid in rupiah.

The views of the four parents are similar to the views of six students in section 4.1.1. The parents saw English as an important language for their children to learn because they thought English could give their children study or job opportunities. Such views indicate that for the parents, English is language capital which can be converted into economic and social capital (Bourdieu, 1986). Therefore, in their view, English learning is a form of ‘investment’ with an expectation to get economic and social returns (Norton Pierce, 1995; Norton, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2006a, 2006b, 2010, 2013).

In relation to the ‘delusionary’ effects of English, the parents’ responses indicate that they are aware of the status and functions of English in Indonesia, and also the benefits which students can get by learning the language. As described in the literature review, in Indonesia, English is commonly used by employers as a factor that determines job positions (Lie, 2007). The way the parents perceived English as providing study or job opportunities seems to be based on their personal experience or the experience of individuals close to them. For example, Mrs. Aryodamar reported that her child wanted to learn English ‘just like her aunty’ and Mr. Hardi mentioned that his view is based on personal experience. Such findings suggest that the parents’ views of the language do not seem to be ‘delusional’.
English as social status

The second view identified in interviews with the parents is English as a language that symbolizes high status in the local community. Three parents perceived English as denoting 'high', 'educated' and 'modern' social status. Such a view was expressed by Mrs. Aryodamar, Mrs. Hardi and Mrs. Darman:

Mrs. Aryodamar

*My daughter thinks it's cool to speak English, to communicate like her aunty. When I was in Surabaya, her aunty often took her to LIA. That's an English course. I experienced that... I met some students and I thought they are really good in speaking. I wonder if my daughter can speak like them. They look different... educated. You know, I can speak Javanese, Madurese, Balinese... but English, it's difficult for me. I can't teach my daughter, but I wish she can speak like those people, speaking English so fluently.*

Mrs. Hardi

*It's also an image... of course people will see it differently. It's so different when you speak English. I mean... let me ask you. What do people in your place... let's say in district, say when they know you can speak English? They will respect you. That's what I want for my son.*

Mrs. Darman

*More than that, English is a sign... it's the sign that we have learned something modern, advanced... It's like having a different hat... showing who we are.*

The views of the three parents that English represents high social status are similar to the views of five students in section 4.1. In the views of the parents, English has a function as a social marker which denotes the social status of English users in their social contexts. The parents perceived English as linguistic capital which they thought can be converted into social
capital in the form of social status (Bourdieu, 1986). Furthermore, because English was seen by the parents as representing social status, it is also perceived as closely related to the identity of its users. The parents thought that English has symbolic profit which can put their children in better positions in their social contexts. In the views of the parents not only is English learning an investment in terms of economic aspect, it is also an investment with regard to their children’s identity (Norton, 2001). The way the parents perceived English also indicates that there is a process of social imagination. They expanded the identity of their children by imagining; the parents created imagined identity of the children as English users who have high social status in the society (Norton, 1997, 2000, 2013).

Similar to the students’ views (see 4.1.1), the views of the parents could be attributed to two factors. First, English is perceived as being able to provide job opportunities, as shown by the previous section. Because of such a view, the language is also perceived as reflecting social status. Second, the parents’ views imply the way English is socially constructed in the local community. English is often associated with high social or ‘modern’ lifestyle (Murray & Christison, 2011); it is often seen as a gatekeeper to high social status (Pennycook, 1994). As described in the literature review, English in Indonesia has been shaped by global culture spreading through the media; English is a language indicating the urban lifestyle of its users (Lie, 2007). The way the parents perceived English is likely to have been influenced by such factors.

**English as an international language**

While English as an international language is the most dominant motive underlying the students’ view of English as an important language, in interviews with the parents the motive was only reported by three parents: Mrs. Aryodamar, Mr. Zainal and Mr. Rahmat.
Similar to ten students in section 4.1, the parents had various understandings of English as an international language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Aryodamar</td>
<td>Because <em>English is an international language</em>, that’s what we know. My child has to speak it... must be able to use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Zainal</td>
<td><em>It’s the biggest international language. It’s used everywhere. If we go to any places... everywhere, we can use English. Who knows, maybe my kid got lost... somewhere in another country. He meets people who don’t speak our language, maybe the people can speak English. It’s an international language. That’s why he must be able to use it... so not only using gestures, if he doesn’t understand. Let’s say... if we got lost in Australia, if we can’t speak English... that’s bad.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rahmat</td>
<td><em>It’s an international language. If my children can speak English fluently, they can communicate with people from many different backgrounds... from different countries.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The way Mr. Zainal and Mr. Rahmat described ‘English as an international language’ reflects the notion of English as a *lingua franca* (Widdowson, 1998; Sarifian, 2009). In the views of the two parents, English is a language of intercultural communication which enables individuals to ‘go to any places’ – as outlined by Mr. Zainal – or to ‘communicate with people from many different backgrounds’ – as asserted by Mr. Rahmat (Sarifian, 2009). On the other hand, the way Mrs. Aryodamar perceived English seems to indicate that the ‘myth’ of English as an international language is not only present among the students (see 4.1), but also among the parents. Although Mrs. Aryodamar viewed ‘English as an international language’, she did not express her understanding of the term. Her understanding might reflect the notion of
English as a *lingua franca*, similar to the understandings of Mr. Zainal and Mr. Rahmat, or might have been influenced by the 'myth' of English as an international language. In the latter case, 'English as an international language' is a taken-for-grated term deriving from the way English is commonly addressed in the local community.

**English as access to knowledge**

The view that English provides access to knowledge which was mentioned by four students in section 4.1 was reported by one parent. Mr. Samadi thought that English is an important language for students because he perceived it as giving access to better learning materials. He thought that books written in English contain better content than those written in Indonesian language:

---

**Mr. Samadi**

*I know that English is very important... not because people said so, but because I experienced it myself. With English we can read many books which I would say relatively better in terms of quality... I mean content. Whatever the content, as long as it's in English, it's better than in Indonesian. I learned economics. I think I can understand things better... I mean in economics, by reading literature in other languages, especially English. Although my English is not really good... So, from my experience... it's very important for my children. That's the reason... to get better knowledge through English. It's better... the quality, I mean like the explanations, the contents, not too much, but the knowledge is better. It's more varied. So, English is important... even for me it's important, moreover for my children.*

---
Similar to the views of two students in section 4.1, Mr. Samadi’s view of English implies that he saw knowledge from English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries unequally; he perceived English as indicating ‘better’ knowledge. Such a view could be attributed to the image of English-speaking countries, particularly the US and the UK. As discussed in the literature review, the sociocultural, economic and political power of the US and UK has influenced Indonesia in general and Indonesians in particular (Vicker, 2005; Lauder, 2008; Paauw, 2009). Mr. Samadi’s view could be regarded as one of the results of how the sociocultural, economic and political power of English-speaking countries has influenced the way English is perceived by individuals in non-English-speaking countries. The way Mr. Samadi saw English suggests that English is located within complex sociocultural, economic, and political discourses (Pennycook, 1994; Graddol, 2006).
5.2. Parents’ concepts of an ideal English teacher

This subchapter presents and discusses the way the twelve parents conceptualized an ideal English teacher. Empirical findings from interviews indicate that, similar to students in section 4.2, the parents had various multifaceted concepts of an ideal English teacher. While the native speaker fallacy is present among the students, it does not seem to be visible among the parents involved in the study. None of the parents mentioned that ideal English teachers are native speakers of English. An ideal English teacher was characterized by the parents in terms of three aspects: personal quality, pedagogical quality and language (Table 14. Parents’ concepts of an ideal English teacher). Generally, the parents’ concepts of an ideal English teacher are different from those of the students. This does not seem to be an implication of the computer-based image elicitation technique used in the study, as similar themes/categories were identified from interviews with students which employed the technique and group discussions in which the technique was not used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal quality</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivating students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical quality</td>
<td>Able to teach students well/effectively and interestingly</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Have good English competence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal quality

Consistent with findings from interviews with the students, empirical findings from interviews with the parents indicate that personal quality is a dominant aspect in the parents’ various conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher. Five parents characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s personal qualities. Generally, the teacher was described by the parents as having such personal characteristics as patient, friendly, caring, disciplined and motivating students. Furthermore, the way the parents conceptualized an ideal English teacher had also been influenced by the Javanese philosophy of ‘guru’ – a teacher as someone who should be ‘digugu lan ditiru’ – someone who should be obeyed and imitated. Such a culturally specific value was not visible in the students’ conceptualizations of the teacher. The conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s personal characteristics were mentioned by Mrs. Aryodamar, Mr. Rahmat, Mr. Samadi, Mrs. Hardi and Mrs. Darman:

Mrs. Aryodamar  
The teacher can understand students, patient... The teacher can motivate, keep motivating the children.

The teacher can share... talk about the future. That kind of teacher can open children’s eyes... open their eyes to see the world. The teacher must be able to motivate students.
Mr. Rahmat  
*Ideal teachers care about students. They are patient and understand the students. They know students who are good... those who need more attention.*

*Teachers that understand students’ characters... both in and outside the class. At school they become children of the teachers. It’s more than teacher-student... it’s like parents.*

Mr. Samadi  
*One, the personality... an ideal English teacher must have good personality.*

*Based on my experience... my point of view, an ideal English teacher... personal, she is disciplined. She has a good image... for the students. She can be an example, not only for learning the language but also an example for life... for good personality.*

Mrs. Hardi  
*One more thing... for me a good English teacher can be a friend. It’s someone with good personality, who is friendly... nice to students and can be a good model. I think teachers can influence students... I mean they become models. Teachers must have good personality... must be nice, friendly, and patient.*

Mrs. Darman  
*Most importantly, what the teacher does... he must be a good model for students. Because teachers... not only do they teach, they also become models... role models for students’ behaviors.*

*For me, guru... digugu lan ditiru*

Generally, the way the five parents characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s personal quality is similar to how students in subchapter 4.2 described the teacher. An ideal English teacher was conceptualized by the parents as a teacher who has such personal characteristics as patience, friendliness, care, discipline and the ability to motivate students. Such conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher in terms of the
teacher’s personal quality could be related to the parents’ expectation of personal characteristics which the teacher should have, their learning experience and views of local students.

The parents’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher highlight the findings of previous studies (Mullock, 2003; Arnon & Rachel, 2007; Barnes & Locked, 2013; Mahmoud & Thabet, 2013); the characteristics mentioned by the parents are similar to personal characteristics of the teacher identified in the previous studies. In Mullock’s (2003) study, a good teacher was described by the participants as someone who knows and understands students. Similarly, in this study such a view was mentioned by Mrs. Aryodamar who described an ideal English teacher as a teacher who ‘can understand students’ and by Mr. Rahmat who characterized the teacher as someone ‘that understand[s] students’ characters... both in and outside the class’. The other personal characteristics mentioned by the parents such as being patient, friendly, nice, disciplined, caring and motivating are generally similar to characteristics of the teacher identified by participants in studies conducted by Arnon and Rachel (2007), Barnes and Locked (2013), and Mahmoud and Thabet (2013).

While, in general, the parents’ and the students’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s personal quality are similar, there is one aspect which was not mentioned by the students, but was present among the parents. An ideal English teacher was described by one parent as a teacher who plays an important role in students’ learning, not only teaching, but also as a role model for students. An ideal English teacher was characterized by the parent as ‘guru’ – a teacher who should be ‘digugu lan ditiru’ – be obeyed and imitated. Such a notion shows that the way the parent conceptualized an ideal English teacher had been influenced by the culturally-specific philosophy of guru.
**Pedagogical quality**

Similar to the student participants’ concepts of an ideal English teacher, pedagogical quality is also dominant in the parents’ conceptualizations of the teacher. Five parents characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s pedagogical quality. The teacher was described by the five parents as having an ability to teach students well and to deliver materials to students interestingly. Such a description was expressed by Mr. Zainal, Mr. Samadi, Mrs. Hardi, Mrs. Darman and Mr. Rahmat:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Zainal</td>
<td>I know it’s really hard to talk about an ideal teacher. We often think that ideal teachers are those people who speak English fluently... but I think that’s not the only thing. It’s hard to teach... teaching is not easy. So, the criteria must be balanced. The teacher must be smart, but not smart for himself. <strong>He must be able to teach. He can deliver materials to students.</strong> One is smart... second, he can make students smart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Samadi</td>
<td>The way the teacher teaches. I graduated from a teacher training institution, so I know what it needs to be a good teacher. <strong>She must be able to teach... to make students understand. The way she teaches must be very clear... must be able to give examples to students.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Hardi</td>
<td>More importantly, <strong>he can teach well. The teacher must be able to explain English materials to students... because many students still think that English is a difficult thing to learn, that’s why.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Darman</td>
<td>More importantly, <strong>he can explain clearly. English is not our language. That’s why the teacher must be able to explain it clearly.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Mr. Rahmat  

*Even English teachers from overseas, if they cannot explain, cannot teach, they are not ideal. They must be able to teach interestingly. So that students enjoy learning English. Although the teachers are from Indonesia, but if they can explain well, they are ideal teachers, I think.*

Generally, the parents’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s pedagogical characteristics are similar to the students’ conceptualizations (see 4.2). An ideal English teacher was described by the parents as someone who has the ability to teach students effectively and interestingly. The way the parents characterized the teacher in terms of the pedagogical quality aspect is likely to be based on their views of good learning processes which students should experience, their views of local students, their expectations of the teacher’s pedagogical competence and their past learning experiences.

The descriptions expressed by the parents are consistent with Harmer’s (2008) description of a good English teacher. Harmer describes that the teacher can teach well and interestingly in the class. Furthermore, the pedagogical characteristics which the parents reported are similar to characteristics of the teacher identified by previous studies (Brosh, 1996; Mullock, 2003; Park & Lee, 2006; Kadha, 2009). In Brosh’s (1996) study, the teacher was characterized as having the ability to explain teaching materials. Participants in Mullock’s (2003) research described an ideal English teacher as being skilled in teaching techniques. While students in Park and Lee’s (2006) study considered pedagogical knowledge as the most important aspect, students and teachers in Kadha’s (2009) considered the following aspects as the most important criteria of a good English as a foreign language teacher: preparation and presentation of materials, lesson planning, making class interesting, stating the objectives of learning, motivating students, and analysing students’ needs. Overall, the empirical findings
suggest that, along with personal quality, pedagogical quality is an important perceived aspect of an ideal English teacher.

**Language competence**

Four parents described an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s English language competence. The parents reported that the teacher must have good English language proficiency. Such a conceptualization was expressed by Mrs. Darman, Mrs. Hardi, Mrs. Aryodamar and Mr. Samadi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Darman</td>
<td><em>His English must also be good. Because the teacher teaches English, his language must be good... must have good English.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Hardi</td>
<td><em>A good English teacher has good language, good English...</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Aryodamar</td>
<td><em>He must talk in English, always in English... because he’s teaching English, isn’t he? If he doesn’t teach English, I’m fine if he’s talking in Javanese. He’s being an example for students.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mr. Samadi      | *I think English teachers must be different from other teachers... maybe because of English, because of the language she speaks.*  

You know, like speaking... conversation, not only writing. *She must have good English.*

The way the three parents saw good English language competence as one of important characteristics of an ideal English teacher is similar to the views of students in subchapter 4.2. The parents’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher in terms of the
teacher's English language competence seem to be related to their past learning experiences and expectations of the teacher's English language competence.

Generally, the parents' views are consistent with Brown's (2014) and Harmer's (2008) notion that a good language teacher should possess good knowledge of the target language. Furthermore, their views also confirm the findings of previous research, suggesting that being competent in English language is an important perceived characteristic of an ideal English teacher (Brosh, 1996; Mullock, 2003; Park & Lee, 2006; Arnon & Rachel, 2007; Kadha, 2009; Wichadee, 2010; Chang, 2012).
5.3. Parents’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’

As described in the introductory chapter, this study also explores the way parents understand the term ‘native English speaker’. Empirical findings from interviews with the parents indicate that they had various understandings of the term. ‘Native English speaker’ was defined by the parents with regard to three aspects: language, geographical context and race (Table 15. Parents’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’). Similar to students’ understandings of the term, the parents’ understandings are problematic as they hold particular misconceptions. First, a native English speaker was defined by two parents as an individual from abroad regardless of what language the individual speaks and how the individual acquires the language. Second, one parent associated English language nativeness with race.

Table 15. Parents’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Understandings</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Speaking English as a mother tongue</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical context</td>
<td>Those from abroad</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White Caucasians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Language – speaking English as mother tongue*

A native English speaker was defined by three parents as an individual who uses or speaks English as a mother tongue. Such a definition was reflected by the responses of Mr. Samadi, Mr. Zainal and Mr. Rahmat:
Native speakers are real users of a language. They use the language as a daily language. They speak it in their offices, in their homes... when they interact. The language is their mother tongue. It's like Indonesian language for Indonesians. Let's say native English speaker is from England. He must speak English... that's a native English speaker.

People... from their language... who speak their language. They are people who have... who speak their mother tongue.

They are speakers of their own language. Just like me speaking Javanese, because I was born here. Native English speakers are people born in English-speaking countries, who have been using English since they were children.

In terms of language aspect, the parents' understandings are different from the understandings of the student participants. Native English speakers were defined by students as individuals who have good English language competence, good speaking in general and pronunciation in particular, and have an accent which they thought to be ‘real’ (see 4.3.1). On the other hand, the three parents stated that a native English speaker is an individual using English as a first language.

Fundamentally, the three parents’ understandings of the term ‘native English teacher’ align with the definitions of a native speaker proposed by Edge (1988), Rampton (1990), Crystal (2003) and Davies (2003). A native speaker is generally described as someone who speaks his or her first language which he or she has acquired in a natural social setting from childhood (Edge, 1988; Rampton, 1990; Crystal, 2003; Davies, 2003). Furthermore, the way Mr. Samadi and Mr. Rahmat associated nativeness with the social setting in which speakers of
a language are born reflects Rampton’s (1990) and Nayar’s (1994) notion that nativeness can be related to a social group stereotypically associated with a particular language.

**Geographical context - those from abroad**

Empirical findings of the study indicate that there is a misconception among the parents with regard to the way they defined ‘native English speaker’ in terms of the speaker’s geographical origin. Two parents defined a native English speaker as an individual from other countries regardless of what language the individual speaks and how the individual acquires the language:

| Mrs. Hardi | *A native speaker of English is someone from overseas... from other countries. He can be from America, from Australia, or from the Netherlands.* |
| Mr. Darman | *From everywhere overseas, as long as they give something to students. Ok... this is from Germany teaching English... or someone from England teaching English. As long as he gives knowledge to students... gives vocabularies.* |

Such understandings of Mrs. Hardi and Mr. Darman are similar to the understandings of student participants in section 4.3.1; the students defined a native English speaker merely as an individual from abroad regardless of the language the individual speaks. While language nativeness can be related to social contexts (Davies, 2003), the way Mrs. Hardi and Mr. Darman understood the term ‘native English speaker’ is problematic. They mistakenly recognized any individuals from abroad as native English speakers although the individuals are not native speakers of English.
**Race – they are white**

Another misconception about the term ‘native English speaker’ found among the parents is related to race. One parent defined native English speakers as white individuals from English-speaking countries. This conceptualization was expressed by Mr. Aryodamar:

Mr. Aryodamar said, "Native English speakers... they are white, speaking English... from English-speaking countries. Yes, I think native speakers are blue coming from other countries."

Such a view of Mr. Aryodamar indicates that the misconception about native English speakers which is related to race aspect is not only visible among the students, but also among the parents. Similar to the views of four students in section 4.3.1 who defined native speakers of English as individuals having a ‘white’ complexion, Mr. Aryodamar’s view is problematic as he assumed that there is relationship between individuals’ race/physical features and English language nativeness. This finding confirms the view that English language nativeness is often associated with race, although the concept of race is intricate (Curtis & Romney, 2006; Kubota & Lin, 2006; Shuck, 2006; Romney, 2010). It also highlights the notion that English language nativeness is a problematic concept as it is often valued based on individuals’ whiteness (Kubota & Lin, 2006; Aboshiha, 2013; Holliday, 2008).
5.4. Parents’ perceptions of NESTs

Section 4.4 has shown that the way students perceived NESTs is complex and multifaceted. The students had various perceptions of the teachers which had been informed by their experience in being taught by NESTs and also informed by the stereotype of NESTs as good English teachers.

Empirical findings from interviews with parents indicate that the parents had various perceptions of NESTs. The teachers were valued by the parents in terms of three aspects: language, pedagogy and physical/racial aspects (Table 16. Parents’ perceptions of NESTs).

The parents’ perceptions of NESTs are similar to the students’ perceptions in that they depict a positive image of the teachers. None of the parents saw NESTs as having disadvantages. NESTs were seen by the parents as having advantages with regard to the three aspects. As the parents involved in the study did not have experiences in being taught by NESTs and that they did not have high English language proficiency, it can be argued that such perceptions of the parents are based on their assumptions about the teachers, which are likely to have been informed by the stereotype of NESTs as good English teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Good English</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good speaking, correct pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Teaching practical English Focus on practices</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Racial</td>
<td>Physically attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Parents’ perceptions of NESTs
Language

Language is the most dominant aspect in the parents’ perceptions of NESTs, similar to the students’ perceptions. Five parents perceived the teachers positively in terms of their language. NESTs were seen by two of the five parents as having good English. Furthermore, the teachers were perceived as having good speaking and pronunciation by three parents.

Having good English competence

NESTs were perceived as having good English language competence by Mr. Zainal and Mr. Hardi:

| Mr. Zainal | I see that they have different strengths. Native English-speaking teachers have good English, because they use it every day. That also motivates students to learn... they have better language. |
| Mr. Hardi | Native English-speaking teachers have good English, I think. They have used English since they were children... and grew up in their countries, in which English is used every day. |

The two parents’ view that NESTs have good English competence is similar to the view of two students in 4.1.1. Such a view was also expressed by students in group discussions. While the students had direct experience of being taught by NESTs, the parents had never been taught by the teachers. Therefore, such a perception is likely to be based on the parents’ assumption about the teachers’ language, which could have been shaped by the stereotypes of NESTs. Similar to the students’ views, the two parents’ perceptions are consistent with the views of participants in Mahboob’s (2004), Benke and Medgyes’ (2005),
Chun’s (2014), and Walkinshaw and Oanh’s (2014) studies. In such research, generally, NESTs were seen as having good English language competence by the participants.

**Good speaking, correct pronunciation**

While Mr. Zainal and Mr. Hardi had general perceptions of NESTs in terms of the teachers’ language, three parents were more specific in valuing the teachers’ English. Mrs. Aryodamar, Mrs. Samadi and Mrs. Darman perceived NESTs as having good speaking and pronunciation:

---

**Mrs. Aryodamar**

*We had two choices... We tried to find information about the two institutions. I have seen the two and compared them... this, we have the money. So, we can choose what we want. We chose that institution because there were native English speakers there. I think native speakers can make students become more confident... I understand that native English speakers are better in speaking. They speak fluently... it’s English that they use everyday as a daily language.*

**Mrs. Samadi**

*Native English-speaking teachers use their language directly... just like they use it every day in their countries. They know how to pronounce words correctly... the intonation.*

**Mrs. Darman**

*Native English speakers can give correct examples. For example, pronouncing English words... they can say the words accurately. They give examples how to speak, how to read. It’s like reading Koran, like pronouncing letter ‘r’... we pronounce it differently. They have better speaking.*

---
Such views of the three parents are similar to the views of two students in section 4.4.1 who asserted that NESTs have good speaking competence. The views are also consistent with the perceptions of participants in studies conducted by Mahboob (2004), Benke and Medgyes (2005), Sung (2014), and Walkinshaw and Oanh (2014). Generally, in such studies NESTs were seen as having good speaking and, particularly, pronunciation. While the perceptions of participants in such research might be related to their learning experience with NESTs, the three parents’ perceptions of NESTs in this study seem to be based on their assumptions about the teachers’ language; this is indicated by the fact that the parents had never been taught by NESTs. It is likely that the stereotype of NESTs had informed the way the parents perceived the teachers.

**Pedagogy**

The second aspect in terms of which the parents valued NESTs is pedagogy. Three parents perceived the teachers positively in terms of the way they teach students. NESTs were perceived as being practical in teaching by the three parents.

**Practical in teaching**

In terms of pedagogical aspect, NESTs were perceived by Mr. Zainal, Mr. Hardi and Mr. Rahmat as being practical in teaching:

---

Mr. Zainal  
*Two of them... local teachers are for grammar and native English-speaking teachers for real practices. Because they use English every day, they know how to use it. They can show students how to use English. They teach that... teach how to use the language.*
Mr. Hardi: *Not theoretical... the way they teach, because they share how the language is used... how they use English, not teaching the language. I mean they teach, but the way is more practical. It's how to use English in real contexts.*

Mr. Rahmat: *The way they teach is different. They teach practical English... more practice, not grammar. Native English-speaking teachers give real examples... how the language is used. I think the words are different, the sentences are different. The way native English-speaking teachers teach students is also different. They teach things that they know... that are used in reality.*

Interestingly, while the parents did not have experience of being taught by NESTs, they had views which are similar to the views of student participants in the study who had experience of being taught by NESTs. Similar to two students in section 4.4.1 and some students in section 4.4.2, the parents saw NESTs as being practical in teaching, focusing on practices for students. As the parents had never been taught by NESTs, such a view could derive from interactions with their children.

With regard to previous studies, the views of the three parents are similar to the views of participants in Law's (1999) and Ma's (2012) research. In these two studies, NESTs were seen as being practical in teaching. However, Mahboob's (2004) research reveals different findings. It shows that, in terms of pedagogy, NESTs were perceived as lacking teaching methods. Such different views could be related to different experiences which participants of the studies had with NESTs.
Racial

The third aspect identified from interviews with the parents is the racial aspect. One parent valued NESTs based on the teachers' physical/racial appearance. The teachers were perceived as being physically attractive.

Physically attractive

One parent, Mrs. Aryodamar, valued NESTs in terms of their physical/racial appearance. She perceived the teachers as ‘handsome’ and ‘beautiful’. Therefore, as she further reported, students are more interested in being taught by NESTs:

Mrs. Aryodamar  I think students are more interested in being taught by native English-speaking teachers. I think because they are handsome... beautiful.

While Mrs. Aryodamar did not explicitly describe the physical or racial features of NESTs, her view seems to derive from a misconception that NESTs have white complexions. Findings in subchapter 5.3 show that there is a misconception about the definition of a ‘native English speaker’ expressed by Mr. Aryodamar; a native English speaker was defined by Mr. Aryodamar as an individual who has a white complexion and coming from an English-speaking country. The perception of Mrs. Aryodamar of NESTs is likely to be related to Mr. Aryodamar’s understanding of ‘native English speaker’.

The view that NESTs are physically attractive was mentioned by two students in interviews and also some students in group discussions. Similar to the students’ views, the view of the parent reflects the notion of NESTs as ‘exotic other[s]’ (Kramsch, 2013, p. 58).
Such a view seems to be related to the stereotype of NESTs in terms of their racial characteristics. As Amin (2004) demonstrates, NESTs are often stereotyped as having particular racial characteristics such as a white complexion. The way Mrs. Aryodamar perceived NESTs suggests that such a stereotype is visible among the parents in this research.
5.5. Parents’ perceptions of ITEs

Empirical findings from interviews with parents indicate that they perceived ITEs variously. The teachers were valued by the parents in terms of three aspects: language, pedagogy and culture (Table 17. Parents’ perceptions of ITEs). While generally the parents perceived NESTs positively as having strengths in terms of language, pedagogy and racial aspects (see 5.4), they saw ITEs as having more weaknesses than strengths with regard to language, pedagogy and culture aspects. Different from parents’ perceptions of NESTs which depict a positive image of NESTs, the parents’ various perceptions of ITEs reflect a negative image of these teachers. As table 17 indicates, the parents had more negative perceptions of ITEs.

The findings of the study indicate that the way the parents perceived ITEs seems to have been influenced by various factors, such as the parents’ past experience in learning English from ITEs, their awareness of characteristics which ITEs have, the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers, and the belief that learning English-related cultures is an important part of English learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Positive Perceptions</th>
<th>Negative Perceptions</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Sharing mother tongue</td>
<td>Having low English language competence</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking accented English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Focusing on grammar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Sharing local culture</td>
<td>Not knowing English-related culture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language

Similar to students’ and parents’ perceptions of NESTs, language is the most dominant aspect in the parents’ perceptions of ITEs. In terms of the aspect, ITEs were seen positively as sharing mother tongue with students and negatively as having low English language competence and speaking ‘accented English’.

Sharing a mother tongue with students

ITEs were perceived positively by Mr. Zainal and Mr. Samadi as sharing a mother tongue with students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Zainal</th>
<th>They can speak Indonesian language... that can help students learn English. I think that is one of their advantages as Indonesians.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Samadi</td>
<td>It is difficult for me to choose... but I think both teachers have different strengths and weaknesses. Local teachers can speak two languages because they are local... because they are Indonesians. They can explain English using Indonesian language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The view of Mr. Zainal and Mr. Samadi is similar to the view of six student participants in interviews (see 4.5.1) and some students in group discussions (see 4.5.2); they saw ITEs positively as sharing a first language with students. Such a view of the two parents is likely to be related to their awareness of characteristics which ITEs have and their past learning experiences.
Similar to the students’ view, generally the perceptions of the two parents are consistent with the views of participants of some previous studies, such as the research of Benke and Medgyes (2005), Moussu and Braine (2006), Ling and Braine (2007), Chun (2014), and Walkinshaw and Oanh (2014). Such studies show that NNESTs were perceived by student participants as sharing a mother tongue with students. Benke and Medgyes’s (2005) research show that their student participants saw NNESTs as having the ability to supply the equivalent of the target language in the students’ mother tongue. On the other hand, students in Ling and Braine’s (2007), Chun’s (2014), and Walkinshaw and Oanh’s (2014) studies perceived NNESTs positively as having the ability to use a shared first language in their teaching.

**Having low English language competence**

While ITEs were perceived positively by two parents as sharing the same mother tongue with students, the teachers were perceived negatively by four parents as having low English language competence:

---

**Mrs. Aryodamar**

*They are good, but their language... teachers here, they were not born in English-speaking countries. They learned English in Indonesia. Although some of them have studied overseas, they should make their English better, I think. I mean like native English speakers. So, students can be more motivated when learning from them. Oh my teachers, they are like native English speakers.*

---

**Mr. Zainal**

*In terms of language... from my view, they do not really know English. Their English is not as good as native English speakers.*
Maybe, that’s why native English-speaking teachers were hired by the school... to help students and the teachers.

That does not motivate students. They do not have to know all, but definitely need to add more.

Mr. Samadi

Yes, language competence. Teachers need to learn more... they need to learn more about English.

Because their English is not enough... they need to be fluent. So that they can teach students all about English... not just Indonesian English.

Mr. Rahmat

I can’t choose... teachers have their own characters and strengths. English teachers just need to upgrade their English... just need to learn more. That’s all.

The view of the four parents that ITEs have low English language competence is similar to the perceptions of seven students in interviews (see 4.5.1) and students in group discussions (see 4.5.2). The parents’ past learning experience could be regarded as a factor contributing to their perceptions of ITEs. However, as the empirical findings indicate, the four parents’ perceptions of ITEs in terms of language seem to have been informed by the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers; NESTs were used as a good standard or yardstick by which to value ITEs. Such perceptions of the parents are problematic as they are likely to be based on the parents’ assumptions about NESTs’ English language competence. This is indicated by the fact that, while the parents had experiences of being taught by ITEs, they did not have experience of being taught by NESTs. The way the four parents perceived ITEs suggests that ‘native speakerism’ is also present among the parents (Holliday, 2006).
In relation to previous studies, the parents’ view of ITEs is similar to the perceptions of student participants in Benke and Medgyes’ (2005) and Ling and Braine’s (2007) research. Student participants in research conducted by Benke and Medgyes saw NNESTs as having low English competence. Similarly, in Ling and Braine’s study NNESTs were perceived as having limited use of English.

**Speaking accented English**

In terms of language aspects, ITEs were also seen negatively by four parents as speaking accented English:

---

**Mr. Zainal**

*That is why... Native English-speaking teachers must guide them, because they need to learn the accent. They cannot lie... I mean that they are from Indonesia. Every island has different accents... many accents. That is why. There are Javanese English, with Javanese accent... Sumatra English, Madurese English.*

---

**Mr. Samadi**

*... although their English is their weakness. When they speak, they are different from native English-speaking teachers.*

---

**Mr. Darman**

*Different... they speak differently. Native speakers have different accents and it is difficult for teachers here to speak like them... like how to pronounce ‘r’... it is difficult*

---

**Mr. Rahmat**

*I think because they are not native speakers of English, the way they use English is different. Like local English ya... different from English spoken by native English-speaking teachers.*

---

The way the four parents perceived ITEs as speaking accented English is similar to the way four students in interviews (see 4.5.1) perceived these teachers; such a view was also
mentioned by students in group discussions (see 4.5.2). It is obvious that Mr. Zainal, Mr. Samadi, Mr. Darman and Mr. Rahmat used NESTs as a benchmark for perceiving and valuing ITEs. Their perceptions of ITEs had been informed by the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers in terms of language. In other words, the four parents’ perceptions of ITEs are related to their view of NESTs as a ‘good standard’ in speaking. They saw native English speakers as ideal users of English who should become targets and models for ITEs.

**Pedagogy**

The second dominant aspect in the parents’ perceptions of ITEs is pedagogy. Three parents valued ITEs in terms of the teachers’ ways of teaching. The parents valued ITEs negatively as focusing on grammar.

**Focusing on grammar**

With regard to pedagogy aspect, ITEs were perceived by Mr. Zainal, Mr. Samadi and Mrs. Hardi as giving too much emphasis on grammar teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Zainal</td>
<td>Students need more understanding… how the language is used. The teachers need to teach practical things, including language that is used every day. They usually teach tenses… grammar. They give assignments about grammar and ask students to do the assignments. They are too focused on the tenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Samadi</td>
<td>They do not motivate students, because they are only teaching grammar. They only explain grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Hardi</td>
<td>Students do not know how to use English because the teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
None of the parents valued ITEs positively in terms of their pedagogy. As the findings show, three parents perceived ITEs negatively as focusing on grammar in their teaching. Such a perception of the three parents is similar to the view expressed by some students. As presented in the previous chapter, ITEs were seen negatively by some students as too focusing on grammar teaching, which the students described as being ‘too theoretical’ in teaching (see 4.5). Such perceptions of the parents are likely to be related to their past learning experience; the perceptions could also be attributed to the interactions of the parents with their children. Furthermore, such perceptions of the parents are different from the views of participants in previous research, such as Mahboob's (2004), and Ling and Braine's (2007) studies. Such research demonstrated that NNESTs have a perceived strength in teaching grammar.

**Culture**

The last aspect identified in the parents’ perceptions of ITEs is culture. Two parents valued the teachers in terms of this aspect. One parent perceived ITEs positively as sharing local culture with students; another one valued the teachers negatively as not knowing English-related cultures.
Sharing local culture

That ITEs share local culture with students was mentioned by Mrs. Aryodamar. She expressed that the teachers understand students more because they know the students’ cultures:

Mrs. Aryodamar

Yes, they understand our children more because they know our culture. They know students’ characteristics. That’s important because the students learn English here

The good thing is because teachers here have Javanese character, Indonesian character, they can understand students, help students. They are patient. Because they have such a character, they can interact with students better.

The view of Mrs. Aryodamar that ITEs can understand students more because they share the same culture with students is similar to the views of three students in interviews (see 4.5.1); such a view was not mentioned by students in group discussions. The way Mrs. Aryodamar perceived ITEs positively as sharing local culture with students seems to be related to her awareness of features which ITEs have; such awareness is likely to derive from her past experience in learning from ITEs or from interactions with her children.

Not knowing English-related cultures

While ITEs were seen positively as sharing local culture with students by Mrs. Aryodamar, the teachers were perceived negatively by Mr. Zainal as not knowing cultures related to English language:
Mr. Zainal: Their culture, native English-speaking teachers... Indonesian teachers do not know about their culture. They don't understand it. They teach English, but only the language. They don't explain about culture. I mean culture which is related to English. Native English-speaking teachers know more about that. It's their culture.

Such a view of Mr. Zainal highlights the views of three students in interviews who saw ITEs negatively as not having knowledge of English-related cultures (see 4.5.1). Mr. Zainal’s view is based on his belief that knowledge of English-related cultures is an important part of English learning. The way Mr. Zainal perceived ITEs also indicates that he saw NESTs as better teachers in terms of knowledge of cultures related to English. Such a view could become one of underlying motives behind why parents prefer NESTs to teach students than ITEs. As previous research has demonstrated (Mahboob, 2004), NNESTs were perceived as having fewer insights into cultures related to English.
5.6. Chapter conclusions

This chapter has presented and discussed findings from interviews with the six pairs of parents. It covers five themes: how the parents perceived English (5.1), how they conceptualized an ideal English teacher (5.2), how they understood the term ‘native English speaker’ (5.3), how they perceived NESTs (5.4) and the way the parents saw ITEs (5.5).

Similar to the way the student participants perceived English, the way the parents saw English has been influenced by various factors, including their awareness of the status and functions of English in the local community, the ‘myth’ of English as an international language and the power of English-speaking countries. In the parents’ view, English is not merely a school subject. Rather, they had various views of English, including English as providing further study or job opportunities, English as social status, English as an international language and English as access to knowledge.

This chapter has shown that the parents had various multifaceted concepts of an ideal English teacher. However, the native speaker fallacy, which was found among the students, does not seem to be visible among the parents. An ideal English teacher was characterized by the parents in terms of personal quality, pedagogical quality and language. Furthermore, it was found that the culturally-specific philosophy of ‘guru’ – a teacher who should be obeyed and imitated – has informed the parents’ various conceptualizations.

It has been demonstrated in the chapter that the parents had various understandings of the term ‘native English speaker’. However, their understandings are problematic as there were misconceptions among the parents with regard to geographical context and racial aspects. A ‘native English speaker’ was defined by two parents as an individual from abroad regardless of the language the individual speaks as a first language. Furthermore, one parent associated particular racial characteristics with English language nativeness.
With regard to the way the parents perceived NESTs, this chapter has shown that their perceptions reflect a positive image of the teachers. The parents saw NESTs in terms of language, pedagogy and racial aspects. The parents’ perceptions were based on their assumptions of the teachers which are likely to have been informed by the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers.

Last, the parents’ perceptions of ITEs reflect a negative image. ITEs were seen by the parents as having more weaknesses than strengths in terms of language, pedagogy and culture. The way the parents perceived ITEs is likely to have been influenced by their past learning experiences, their awareness of characteristics of ITEs, the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers and the belief that learning English-related cultures is an important part of English learning.
Chapter 6
Other Subject Teachers’ Perceptions

This chapter presents and discusses empirical findings from interviews with eight OSTs. It covers five themes: how the OSTs perceived English (6.1), how they conceptualized an ideal English teacher (6.2), how the teachers understood the term ‘native English speaker’ (6.3), how they perceived NESTs (6.4), and the way they saw ITEs (6.5).

6.1. OSTs’ perceptions of English

Empirical findings from interviews with the eight OSTs indicate that generally their perceptions of English are similar to the perceptions of students and parents involved in the study, in that they saw English as an important language for students to learn, not merely because it is a school subject, but also because they had various views of English. Empirical findings from interviews and group discussions with students reveal five views: English as an international language, English as providing job opportunities, English as social status, English as access to western knowledge and English as closely related to globalization (see 4.1). On the other hand, interviews with parents reveal four views: English as providing job opportunities, English as social status, English as an international language and English as access to knowledge (see 5.1). Only two views were identified in interviews with the OSTs: English as a language that can give students job opportunities and a language that provides access to knowledge.
### Table 18. OSTs' views of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views</th>
<th>OSTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English as providing job opportunities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as access to knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**English as providing job opportunities**

As indicated by table 18, English as providing job opportunities is a dominant view among the OSTs. Six OSTs perceived English as an important language for students in this way. Such a view was expressed by Nova, Mardi, Rudi, Okta, Fajar and Henny:

- **Nova** *English is very important for students. It's important for their future, long term...* they will need English for their jobs, especially for communication. *It's for getting good jobs.*

- **Mardi** *English is for their future. They have to learn it at school because in the future they will need English... applying for a job, for example. They will need it for their future career.*

- **Rudi** *It's very important because our government has signed the Free Trade Asia, World Free Trade too. That means our opportunities are not only in Indonesia, but also overseas... in other countries. Students have to compete. If they want to get good opportunities, they have to compete with those people from abroad. So, communication skill is very important. English is very important.*

- **Okta** *I'm teaching physics... but I always ask my child and students to learn English. It's important for them. English will be useful for*
them in their future. It will help them get good jobs with high salaries. They can work in multinational companies. If they can't speak English, they won't be able to do that.

Fajar

I've been learning English my whole life. I think it's important for students too. If they can use English, they will get good jobs. Working in international companies maybe... or they can even go abroad. They will have those opportunities.

Henny

I think English is important for children. Why? Because many people use it... it's used everywhere. So, I think it's important because English gives them more opportunities. They can communicate with many people from overseas, from many countries. Then, they can get good jobs easily.

The six OSTs’ views of English are similar to the views of six students in section 4.1.1 and four parents in subchapter 5.1. The teachers thought that English is important for students because they perceived the language as being able to give students job opportunities. Similar to the students and parents, the six OSTs saw English as linguistic capital which can be converted into economic and social capital in the form of job opportunities (Bourdieu, 1986). Therefore, in the views of the OSTs, English learning is also an investment, in which students learn English to acquire economic and social resources (Norton Pierce, 1995; Norton, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2006a, 2006b, 2010, 2013).

Furthermore, as the OSTs’ responses demonstrate, the way they perceived English seems to be based on their understandings of the status and functions of English in Indonesia, similar to both the students’ (see 4.1) and parents’ perceptions (see 5.1). The OSTs are aware that, in their local community, English can give individuals job opportunities, as many employers use competence in the language as a factor determining job positions (Lie, 2007).
Therefore, the way the OSTs saw English does not seem to be predominantly shaped by the delusionary effects of English (Pennycook, 2004); rather, their understandings and awareness of the status and functions of English in their social contexts had also contributed to their views about the language.

**English as access to knowledge**

Three of the eight OSTs saw English as an important language for students because the teachers thought that it provides access to knowledge, which they assumed as being predominantly communicated in English:

---

**Hermin**

*English is important for students because the transfer tool for science and technology is English. Yes, it’s English... for transferring knowledge. It’s obviously important.*

---

**Fatah**

*Let alone for students. English is also important for us, teachers... because a lot of references are from abroad, from English speaking countries. So, I found the literature. I read it. So, it's originally from there... from those places. If it’s from Indonesia, it’s just translation of the original book. If I read the original, it’s authentic. English is important for getting such knowledge... for reading original knowledge.*

---

**Mardi**

*English is also a way to know many things. I mean many things are written in English. If students can use English, they can learn many things.*

---

Such views of the three OSTs are similar to the views of four students in section 4.1.1 and one parent in subchapter 5.1. The OSTs perceived English as access to knowledge.
However, unlike the views of two of the four students in section 4.1.1 and one parent in subchapter 5.1 which are based on the belief that knowledge from English-speaking countries is superior and that English provides access to the superior knowledge, the OSTs’ views are based on the belief that knowledge is predominantly produced and communicated in English. It seems that the way the OSTs perceived English had been informed by the image of English as a dominant language in the world (Pennycook, 2004). They saw English as an important language because they thought the language gives access to knowledge which they believed is predominantly transferred in English.
6.2. OSTs’ concepts of an ideal English teacher

Empirical findings from interviews with the eight OSTs indicate that the teachers conceptualized an ideal English teacher variously. The teacher was characterized by the OSTs in terms of four aspects: language, personal quality, pedagogical quality and professionalism (table 19. OSTs’ concepts of an ideal English teacher). The findings show that the native speaker fallacy, the belief that ideal English teachers are native speakers of English, does not seem to be visible among the eight OSTs; none of the teachers mentioned that native speakers of English are ideal English teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>OSTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>has good English competence</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal quality</td>
<td>patient and close to students</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>can be a good model for students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical quality</td>
<td>able to teach well (interestingly, effectively)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>able to do administrative task</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>able to interact with other school stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language

As the above table indicates, all of the eight OSTs characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s English language competence. Generally, an ideal English teacher was described by the OSTs as a teacher who has good English language competence:

---

5 Professionalism refers to characteristics related to the professional responsibilities of teachers.
Hermin  
*The teacher must have good English competence... a must. She must be able to use it... to speak English... an example for students.*

Fatah  
*The teacher must speak English. I mean his English must be good, above average. Then, he can be an example for student... how to use the language, to use it in their lives... for study or even for the students' future.*

Nova  
*I can say the teacher is ideal if the grammar is good. The vocabulary is good... and the teacher is communicative. He can use the language... can help students to talk. I think the teacher language is the most important. That's ideal.*

Rudi  
*The teacher can communicate well in English... good English wherever they are. They become examples for students and other teachers. Every time I meet the teachers I want to use my English, although simple English. I believe if good teachers use English well, students will follow them. They will also have good English.*

Henny  
*In my opinion, good English teachers must have good knowledge of the subject which they teach. In this case... English. The teachers must have good knowledge of English. More importantly, they can use English.*

Mardi  
*Their English must be good. They become examples for students. They use English every day... then they know how English should be used every day.*

Okta  
*Good teachers must have good knowledge of their field... of their subject... good English teachers must have good English. How good? It is a bit difficult to tell, but higher is better... the more the teachers know, the better.*

Fajar  
*And of course the teachers must have good English, because it is the foundation of good English teachers.*
The views of the eight OSTs are consistent with the views of students in subchapter 4.2 and parents in subchapter 5.2. Similar to the students’ and parents’ conceptualizations, the eight OSTs’ characterizations of an ideal English teacher in terms of language aspect are related to their expectation of the teacher’s English language competence. Furthermore, they are in line with the view that good proficiency in a target language is one of important features of an ideal English teacher (Brown, 2014; Harmer, 2008). The OSTs’ views are also consistent with the empirical findings of previous studies which suggest that competence of English is an important perceived characteristic of an ideal English teacher (Brosh, 1996; Mullock, 2003; Park & Lee, 2006; Arnon & Rachel, 2007; Kadha, 2009; Wichadee, 2010; Chang, 2012).

**Personal quality**

Six of the eight OSTs characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s personal quality (Table 19). An ideal English teacher was described by the six teachers as having certain personal characteristics such as being patient and close to students. It is also found that, similar to the parents’ conceptualizations, the way the OSTs conceptualized an ideal English teacher had been influenced by the Javanese philosophy of a teacher as a ‘guru’ who is ‘digugu lan ditiru’ – someone who should be obeyed and imitated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hermin</th>
<th>A teacher who can make students understand that English is important. Students need it. That’s why the teacher must be close to students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher must have personal dedication. She must be patient... must become a stepping stone for students. It’s like helping students climbing... from hands, to shoulders, even heads if</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fatah

He is willing to approach students... he can approach students. 

*He has patience.* You know, students here are different. *Teachers must be patient.*

Rudi

*I think the teacher’s approach to students is also important.*

Many students think that English is a very difficult subject. That is why *good teachers must be close to students*... to motivate students. *They must be patient.*

Mardi

*Of course the teachers must also be patient.* Students here are different from those in other countries. They cannot study independently. Thus, the teachers must be patient in guiding students to learn.

Fajar

*They have good personality.* They can approach students and understand them. Those are the most important things. If they can get close to students, they will know how to teach the students... and the students will like the teachers.

Henny

*Teachers are not only teaching... they are educating.* It is not only about the subject, but also about being examples for students. *Good English teachers must have good personality,* which influence students’ characters... such as *being patient,* *disciplined,* and so on.

The way the six OSTs characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s personal qualities is similar to the way students in subchapter 4.2 and five parents in subchapter 5.2 conceptualized the teacher. An ideal English teacher was described by the OSTs as having such characteristics as being patient and close to students. As the empirical findings indicate, the OSTs’ conceptualizations of the teacher are likely to be related to...
various factors, such as their learning experiences, their views of local students’ characters, their views of ideal teaching-learning processes and their expectations of personal qualities which they felt an ideal teacher should have. With regard to previous studies, such characteristics mentioned by the OSTs are similar to the characteristics asserted by participants in Chang’s (2012), Barnes and Locked’s (2013), and Mahmoud and Thabet’s (2013) research. While generally the characteristics of an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s personal quality are similar to those mentioned by participants in previous studies (Chang, 2012; Barnes & Locked, 2013; Mahmoud & Thabet, 2013), the empirical findings of this study also indicate that the Javanese philosophy of ‘guru’ as a model for students had influenced the way two teachers, Hermin and Henny, conceptualized an ideal English teacher.

**Pedagogical quality**

Four OSTs characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher's pedagogical quality. Generally, the teacher was described by the four OSTs as having the ability to teach students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OST</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatah</td>
<td><em>He must have teaching skill.</em> The teacher can teach students effectively. You know, some teachers speak English fluently, but they can’t teach students. They can’t explain materials to students. I think the teacher must teach in certain ways, which students enjoy.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova</td>
<td><em>A good teacher has to know teaching materials... can teach well and know the class.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardi</td>
<td><em>They must be able to teach students. If they have good English but they cannot teach, they are not good teachers. They can explain difficult things to students.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The four OSTs’ characterizations of an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s pedagogical quality are consistent with the views of students in subchapter 4.2 and parents in subchapter 5.2. Similar to the students and the parents, the four teachers asserted that an ideal English teacher should have the ability to teach effectively and interestingly. As the empirical findings indicate, the way the OSTs conceptualized the teacher seems related to their expectation of how an ideal English teacher should teach students; it is also likely to be related to their views of ideal processes of teaching and learning. Furthermore, the OSTs’ conceptualizations are consistent with the findings of previous studies which suggest that having the ability to teach students is a characteristic of a good English teacher or a good teacher in general which the participants regarded as important (Brosh, 1996; Mullock, 2003; Park & Lee, 2006; Arnon & Rachel, 2007; Kadha, 2009; Barnes & Locked, 2013).

**Professionalism**

Two OSTs mentioned characteristics of an ideal English teacher which reflect teachers’ professional responsibilities in general. The teacher was described by the two OSTs as having the ability to do administrative tasks and to interact with other school stakeholders:

*Okta*  
*The teachers can teach students well... That’s the point of becoming a teacher, right? Even though you are good at a particular subject... if you cannot teach, you cannot become a good teacher.*

---

---

---

---

---
teach... but he must also do such tasks. Those are important parts of good teachers.

Fajar

Besides that, the teachers are able to do their professional responsibilities. I mean not only do teachers interact with students, but also with parents, with colleagues, management, principals, the department. Good English teachers can put themselves, interacting with others. The point is... they must do whatever attached to the label ‘English teachers’... marking, taking part in meetings, managing classes, working collaboratively, obeying the school rules... those are also important.

None of the student participants in chapter 4 and parents in chapter 5 characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of this professionalism aspect; furthermore, such characteristics have not been identified by previous research. That an ideal English teacher must be able to do professional responsibilities or tasks such as marking students’ assignments, giving feedback to students, and interacting with other school stakeholders was mentioned by two OSTs in this study, Nova and Fajar. The way Nova and Fajar conceptualized an ideal English teacher in terms of professionalism aspect could be attributed to their status/profession as teachers at the school. In other words, their views and experiences as teachers are likely to have influenced the way they characterized an ideal English teacher. This finding suggests that professionalism aspect, which includes the ability of teachers to undertake tasks or responsibilities related to their profession, is one of important perceived characteristics of an ideal English teacher.
6.3. OSTs’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’

As described in the introductory chapter, besides exploring the way the professional identity of ITEs is perceived by various education stakeholders, the research also investigated the way the four groups of participants defined the term ‘native English speaker’. This subchapter presents and discusses the OSTs’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’.

Subchapter 4.3 has demonstrated that the students' understandings of the term ‘native English speaker’ are problematic as there were misconceptions among them which are related to two aspects: geographical context and racial aspects. In terms of geographical context, a native English speaker was defined by some students simply as an individual from abroad regardless of the language the speaker speaks. Furthermore, the speaker was defined by some students as an individual who has a ‘white’ complexion.

Similarly, the parents' understandings of ‘native English speaker’ are problematic with regard to geographical context and racial aspects, as discussed in subchapter 5.3. Two parents defined a native English speaker as an individual from abroad regardless of the language the speaker speaks. Furthermore, one parent related language nativeness with race; the parent thought that the speaker has a ‘white’ complexion.

Empirical findings from interviews with the eight OSTs indicate that generally ‘native English speaker’ was defined by the OSTs in terms of three aspects: language, infancy and geographical context (Table 20. OSTs’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’). The findings indicate that the OSTs’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’ are unproblematic as there is no misconception about the term among the teachers. The view that race is part of English language nativeness or that English language nativeness can be valued from individuals' complexions as expressed by students and parents in the previous sections are not visible among the OSTs. In general, the eight OSTs’ understandings of ‘native English
speaker’ is close to the definitions of ‘native speaker’ proposed by researchers such as Edge (1988), Rampton (1990), Nayar (1996), Crystal (2003) and Davies (2003, 2004).

Table 20. OSTs’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Understandings</th>
<th>OSTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Speaking English as a mother tongue</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infancy</td>
<td>Born in social groups of contexts associated with the language</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical context</td>
<td>Come from contexts where the language is used as a daily language</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language – speakers of English as a mother tongue**

Four of the eight OSTs defined native English speakers as individuals who speak English as their first language:

**Hermin**

*I think native speakers are people who speak their mother tongue. Like me... I am a native speaker of Indonesian language. If it is English... native speakers of English are those who use English as a first language.*

**Mardi**

*The first language is the sign... if they speak English as a first language, they must be native speakers of English. If they use Indonesian language, they must be native speakers of Indonesian.*
Okta  From their language… native speakers are users of a mother tongue. They use their mother tongue every day… for communication.

Rudi  People who speak their language, their mother tongue. They can be from anywhere. Like Indonesians are native speakers of Indonesian language. Native speakers of English are those speaking English every day as a first language.

Generally, the four OSTs’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’ are close to the definitions of ‘native speaker’ proposed by researchers (Edge, 1988; Crystal, 2003; Davies, 2003, 2004). Edge (1988), Crystal (2003) and Davies (2003, 2004) define native speakers of a language as individuals who acquire and use the language as a mother tongue. With regard to language aspect, there was no misconception among the eight OSTs about ‘native English speaker’.

Infancy – born in social groups or contexts associated with a language

Two OSTs defined a native speaker of a language as an individual born in a social group or a context associated with that language. Such a definition indicates that native speakers of English refer to individuals born in social contexts associated with English:

Fatah  Speakers of a language who are born in places where the language is used as a daily language… like Javanese… born in Java… speaking Javanese every day.

Jafar  They were born in countries where the language is an everyday language… used as a daily language by the people. Native
The understanding that native speakers of a language are individuals born in social groups or contexts associated with the language is only found among the OSTs; other participants of the study did not express such an understanding. Fundamentally, the two OSTs’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’ are in line with Rampton’s (1990) definition of ‘native speaker’. Rampton argues that infancy, being born in a particular social context, is part of language nativeness.

Geographical context – from contexts where English is used as a daily language

While the previous two OSTs indicated that native speakers of a language must be born in social groups or contexts associated with the language, two other OSTs associated language nativeness with geographical contexts. According to Nova and Henny, native speakers of a language must come from contexts where the language is spoken as a daily language. This implies that the speakers do not necessarily have to be born into such contexts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nova</th>
<th>If they are native English speakers, they must be from English-speaking countries. Native speakers must be from countries in which the language is used every day... people use it every day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henny</td>
<td>I mean native speakers are speakers of a language. Native speakers of English are people from English-speaking countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They must be from countries in which the language is used by...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Nova's and Henny's understandings of ‘native English speaker’ are different from Fatah's and Jafar's understandings, in that Nova and Henny did not mention infancy as part of language nativeness. Rather, they saw geographical origin or context as part of English language nativeness. Such views reflect Nayar's (1994) and Davies' (2003, 2004) notions about language nativeness. Nayar proposes that language nativeness is often associated with geographical contexts or social settings as individuals acquire a language in such contexts. On the other hand, Davies argues that affiliation with the speech community of a language in particular settings is inseparable part of individuals’ nativeness.
6.4. OSTs’ perceptions of NESTs

Subchapter 4.4 has indicated that the way students perceived NESTs is complex and multifaceted. The students perceived NESTs in terms of six aspects in interviews: language, culture, pedagogy, personal quality, physical/racial and roles (see 4.4.1) and four aspects in group discussions: pedagogy, language, physical/racial and knowledge (see 4.4.2). NESTs were seen as having more strengths rather than weaknesses with regard to these aspects; therefore, the students’ perceptions tend to depict a positive image of NESTs. It is found that the way the students perceived NESTs had been informed by their learning and interaction experience with their teachers and by the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers.

Subchapter 5.4 has demonstrated that the parents had various perceptions of NESTs. They perceived these teachers in terms of three aspects: language, pedagogy and physical/racial aspects. Similar to the students’ perceptions, the parents’ perceptions of NESTs depict a positive image of the teachers; NESTs were seen by the parents as having strengths with regard to the three aspects. The parents’ perceptions seem to be based on their assumptions about NESTs, which are likely to be influenced by the stereotype of NESTs as ‘better’ teachers.

Empirical findings from interviews with OSTs indicate that the OSTs perceived NESTs variously in terms of three aspects: language, pedagogy and culture (Table 21. OSTs’ perceptions of NESTs). Generally, the OSTs’ perceptions of NESTs depict a heterogeneous image of the teachers; NESTs were seen by the OSTs as having various strengths and weaknesses with regard to these three aspects. However, the findings also indicate that the way the OSTs perceived NESTs seems to have been influenced by the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers, particularly in terms of language.
Table 21. OSTs’ perceptions of NESTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>OSTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Having good English competence</td>
<td>Not knowing local curriculum</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Practical in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Having/knowing English-related culture</td>
<td>Not knowing local culture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language**

Empirical findings from interviews with students and parents have shown that language is a dominant aspect in their perceptions of NESTs (see 4.4.1 and 5.4). Most students and parents valued NESTs in terms of their language. Similarly, findings from interviews with the eight OSTs indicate that language is the most dominant aspect in their perceptions of NESTs. Five OSTs valued NESTs positively with regard to their language. The teachers saw NESTs as having good English competence.

**Having good English competence**

Generally, NESTs were perceived by the five OSTs as having good English language competence. Such a view is reflected by the responses of Hermin, Fatah, Nova, Rudy and Henny:

Hermin: *Because they are native English speakers, they have good English... the way they speak, the way they use the language.*
Native English-speaking teachers are more fluent. Their English is superior to local teachers.

From my perspective as a teacher, native English-speaking teachers give more challenge to students. They feel more challenged to speak like the speakers because of their language.

Fatah

Native English speakers? Their English is good... better if we compare to local teachers. That’s what makes them interesting...

I mean students are excited when they are taught by native English-speaking teachers because they are users of English.

Nova

They are good examples, because they have good language. At the end... students want to speak like them, to be like them. I know they are still afraid to talk, but if native English-speaking teachers encourage them, give them examples, that is different.

Henny

They have good English... fluent English, because for them English is a first language. Because of their English, they can encourage students. Students are more enthusiastic, because they are pushed to speak with them.

Rudy

Obviously, native English-speaking teachers can use the language better. They are more fluent... if we compare them to local teachers. For them, English is a daily language. So, it’s like using their language. They speak the language that they use every day.

The views of Hermin, Fatah, Nova, Rudy and Henny are similar to the views of two parents in subchapter 5.4 and two students in section 4.1.1. That NESTs have good English language competence was also asserted by students in group discussions. Furthermore, the OSTs’ perceptions are consistent with the views of participants in research conducted by

The way the five OSTs perceived NESTs could be related to their experience in interacting with NESTs. As described in Chapter 3, the OSTs who were involved in this study had experience in interacting with NESTs. This experience could be regarded as an aspect contributing to the OSTs’ perceptions. Furthermore, the way the OSTs’ perceived NESTs is likely to have been informed by the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers, particularly in terms of language. Because the OSTs did not have high English language competence, their perceptions of NESTs’ English language could be based on their assumptions, and these could be informed by the stereotype of NESTs.

**Pedagogy**

Subchapter 5.4 has indicated that pedagogy aspect is the second dominant aspect in the parents’ perceptions of NESTs. Empirical findings from interviews with OSTs indicate that such an aspect also appears to be the second most dominant aspect in the OSTs’ perceptions of NESTs. Four OSTs valued NESTs in terms of the teachers’ pedagogy. NESTs were seen positively by three OSTs as teaching ‘practical English’ and negatively by one OST as not knowing local curriculum.

**Practical in teaching**

In terms of pedagogy, NESTs were perceived positively by Nova, Mardi and Okta as being practical in teaching English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nova</th>
<th>They are practical. They teach practical skills, such as how to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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**Mardi**

The way they teach is different... they speak English more, teach speaking more and give real examples to students... how to speak, to pronounce. It's because they speak the language fluently.

**Okta**

I don't know about their teaching methods... but they asked students to interact, to speak with them... the way students talked is different. They were more active. I think because they have good English, because English is their first language. They teach how to use English. Students are more attracted.

NESTs were seen as being practical in teaching by Nova, Mardi and Okta. The perceptions of the three OSTs are similar to the perceptions of two students in interviews (see 4.4.1); a similar view was also mentioned by some students in group discussions (see 4.4.2). Furthermore, the perceptions are also similar to the views of three parents in Subchapter 5.4. With regard to previous studies, the views of Nova, Mardi and Okta are consistent with the views of participants in Law's (1999) and Ma’s (2012) research; NESTs were seen by the participants of the two studies as focusing on practice in their teaching. While the student participants had experience of being taught by NESTs, the three OSTs are similar to the three parents in that they had never been taught by NESTs. Such views of the OSTs are likely to derive from their interactions with students or possibly from their assumptions about the way NESTs teach students.
Not knowing local curriculum

One OST perceived NESTs negatively in terms of the teachers’ pedagogy. Hermin asserted that the way NESTs teach is not appropriate for local students because, as she argued, the teachers do not know the local school curriculum and students’ objectives of learning:

Hermin  
But we need to understand that this is a school, and they don’t really know the school. It’s not a course provider… institution. It’s a school and it’s different. They do not know the direction, the curriculum. We know that they are good at speaking, but the subject is not only about speaking. It’s speaking, writing, listening, and reading. Students have to take national tests. Their way of teaching is not suitable.

Hermin’s perception is similar to a view mentioned by some students in group discussions (see 4.4.2); the students saw NESTs as not knowing teaching methods appropriate to local students. However, the view was not outlined by parents involved in the study. The way Hermin perceived NESTs seems to be related to her awareness of students’ learning objectives and her view of the way NESTs teach students. It could also have been informed by her view as a teacher at the school.

Culture

The last aspect in terms of which NESTs were perceived by the OSTs is culture. Three OSTs valued NESTs based on this aspect. NESTs were seen positively by two OSTs as having knowledge of English-related cultures and negatively by one OST as not knowing local culture.
Having knowledge of English-related cultures

NESTs were perceived positively as having knowledge of English-related culture by Fatah and Jafar:

---

**Fatah**

*They are different, but native speakers are better teachers because they know more... more about the language and more about the culture... about lives in their countries. Although they don't know about our education system, that's not a difficult thing to learn. Just put them in teacher training institutions and they will learn the system.*

---

**Jafar**

*They know about their culture and they can share it with students. They must not learn the language only, but also the culture... because they are related, English and culture of English*

---

The perception of the two OSTs confirms Mahboob's (2004), and Walkinshaw and Oanh's (2014) studies which suggest that NESTs are preferred with regard to cultures related to English language. The studies demonstrated that NESTs are often seen as having awareness and better insights into the cultures of English-speaking countries. However, the way the two OSTs perceived NESTs in terms of culture is different from the way four students in interviews perceived the teachers (see 4.4.1). The students saw NESTs as having ‘better’, ‘more modern’ and ‘more advanced’ cultures; their perceptions of NESTs are related to their disparate views about the cultures of English-speaking countries and non-English speaking countries. On the other hand, the two OSTs perceived NESTs as having knowledge of English-related cultures. Such a perception of the OSTs seems to be related to the belief that knowledge of English-related cultures is an important part of English language learning.
Not knowing local cultures

One OST perceived NESTs as not knowing local cultures. Mardi asserted that NESTs do not know the culture of local students. Further, he proposed that NESTs’ lack of knowledge of students’ cultures can cause misunderstanding:

| Mardi | They don’t know about students’ culture. They can speak English well because it’s their language, but they need to know... they need to learn local culture. If they teach student here, they have to know the culture. The problem is... they don’t know. Sometimes, that can cause misunderstanding. |

Mardi’s view that NESTs do not know students’ cultures is similar to the views of three students in interviews (see 4.4.1). The way Mardi perceived NESTs in terms of culture is likely to be related to his view that knowledge of students’ cultures is important in the process of teaching and learning. In addition, it also seems to be based on his awareness of the characteristics of NESTs, particularly with regard to culture.
6.5. OSTs’ perceptions of ITEs

Subchapter 4.5 has demonstrated that the way students perceived ITEs is complex and multifaceted. The students perceived ITEs in terms of six aspects: language, culture, pedagogy, second language (L2) learning experience, knowledge and roles. Findings from interviews and group discussions with the students show that they saw ITEs as having strengths and weaknesses with regard to these six aspects. Therefore, their perceptions depict a heterogeneous image of ITEs. The way the students perceived ITEs has been informed by various factors, such as their experience in learning English with NESTs and ITEs, and the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers.

Subchapter 5.5 shows that parents perceived ITEs variously in terms of three aspects: language, pedagogy and culture. ITEs were seen by the parents as having strengths and weaknesses with regard to these aspects. However, empirical findings from interviews with the parents indicate that their perceptions reflect a negative image of ITEs. The way the parents saw ITEs seems to have been influenced by their past experience in learning English from ITEs, their awareness of characteristics which ITEs have, the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers and their belief that learning English-related cultures is an important part of English language learning.

Findings from interviews with the eight OSTs indicate that they perceived ITEs variously in terms of three aspects: culture, language and second language learning experience (table 22. OSTs’ perceptions of ITEs). Similar to the OSTs’ perceptions of NESTs, their perceptions of ITEs depict a heterogeneous image of these teachers. ITEs were perceived by the OSTs as having strengths and weaknesses with regard to the three aspects. Empirical findings indicate that the way OSTs perceived ITEs seems to have been influenced by various factors, including their awareness that ITEs and local students share the same first
language and culture, the view that the shared language and culture are useful in the process of teaching and learning, the belief that learning cultures related to English is an important part of English language learning, and the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers, particularly in terms of language.

Table 22. OSTs’ perceptions of ITEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Sharing culture with students</td>
<td>Not/less knowing the culture of English-speaking countries</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Sharing mother tongue with students</td>
<td>Having low English competence/proficiency</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Learning experience</td>
<td>Having experience in learning English as a second language</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Culture**

Subchapter 4.5 and 5.5 have indicated that language is a dominant aspect in the students’ and parents’ perceptions of NESTs and ITEs. Furthermore, empirical findings in Subchapter 6.4 indicate that this aspect is also dominant in OSTs’ perceptions of NESTs. However, findings in this subchapter show that in the OSTs’ perceptions of ITEs, the culture aspect is dominant. Eight OSTs valued ITEs in terms of culture. ITEs were seen positively by four OSTs as sharing local culture with students and negatively by the other four OSTs as not knowing the cultures of English-speaking countries.
**Sharing culture with students**

Four of the eight OSTs perceived ITEs positively as sharing local culture with students:

---

**Hermin**

Local teachers know this place more. They were born and raised in this place. They have been living in the same culture with us, with the students. So, they are part of the community. I mean they can be closer to their students and understand what the students want.

---

**Nova**

However, they know the students more because they are from this city. They understand them.

---

**Mardi**

I think they understand students more than native English-speaking teachers. I think because they are from here, They are Javanese too. That becomes their advantage. They know students better.

---

**Okta**

For the school... of course the teachers are better because they know our system. More importantly, they know students’ habits and culture... they know what to do with the students

The views of the four OSTs are similar to the perceptions of three students in interviews (see 4.5.1); they are also consistent with the view of one parent in Subchapter 5.5. Furthermore, the views of Hermin, Nova, Mardi and Okta are in line with the views of student participants in Walkinshaw and Oanh’s (2014) studies. Students in Walkinshaw and Oanh’s study perceived the shared cultural background which NNESTs have as a positive feature of the teachers. The way Hermin, Nova, Mardi and Okta perceived ITEs is related to their awareness of the fact that students and ITEs share the same culture. They saw the shared
culture as a useful aspect in the process of English teaching and learning, and they therefore perceived ITEs positively as sharing the same culture with local students.

**Not knowing the cultures of English-speaking countries**

While, in terms of culture, ITEs were seen positively by the previous four OSTs as sharing the same culture with local students, these teachers were perceived negatively by the other four OSTs as ‘not knowing the cultures of English-speaking countries’. Such a view is reflected by the responses of Hermin, Fatah, Rudi and Henny:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hermin</th>
<th>It’s also a problem when the teachers don’t know about the culture of English speaking countries. When they discuss certain things from those countries, they don’t know and their students question that… mom, you don’t know about this? That often happens, because our teachers here are local. Most of them... they have never been to those places.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatah</td>
<td>I’ve been working with both native English-speaking teachers and local teachers... even longer with the local teachers. They are different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The limitation is our English teachers don’t know about the culture. It’s not complete, learning English without knowing the culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudi</td>
<td>It’s just different. They are English teachers, just like native English-speaking teachers, but they are different. Like me, I’m teaching economics. That’s it. But teaching English... the teachers should know culture of English speaking countries. So, they can teach both English and the culture. So, students can use English correctly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
... but most of them don’t know the culture or they know, but not like native English speakers do.

Henny

Just like me... I’m teaching Indonesian language, and that’s quite easy for me because I’m from Indonesia and students don’t question that. The challenge of English teachers is they teach English, but they are not from English speaking countries... and they don’t know about the culture. That’s a very important thing, especially for students.

The view that ITEs do not have knowledge of the cultures of English-speaking countries expressed by the four OSTs is similar to the views of three students in section 4.5.1 and one parent in subchapter 5.5. Furthermore, the view is consistent with the perceptions of participants in Mahboob’s (2004) research. In Mahboob’s study, NNESTs were perceived by the participants as having less cultural knowledge related to English. The view of Hermin, Fatah, Rudi and Henny seems to be based on the belief that learning cultures of English-speaking countries is an important part of English language learning.

Language

The next aspect in terms of which OSTs perceived ITEs is language. While this aspect is dominant in students’ and parents’ perceptions of ITEs, only five OSTs valued ITEs with regard to the language aspect. ITEs were seen positively by one OST as sharing mother tongue with students. On the other hand, ITEs were perceived negatively by four OSTs as having low English language competence.
Sharing a mother tongue with students

Only one OST perceived ITEs positively as sharing a first language with students. In Henny’s view, that ITEs speak the same mother tongue as their students is an advantage to these teachers. Because of ITEs’ and students’ shared first language, Henny further reported, ITEs understand what the students want:


Henny’s view that ITEs have an advantage in that they share the same first language with student is consistent with the views of six students (see 4.5.1) and two parents (see 5.5) in interviews; a similar view was also expressed by some students in group discussions (see 4.5.2). Furthermore, this perception is also consistent with the views of participants in previous studies (Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Moussu & Braine, 2006; Ling & Braine, 2007; Chun, 2014; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014). Participants in these studies saw NNESTs as sharing a first language with their students, which the participants regarded as one of the strengths of NNESTs. The way Henny perceived ITEs is based on her awareness that the teachers share the first language with local students. It is likely to be related to her belief that the shared mother tongue is useful in the process of English language teaching and learning.

Low English language competence

ITEs were perceived negatively by Hermin, Fatah, Nova and Rudi as having low English language competence:
Hermin  
I have been a teacher for a long time and my impression is that they don't have enough English competence... most of them. Native English speakers are the standard. They become the tool for measuring English teachers. If teachers want to be good English teachers, they must have language competence similar to those of native speaker of English.

The teachers here... you know, their English... they need to learn it from native speakers of English.

---

Nova  
They are teachers, but that doesn't mean that they are better than students. Some of them... or most, I think... still have low language competence.

Students often tell me that their teachers are not good enough. They often make grammatical mistakes and the students know it.

---

Fatah  
I think it's been changing. New generation teachers are much better. They are much more fluent than English teachers in the past. Perhaps that's because now they have various sources and media for learning English, such as TV programs, songs, and the internet.

Of course, they are still below native English-speaking teachers. The language, I don't think they can speak like native English speakers do.

---

Rudi  
I think that’s their weakness. For example, when we went to Bali, they met native English speakers. They could not talk.

I think it would be better if they can get an opportunity to go abroad, to English speaking countries, so that they can learn English in America, British, or Australia, so that their English is better.
The views of Hermin, Fatah, Nova and Rudi that ITEs have low English competence are similar to the views of seven students in interviews (see 4.5.1) and some students in group discussions (see 4.5.2). They are also similar to the views expressed by two parents in interviews (see 5.5). With regard to previous studies, the four OSTs’ views are consistent with the views of student participants in studies conducted by Benke and Medgyes (2005) and Ling and Braine (2007). Similar to the OSTs, student participants in the two studies saw NNESTs as having low English language competence.

It is obvious that in their perceptions of ITEs, Hermin, Fatah, Nova and Rudi saw NESTs as a standard of ‘good’ English. The way the four OSTs perceived ITEs has been influenced by the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers, particularly in terms of English language. The OSTs’ perceptions are problematic as they seem to be based on the OSTs’ assumptions about the English language competence of native English speakers. It is important to acknowledge that the OSTs involved in this study did not have high English language competence and had never been taught by NESTs.

**L2 Learning experience**

The last aspect in terms of which OSTs perceived ITEs is second language learning experience. ITEs were seen positively by two OSTs as having experience in learning English as a second language.

**Having experience in learning English as a second language**

Okta and Jafar perceived ITEs positively as having experience in learning English as a second language:
Okta

Their experience is their weapon in the class. They know students more than native English-speaking teachers because they have been teaching the students since the first day they entered the school... also because they are local people, they were once students.

Jafar

They have experienced what students are experiencing now... so they know how to teach. Indonesian teachers are learners of the language too. They know the difficulties and the challenges.

The view that ITEs have second language learning experience outlined by Okta and Jafar has been reported by three students in interviews (see 4.5.1). However, such a view was not expressed by parents involved in this study. With regard to previous studies, the views of Okta and Jafar are consistent with the views of participants in Mahboob’s (2004) research. Participants in Mahboob’s study regarded NNESTs’ second language learning experience as an advantage of the teachers. The way Okta and Jafar perceived ITEs is related to their awareness of ITEs’ learning experiences and their view that such experiences are useful in the process of teaching and learning English.
6.6. Chapter conclusions

This chapter has presented and discussed findings from interviews with the eight OSTs. It covers five themes: how the OSTs perceived English (6.1), how they conceptualized an ideal English teacher (6.2), how they understood the term ‘native English speaker’ (6.3), how they perceived NESTs (6.4) and the way the OSTs saw ITEs (6.5).

This chapter has demonstrated that, generally, the OSTs’ perceptions of English are similar to the perceptions of students and parents in that they saw English as an important language to learn not merely because it is a school subject, but also because they had various views of English, which include English as providing job opportunities and English as access to knowledge. The way the OSTs saw English has been informed by their awareness of the status and functions of the language in the context of the study, and the belief that knowledge is predominantly produced and communicated in English.

It is found that the eight OSTs conceptualized an ideal English teacher variously in terms of language, personal quality, pedagogical quality and professionalism aspects. The native speaker fallacy does not seem to be visible among the OSTs. The way the OSTs conceptualized an ideal English teacher has been shaped by their expectations of the teacher, their learning experiences, their views of local students, their experiences and views as teachers, and the culturally-specific philosophy of ‘guru’.

With regard to the way the OSTs’ understood the term ‘native English speaker’, this chapter has shown that their understandings are unproblematic as there was no misconception among them. A ‘native English speaker’ was defined by the OSTs in terms of language, infancy and geographical context. Generally, the eight OSTs’ understandings of the term ‘native English speaker’ align with the definitions of a ‘native speaker’ proposed by researchers.

The OSTs’ perceptions of NESTs depict a heterogeneous image of the teachers. They
perceived NESTs as having various strengths and weaknesses in terms of language, pedagogy and culture. As demonstrated in the chapter, the way the OSTs perceived NESTs had been influenced by the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers, particularly in terms of English language.

On the other hand, ITEs were seen by the OSTs as having strengths and weaknesses in terms of culture, language and L2 learning experience. The OSTs’ various perceptions depict a heterogeneous image of ITEs. The way the OSTs saw ITEs has been informed by various factors such as their awareness of the language and culture which students and ITEs share, their belief that the shared language and culture are useful in the process of teaching and learning, the belief that learning cultures related to English is an important part of English learning and the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers.
Chapter 7
The Perceptions of Indonesian Teachers of English

This chapter presents and discusses empirical findings from interviews with the six Indonesian teachers of English. The chapter covers five themes: how ITEs perceived English (7.1), how the teachers conceptualized an ideal English teacher (7.2), how they understood the term ‘native English speaker’ (7.3), how they perceived NESTs (7.4), and how the teachers perceived their own professional identity (7.5).

7.1. ITEs’ perceptions of English

Empirical findings from interviews with the six ITEs indicate that generally the ITEs saw English as an important language for students to learn. While five views were identified from interviews and group discussions with the students: English as an international language, English as providing job opportunities, English as social status, English as access to western knowledge and English as closely related to globalization (see 4.1), interviews with the parents revealed four views: English as providing job opportunities, English as social status, English as an international language and English as access to knowledge (see 5.1). On the other hand, empirical findings from interviews with the OSTs show that generally the OSTs perceived English as an important language for students because of two views: English as providing job opportunities and English as access to knowledge (see 6.1). Three views were identified from interviews with the six ITEs: English as access to knowledge, English as providing study or job opportunities and English as closely related to globalization (Table 23).
Table 23. ITEs’ views of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views</th>
<th>ITEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English as access to knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as providing study or job opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as part of globalization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**English as access to knowledge**

As indicated by table 23, three ITEs perceived English as an important language for students to learn because the ITEs thought that the language can give access to knowledge. Such a view was expressed by Vita, Asri and Mamik:

**Vita**

*English is important for students because they need to access the internet for getting information.*

*They work using computers... most of the instructions on computers are English. That’s why they need to learn English.*

**Asri**

*Very important for getting knowledge for their future. English is also important for communication. Also, English is used in the national test. Therefore students need to learn English.*

**Mamik**

*English is important for students and also for any individuals because we need to use it in our daily lives... to learn.*

*We need to use English. We need English because everything uses English.*
The view that English provides access to knowledge expressed by the three ITEs is similar to the views of two students in section 4.1.1 and three OSTs in subchapter 6.1. The ITEs’ view is based on their understanding that English is a dominant language with regard to knowledge and knowledge transfer. The teachers saw English as an important language because they thought that knowledge is predominantly transferred in English. Such a view reflects the image of English as a hegemonic language (Pennycook, 2004). The way the ITEs saw English suggests that not only has the image of English as a dominant language influenced the way the students, parent and OSTs perceived the language, it has also informed the way the ITEs perceived English.

**English as providing study and job opportunities**

The second view identified from interviews with the ITEs is English as a language which provides study or job opportunities. Such a view was expressed by two ITEs, Syaifur and Hepti:

---

Syaifur  
*It is very important to learn... this is for continuing their study to university, state universities or private universities. They also need English for working, such as in hotels or coal mining company in Kalimantan after they finish their study.*

---

Hepti  
*English is important for students because it is like our second language, in terms of its function. They need English for getting good jobs. English is not an additional requirement. It is now a requisite.*
The views of Syaifur and Hepti corroborate the views of six students in section 4.1.1, four parents in subchapter 5.1 and six OSTs in subchapter 6.1. Similar to the students, parents and OSTs, the two ITEs perceived English as linguistic capital which can be converted into economic and social capital in the form of job opportunities (Bourdieu, 1986). Therefore, the way the ITEs saw English also reflects the concept of ‘investment’ in language learning (Norton Pierce, 1995, 1997; Norton, 2000a, 2000b, 2006, 2011, 2013). Because the ITEs perceived English as linguistic capital, in their view English learning is a form of investment. In other words, the ITEs perceived students’ process of learning English as a process of investing linguistic capital in order to get material and social gain.

The ITEs’ responses indicate that the way they perceived English as providing study or job opportunities is based on their awareness of the status and functions of English in the context of the research. They are aware that many employers in Indonesian use English proficiency as one of recruitment criteria and for determining job positions (Lie, 2007); therefore, the OSTs’ views cannot be regarded as predominantly shaped by the ‘delusionary effects’ of English (Pennycook, 2004).

**English as part of globalization**

One ITE saw English as an important language for students to learn because she thought that it is closely related to globalization. Such a view was expressed by Wahyu:

---

Wahyu  
*English is important for students because of globalization. Although students are passive... at least they learn English, they have to learn it.*

---
The way Wahyu saw English as closely related to globalization is similar to the way three students in subchapter 4.1 perceived the language; such a view was not mentioned by parents and OSTs. Wahyu's view of English seems to reflect the 'collusionary effect of English' (Pennycook, 2004, p. 26). Similar to the views of the three students, the way Wahyu perceived English had been informed by the image of English in the context of the research. As described in the literature review, English in Indonesia is often related to globalization. English is seen as 'the linguistic engine of globalization' (Sayer, 2012, p. 2). In Indonesia there is discourse which closely relates English with globalization (Candraningrum, 2008; Hamid, 2012).
7.2. ITEs’ concepts of an ideal English teacher

Empirical findings from interviews with the six ITEs indicate that the teachers conceptualized an ideal English teacher variously, similar to the other participants of the study. The six ITEs characterized the teacher in terms of four aspects: personal quality, pedagogical quality, language and knowledge of cultures (Table 24). The findings indicate that the native speaker fallacy, the belief that ideal English teachers are native speakers of English, was not visible among the ITEs. None of the teachers asserted that native English speakers are ideal English teachers.

Table 24. ITEs’ concepts of an ideal English teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>ITEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal quality</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Close to students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having personal desire to learn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical quality</td>
<td>Having ability to manage class and recognize students’ ability</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching clearly and interactively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Having good language competence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of cultures</td>
<td>Having knowledge of cultures of English-speaking countries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal quality

Empirical findings from interviews with ITEs indicate that their conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher are similar to students’ and parents’ conceptualizations, in that personal quality is a dominant aspect. As table 24 indicates, all six ITEs characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s personal quality. The teacher was described by them as a teacher who has such personal characteristics as friendliness, being close to students and understanding them, being patient and having a personal desire to learn:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td>Friendly, they can make students feel comfortable in learning. If the students ask about vocab, for example, they feel free to ask. They don’t feel afraid of asking... again and again. They can maintain good interaction with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepti</td>
<td>They can be close to students and interact with them. They don’t make students afraid to ask. One more thing, good teachers shouldn’t be scary. That’s my experience when I was in my senior high school. My English teacher was a killer, because he asked us not to make even a single mistake, not even a single sentence. That’s good, but that makes the students silent. That’s why, I try to be a good teacher, not a scary one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asri</td>
<td>The teacher must have patience... must be patient. She must understand students, know what they need. She must be close to students, and can motivate them... make them interested in learning English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahyu</td>
<td>I can say that the teacher must keep learning... have desire to learn, learn, and learn... long life education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamik</td>
<td>What is an ideal teacher... understanding students. I have learned from my previous teacher... that in teaching,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
transferring knowledge, students must not be afraid of the teacher. What I learned is that... I will never teach in bad ways... hurting the students, being too strict... hitting them, giving punishment... sending them out of class.

Those who care about students... close to students. I think that's important.

Syaifur

Approach to students... good teachers must be close to students. You know, the first time I enter a class, I always say... we are family. Then, I say... you are my daughters. You are my sons, and I am your father. If you have some problems, just see me. You cannot contact your real father, but you can contact me... keep in touch with me. Number one is... family. That's what an ideal English teacher means to me...

... and then, students and teachers can respect each other. The teacher must be able to motivate students... mmm like giving motivation... ask them to study.

Generally, the way the eight ITEs conceptualized an ideal English teacher in terms of the teacher’s personal qualities is similar to the way students, parents and OSTs characterized the teacher. Such characteristics as friendly, close to students and patient mentioned by the ITEs have been expressed by students (see 4.2), parents (see 5.2) and OSTs (see 6.2). One ITE mentioned a different personal characteristic, having a personal desire to learn. The empirical findings indicate that the way the ITEs conceptualized an ideal English teacher seems to be related to their expectations of personal characteristics which the teacher should have, their views of local students, their views of ideal processes of teaching and learning, and their views of interpersonal relationships which teachers and students should have.
Furthermore, similar to the other participants’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher, the ITEs’ conceptualizations in terms of personal quality aspect are consistent with the findings of previous studies (Mullock, 2003; Arnon & Rachel, 2007; Barnes & Lock, 2013; Mahmoud & Thabet, 2013). Such personal characteristics as being friendly and close to students were expressed by student participants in Barnes and Lock’s (2013) study. On the other hand, patience was regarded as an important personal feature of the teacher by participants in studies conducted by Arnon and Rachel (2007), Barnes and Lock (2013), and Mahmoud and Thabet (2013). While such a characteristic as understanding students was expressed by participants in Mullock’s (2003) research, another personal characteristic, having a personal desire to learn, is consistent with Brown’s (2014) description of the teacher. The personal characteristics of an ideal English teacher which the ITEs suggested reflect the personal characteristics of good teachers in general.

**Pedagogical quality**

The second dominant aspect in the ITEs’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher is pedagogical quality. Five ITEs characterized the teacher in terms of the teacher’s pedagogical quality. An ideal English teacher was described by the five ITEs as a teacher who has the ability to manage a class and to teach clearly and interactively:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td><em>I think ideal English teachers are just like good teachers in general. They can handle the class.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepti</td>
<td><em>They can explain things, teach clearly. They also use games in their teaching. So, it’s interactive and not boring.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asri

*Also important, she must have the ability to teach.* Well, if she has good English but can't teach, she keeps English for herself. That's not ideal. *She must be good at explaining materials to students.*

Mamik

*The teachers must be able to teach... can deliver materials to students.*

Syafur

*The teacher must have good pedagogy... ability to teach students.* Let's say in the first 15 minutes students are active. The next 15 minutes they are lazy... the teachers must give ice breaking activities... maintain students’ learning.

With regard to pedagogy, the way the five ITEs conceptualized an ideal English teacher is generally similar to how the other participants characterized the teacher. Such a characteristic as having the ability to teach students has been mentioned by students, parents and OSTs. However, one characteristic, having the ability to manage a class, was expressed by only one ITE, Vita. The way the five ITEs characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of pedagogy aspects is likely to be related to their experience as teachers. Furthermore, the characteristics mentioned by the five ITEs are consistent with characteristics identified by previous studies (Brosh, 1996; Mullock, 2003; Park & Lee, 2006; Kadha, 2009); they also reflect the descriptions of the teacher suggested by Brown (2014) and Harmer (2008). That the teacher must have the ability to teach effectively and interestingly was expressed by participants in research conducted by Mullock (2003), Park and Lee (2006), and Kadha (2009); this feature was also mentioned as part of the descriptions of the teacher by Brown (2014) and Harmer (2008). The other characteristic, that the teacher has the ability to manage classes, was expressed by participants in Kadha’s (2009) study.
Language

While language is the most dominant aspect in OSTs’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher (see 6.2), it is less dominant in ITEs’ conceptualizations. Generally, ITEs’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher are similar to those of students and parents in that they focused on personal and pedagogical aspects. Only two ITEs characterized the teacher in terms of language aspects. The two ITEs asserted that an ideal English teacher has good competence in English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asri</th>
<th><em>An ideal English teacher should have good English, because it’s a subject which she or he teaches.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mamik</td>
<td><em>I think that’s important. The teachers’ language... well, it depends... depends on who the students are...</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher in terms of language aspects of the two ITEs are similar to those of some students (see 4.2), parents (see 5.2) and OSTs (see 6.2). That an ideal English teacher has good competence in English has been expressed by the students, parents and OSTs. Although empirical findings from interviews with ITEs demonstrate that language aspect is less dominant in ITEs’ various conceptualizations of the teacher, they suggest that having good English language competence is one of the most important perceived characteristics of an ideal English teacher. The conceptualizations of the two ITEs are likely to be related to their experience and views as English teachers.

Furthermore, the two ITEs’ views are consistent with the views of participants in previous studies (Brosh, 1996; Mullock, 2003; Park & Lee, 2006; Arnon & Rachel, 2007;
Kadha, 2009; Wichadee, 2010; Barnes and Lock, 2013). The participants in such studies expressed that competence in a target language is an important feature of an ideal English teacher. Additionally, the views of the ITEs confirm Harmer’s (2008) description of the teacher; Harmer asserts that an ideal English teacher should have good competence in English.

**Knowledge of cultures**

One ITE thought that an ideal English teacher must have knowledge of the cultures of English-speaking countries. Wahyu suggested that for her, learning a language includes learning cultures related to the language. As she stated, an ideal English teacher must have lived in English-speaking countries and know cultures related to English:

---

**Wahyu**

Learning a language is also about learning the culture of the language, the habits of the speakers, those who speak the language. That’s why, ideally the teacher must have stayed... lived in western countries.

The teacher has lived in an English speaking country.

---

The view that an ideal English teacher must have knowledge of the cultures of English-speaking countries was expressed by only one ITE; such a view was not mentioned by other participants in this study. Furthermore, none of previous studies suggested that having knowledge of the cultures of English-speaking countries is a perceived characteristic of an ideal English teacher. As indicated by Wahyu’s response, her view is likely to derive from the
belief that learning cultures related to English is an inseparable part of English language learning.
7.3. ITEs’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’

Subchapter 4.3 and 5.3 have shown that the students’ and parents’ understandings of the term ‘native English speaker’ are problematic as there were misconceptions among them related to two aspects: geographical context and racial aspects. In terms of the geographical context, a native English speaker was defined by some students and parents simply as an individual coming from abroad, regardless of the language the speaker speaks as a first language. Furthermore, some students and parents associated language nativeness with race; they described a native English speaker as an individual who has a ‘white’ complexion. Unlike the students’ and parents’ understandings, the OSTs’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’ seem to be unproblematic, as there is no misconception among the teachers. The OSTs defined a native English speaker in terms of three aspects: language, infancy and geographical context (see 6.3).

Empirical findings from interviews with the six ITEs indicate that their understandings of ‘native English speaker’ seem to be unproblematic, similar to the OSTs’ understandings. Generally, the ITEs’ understandings are consistent with the definitions of a ‘native speaker’ proposed by researchers. The six ITEs defined ‘native English speaker’ in terms of two aspects: language and geographical context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Understandings</th>
<th>ITEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Acquiring a language during childhood</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use the language as a first language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good language competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical context</td>
<td>Comes from countries in which the language is spoken as a mother tongue</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. ITEs’ understandings of ‘native English speaker’
**Language**

All six ITEs defined ‘native English speaker’ in terms of the language aspect. A native speaker of English was described by the teachers as an individual who acquires English during childhood and uses the language as a mother tongue. Furthermore, the speaker was also characterized as an individual having good competence of the language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td><em>I think native speakers are people who speak their own language, which they have learned since they were children. The language is a daily language.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asri</td>
<td><em>I am a native speaker... a native speaker of Javanese language, because I have used it since I was a child. That's native... If you use English since you were born, First language.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syaifur</td>
<td><em>Native users of a language. So, since they were born, they have been learning the language. They are used to... so they are native speakers.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahyu</td>
<td><em>In my understanding, native speakers are people who use their own, for example, they are not always from western countries... let's say my children are born there, in those places. Then, they use the language. Although they are not originally from Europe, they are native speakers... because they speak the language as a first language. I am a native speaker... but a native speaker of Indonesian.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepti</td>
<td><em>Not all westerners... can be native English speakers. I think native speakers are people who learn a language since childhood... those who have good English.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamik</td>
<td><em>Mother tongue is original. I think those are native speakers. Well, they can be Indonesians who have stayed for a long time abroad</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The empirical findings indicate that the six ITEs’ understandings of the term ‘native English speaker’ in terms of language aspect are unproblematic. There was no misconception among the teachers. Generally, their understandings are in line with the definitions of a ‘native speaker’ proposed by researchers (Edge, 1988; Crystal, 2003; Davies, 2003, 2004). That a native English speaker acquires English during early childhood, which was expressed by all of the six ITEs, is consistent with definitions of ‘native speaker’ proposed by Crystal (2003) and Davies (2003, 2004). Furthermore, that the speaker acquires and uses the language as a first language has been proposed by Edge (1988), Crystal (2003) and Davies (2003, 2004) in their definitions of ‘native speaker’. Hepti’s understanding that a native English speaker has good competence of English reflects Rampton’s (1990), Nayar’s (1994) and Davies’ (2003, 2004) views that, generally, a native speaker of a language has comprehensive knowledge about and competence in the language.

**Geographical context**

Two ITEs thought that native English speakers’ association with the geographical contexts, in which English is used as a daily language, is an important part of the speakers’ language nativeness. In the views of Vita and Asri, ‘native English speakers’ refer to those people who come from English-speaking countries:
Native [English] speakers for teaching English must be those who come from countries in which the language is used as a daily language... it’s a spoken language. The colloquial is English... such as American, British, and Australian.

For me, native speakers of English are from those places, such as UK... where English is a mother tongue.

Native is real... I won't call people from non-English speaking countries as native speakers of English, but I will call them foreign language speakers. I often call them that way.

Similar to the six ITEs’ understandings of the term ‘native English speaker’ in terms of the language aspect, the understandings of the two ITEs with regard to geographical context are unproblematic. There was no misconception among the teachers with regard to this aspect. Vita’s and Asri’s view that native English speakers must come from contexts where English is spoken or English-speaking countries is consistent with the definitions of ‘native speaker’ proposed by Nayar (1994) and Davies (2003, 2004). Both Nayar and Davies regard native speakers’ association with particular social and geographical contexts as part of the speakers’ language nativeness. Nayar argues that language nativeness is closely related to particular geographical contexts as individuals acquire the language in the contexts. On the other hand, Davies proposes that individuals’ language nativeness also derives from the individuals’ affiliation with the speech community of the language living in particular geographical contexts.
7.4. ITEs’ perceptions of NESTs

Subchapter 4.4 has demonstrated that the students’ perceptions of NESTs are complex and multifaceted. The students perceived NESTs in terms of six aspects: language, culture, pedagogy, personal quality, physical/racial and roles (see 4.4.1). Students in the group discussions perceived the teachers in terms of four aspects: pedagogy, language, physical/racial and knowledge (see 4.4.2). Empirical findings from interviews and group discussions with the students show that with regard to these aspects, the students saw NESTs as having more advantages than weaknesses; therefore, the students’ perceptions of NESTs tend to depict a positive image of the teachers. The students’ various perceptions of NESTs seem to have been shaped by their direct experience in interacting with NESTs and informed by the fixed stereotypes of the teachers as superior teachers.

Subchapter 5.4 has shown that, similar to the students, the parents had various perceptions of NESTs; they perceived the teachers in terms of three aspects: language, pedagogy and physical/racial aspects. The parents’ perceptions of NESTs reflect a homogeneously positive image of the teachers. NESTs were seen by the parents as having advantages with regard to the three aspects; none of the parents saw NESTs as having disadvantages. The perceptions of the parents seem to be based on their assumptions about the teachers, which are likely to have been informed by the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers.

On the other hand, subchapter 6.4 has demonstrated that the OSTs perceived NESTs in terms of three aspects: language, pedagogy and culture. Different from the students’ and parents’ perceptions which depict a homogeneously positive image of NESTs, the OSTs’ perceptions tend to reflect a heterogeneous image of NESTs. NESTs were seen as having various strengths and weaknesses with regard to the three aspects. However, the findings
indicate that the way the OSTs perceived NESTs had been influenced by the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers, particularly in terms of language.

Empirical findings from interviews with ITEs indicate that their perceptions of NESTs are similar to the OSTs’ perceptions of the teachers. The ITEs perceived NESTs in terms of three aspects: language, pedagogy and culture (table 26. ITEs’ perceptions of NESTs). The perceptions of the ITEs depict a heterogeneous image of NESTs. The six ITEs saw NESTs as having strengths and weaknesses with regard to the aspects. Unlike the OSTs’ perceptions of NESTs, the ITEs’ perceptions seem to be less informed by the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers; rather, their perceptions of NESTs seem to have been predominantly shaped by their experience in interacting with NESTs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>ITEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Having good English competence</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having good pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Teaching differently</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Knowing English-related culture</td>
<td>Not knowing local culture</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language**

Empirical findings from interviews with the six ITEs indicate that all of the three aspects are equally dominant in the ITEs’ perceptions of NESTs, while findings from interviews with students, parents and OSTs show that the language aspect is the most dominant aspect in their perceptions of NESTs (see 4.4.1, 5.4 and 6.4). Four ITEs perceived
NESTs positively in terms of their language as having good competence in English language and pronunciation.

**Having good English language competence**

NESTs were perceived as having good English language competence by Vita, Hepti and Wahyu:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td><em>Yes, they are better in terms of language... the language that they use every day.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepti</td>
<td><em>Overall, they are better in terms of language. They have good competence.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahyu</td>
<td><em>They are the speakers... native English speakers have good language. It's like us... using Indonesian language. They have good English, better than us. It's because they use English every day.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The views of the three ITEs are consistent with the views of two students in section 4.4.1, two parents in subchapter 5.4 and five OSTs in subchapter 6.4. Similar views were also mentioned by some students in group discussions (see 4.4.2). However, unlike the perceptions of the students, OSTs and parents which seem to have been influenced by the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers, the ITEs’ perceptions seem to be related to their experience in interacting with NESTs. The ITEs’ perceptions of NESTs in terms of language are more credible than the perceptions of the students, parents and OSTs because the ITEs have sufficient competence and knowledge of English. It is important to acknowledge that the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers might have been present among the ITEs. However,
as the empirical findings indicate, the ITEs’ perceptions of NESTs seem to be less informed by
the stereotype.

With regard to previous studies, the three ITEs’ views are consistent with the views of
participants in research conducted by Mahboob (2004), Benke and Medgyes (2005), Ma
(2012), Chun (2014), and Walkinshaw and Oanh (2014); in the research NESTs were seen by
the participants as having good competence in English language.

**Having good pronunciation**

In terms of language, NESTs were also perceived as having good pronunciation by
Vita, Hepti and Syaifur:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td>Their strength... <em>they can be good examples for students in terms of pronunciation.</em> They pronounce words the way the words should be pronounced. <em>Their pronunciation is accurate.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepti</td>
<td>As far as I know, <em>that [pronunciation] becomes the strength</em>... They can motivate students... and students are interested to learn and speak English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syaifur</td>
<td><em>Their pronunciation is better,</em> because English is their daily language... <em>they use it every day.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such views of Vita, Hepti and Syaifur that NESTs have good pronunciation are similar
to the views of two students in section 4.4.1 and three parents in subchapter 5.4. Although the
ITEs’ perceptions are consistent with the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers in terms of
language, they cannot be regarded as being predominantly influenced by the stereotype. This
is indicated by two factors. First, the ITEs involved in this study had sufficient competence in English with which to value NESTs’ language, unlike other participants such as students, parents and OSTs who had low English language competence. Second, as the empirical findings demonstrate, the native speaker fallacy, the belief that ideal English teachers are native speakers of English, is not visible among the ITEs (see 7.1). Therefore, the three ITEs’ perceptions of NESTs are more credible than those of the students, parents and OSTs. With regard to previous research, the views are consistent with the perceptions of participants in studies conducted by Mahboob (2004), Benke and Medgyes (2005), and Sung (2014). Participants in Mahboob’s (2004) research saw NESTs as having better oral skills. More specifically, students in Benke and Medgyes’ (2005), and Sung’s (2014) studies saw NESTs as better teachers in terms of pronunciation.

**Pedagogy**

In terms of pedagogy, NESTs were perceived by four ITEs as using different ways of teaching which the ITEs thought to be unsuitable for local students.

**Teaching differently**

Vita, Hepti, Syaifur and Asri perceived NESTs as using different methods in teaching, which they thought to be unsuitable for local students:

---

| Vita | The impression is... not all of them can teach local students. How they handle the class... I think that’s because their culture is different. They have seen and experienced different things in their schools. Students here are different... the reaction is different. |
---
Hepti  
I think it’s difficult for native English-speaking teachers to teach because we have different culture. I have asked them…their way of teaching might not be suitable for students.

Syaifur  
I can’t ask them to teach, because they don’t know what students need, and also the curriculum. Well, generally students are happy, but the teaching is different… not appropriate with the curriculum. What the curriculum requires… the competence, the objective. If the school is like course providers, that doesn’t matter. For high schools, I don’t think so.

Asri  
Every teacher has different characters. They have different styles in teaching. Students can value… this teacher is A… that teacher is B… A is like this, and B is like that. Native English-speaking teachers… I think native English-speaking teachers bring a different learning environment, informal. Good but not appropriate for schools.

Generally, the view of the four ITEs that NESTs teach differently, which the ITEs thought to be unsuitable for local students, are similar to the views of some students involved in group discussions (see 4.4.2) and one OST (see 6.4). While the four ITEs perceived NESTs as teaching differently, the students saw NESTs as not knowing teaching methods appropriate for local students; one OST perceived NESTs as not knowing local curriculum. Negative perceptions about NESTs’ pedagogy were only expressed by the four ITEs, some students in group discussions, and one OST. On the other hand, students in interviews (see 4.4.1) and parents (see 5.4) did not express any negative views with regard to NESTs’ pedagogy.

The way the four ITEs perceived NESTs as teaching differently is likely to be related to the ITEs’ awareness and understandings of students’ learning objectives. Furthermore, it seems to be based on their knowledge of the local curriculum and education system in
general. Additionally, the ITEs’ views of local students could also contribute to the way the ITEs saw NESTs in terms of their pedagogical capacity.

With regard to previous studies, the views of the four ITEs are consistent with the views of participants in Samimy and Brutt-Griffler’s (1999), Arva and Medgyes’ (2000), and Ma’s (2012) studies. Future NNESTs in Samimy and Brutt-Griffler’s study saw NESTs as being informal in teaching. Such a view is particularly similar to the views of Syaifur and Asri. While Syaifur thought that the way NESTs’ teaching is more appropriate for English course providers, not schools, Asri explicitly mentioned that NESTs bring informal learning environments to school contexts. That NESTs’ way of teaching is informal was also expressed by NNESTs in Arva and Medgyes’ (2000) study. Furthermore, in Ma’s (2012) study NESTs were perceived by the participants as being too casual in teaching; the teachers were seen as being too informal and not oriented to the local curriculum.

**Culture**

Four ITEs valued NESTs in terms of cultural aspects. NESTs were seen positively as knowing English-related cultures by three teachers and negatively as not knowing local cultures by one ITE.

*Knowing English-related cultures*

NESTs were perceived as knowing English-related cultures by Vita, Wahyu and Mamik:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vita</th>
<th>They know culture related to English... all things that are related.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
That... we don't know. We can speak the language. But for the culture? They know more. That is interesting for students. While we can’t... because we don’t live in their culture.

Wahyu

Other thing... oh this is European culture, this and that. They know the culture of English-speaking countries. That becomes their advantage.

Mamik

Native speakers have the culture. That's the aim... besides learning the language. We also introduce the culture to students. Here are native English speakers. Here is the culture. It's the culture they bring.

The views of Vita, Wahyu and Mamik are similar to the views of two OSTs in subchapter 6.4; the OSTs perceived NESTs as knowing cultures related to English. Four students in interviews valued NESTs in terms of culture; however, the students saw NESTs as having cultures which they thought to be 'better, more modern, and advanced' (see 4.4.1). None of the parents perceived NESTs in terms of cultural aspects. The way Vita, Wahyu and Mamik saw NESTs seems to be related to their understandings of particular features which the NESTs have with regard to culture and the view that learning cultures related to English is an important part of English language learning; their perceptions are likely to be related to their teaching experience and experience in working collaboratively with NESTs. Furthermore, the three ITEs’ perceptions of NESTs are consistent with the views of participants in Ma’s (2012) and Walkinshaw and Oanh’s (2014) studies. The participants in the two studies saw NESTs as having cultural knowledge related to English.
**Not knowing local culture**

One ITE, Asri, perceived NESTs as not knowing local cultures. She asserted that, unlike local teachers who understand local social values and cultures, NESTs do not know local cultures:

---

Asri  
*Native English-speaking teachers do not know local culture. They can learn our language and culture, but still they cannot be like us who grew up naturally here. We learn unconsciously. We understand local social values and culture.*

---

Asri's view is similar to the views of three students in interviews (see 4.4.1) and one OST in interviews with OSTs (see 6.4); NESTs were perceived by the students and the OST as not knowing local cultures. The way Asri saw NESTs could be attributed to her understanding of features which NESTs do not have and her experiences in teaching and working collaboratively with NESTs at the school.
7.5. The way ITEs perceive themselves

Subchapter 4.5 has demonstrated that the students had various perceptions of ITEs. ITEs were perceived by the students in terms of six aspects: language, culture, pedagogy, L2 learning experience, knowledge and roles. The students saw ITEs as having strengths and weaknesses. The perceptions of the students depict a heterogeneous image of the teachers. The findings suggest that the students’ perceptions of ITEs had been informed by various factors, such as the students’ experience in learning English with both NESTs and ITEs, and the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers. The findings indicate that NESTs were used as a good standard/a benchmark by the students for valuing ITEs. Furthermore, the way the students perceived ITEs seems to have been informed by sociocultural, economic and political aspects related to English; their views had been shaped by the image of English-speaking countries.

On the other hand, subchapter 5.5 shows that the parents’ perceptions reflect a negative image of ITEs. The parents had various perceptions of ITEs in terms of three aspects: language, pedagogy and culture; ITEs were perceived by the parents as having more weaknesses than strengths. As the empirical findings indicate, the way the parents perceived ITEs seems to have been influenced by their past experience in learning English from ITEs, their awareness of characteristics which ITEs have, the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers and the belief that learning English-related cultures is an important part of English language learning.

Subchapter 6.5 demonstrates that the OSTs perceived ITEs in terms of three aspects: culture, language and L2 learning experience. Similar to the students’ perceptions, the OSTs’ perceptions of ITEs depict a heterogeneous image of the teachers. ITEs were seen by the OSTs as having strengths and weaknesses with regard to these three aspects. The parents’
perceptions of ITEs seem to have been influenced by their past experience in learning English from ITEs, their awareness of characteristics which ITEs have, the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers, and their belief that learning English-related cultures is an important part of English learning.

Empirical findings from interviews with the ITEs indicate that despite the other participants’ views of ITEs, generally the six ITEs had positive self-perceptions, reflected by their feeling about being English teachers and by the way they saw themselves as English teachers who have different strengths and weaknesses rather than as less competent ones. Such self-perceptions of the ITEs are likely to be related to two aspects:

1. The teachers’ awareness of different characteristics of NESTs and ITEs, and their ability to recognize their distinctive features as strengths (Tajfel, 1978)
2. The teachers’ ability to see other individuals, especially students, as important part of their professional selves (Hermans, 2001)

7.5.1. ITEs’ perceptions of themselves

Empirical findings from interviews with the six ITEs indicate that the teachers perceived themselves positively. The ITEs’ perceptions of their professional selves are reflected by their feelings about being Indonesian teachers who teach English and by the way they saw themselves as different teachers rather than less competent ones.
Feeling about being English teachers: I enjoy teaching... being an English teacher

In this study ITEs’ perceptions of themselves can be seen from their feelings about being English teachers. As Riding and Rayner (2001) propose, individuals’ feelings can reveal how negatively or positively the individuals perceive themselves; feelings are self-perception indicators as they are ‘the product of the intrinsically private introspection of some inner reality’ (Laird, 2007, p. 7).

Three ITEs shared their feelings about being Indonesian teachers who teach English. Generally, what the teachers expressed implies that they had positive perceptions of their professional selves:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td>I still feel comfortable teaching them, enjoying what I do everyday although sometimes my students see things differently. I mean local teachers and native English-speaking teachers. I love being an English teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamik</td>
<td>I enjoy teaching... being an English teacher although they often compare... perhaps because of my experience, I am one of the oldest teachers here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahyu</td>
<td>I love teaching... becoming an English teacher. I enjoy this much... myself. But for me, it’s for me... It’s been eight years and still I enjoy teaching English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The way ITEs saw themselves as different teachers: We are so much different

Besides their feelings of being English teachers, the ITEs’ perceptions of their professional selves can also be seen from the way they saw themselves positively as different teachers rather than negatively as less competent ones. Such perceptions were expressed by Vita, Hepti, Asri and Syaifur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td>We have different things. Indonesian teachers are different. We have different things which become our advantages. I think we can complement each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepti</td>
<td>The point is we are different and cannot be compared. We have different strengths and weaknesses. We are so much different. They have their own strengths and so do we.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asri</td>
<td>Well, if we are compared to native English-speaking teachers, we are different. We have different things to give.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syaifur</td>
<td>We have different characteristics... different from them. We teach the same subject, but we have different strengths.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5.2. Aspects contributing to ITEs' perceptions

Section 7.4.1 has demonstrated that the six ITEs perceived their professional identity positively as shown by their positive feelings about being English teachers and the way they saw themselves as different teachers. This study acknowledges that individuals’ identity is
complex 'both in its contents and its derivations' (Tajfel, 1978, p. 63); the six teachers’ perceptions can be understood as being shaped by various factors. Using Tajfel’s (1978) social identity theory and Hermans’ (2001) dialogical self theory as analytical frameworks, the study identifies two factors which are likely to have shaped the way the teachers perceived their professional selves: (1) ITEs’ awareness of different characteristics of NESTs and NNESTs, and their ability to see their distinctive features as strengths, and (2) the teachers’ ability to see other individuals, especially students, as important part of their professional selves.

**Awareness of different characteristics of ITEs and NESTs**

The first aspect which is likely to have contributed to the six ITEs’ positive perceptions of their professional selves is the teachers’ awareness of different features which ITEs and NESTs have, and the ITEs’ ability to see their distinctive features as strengths. Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978) holds that identity is socially constructed through social comparisons. Individuals maintain their identity by valuing their in-groups and devaluing perceived out-groups. Individual members of a group will use their value differentials or distinctive characteristics to maintain their positive identity (Tajfel, 1978). They will attempt to ‘maximize a sense of their positive psychological distinctiveness by establishing terms for the comparison that will favour in-group membership’ (McNamara, 1997, p.563). Consistent with Tajfel’s social identity theory, the findings of this study indicate that the six ITEs were aware about different characteristics which ITEs and NESTs have and that the ITEs saw their distinctive features as strengths for establishing positive views of themselves. The six ITEs perceived themselves in terms of four aspects: language, culture, pedagogy and L2 learning experience (Table 27. ITEs’ self-perceptions).
Table 27. ITEs’ self-perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Positive Perceptions</th>
<th>Negative Perceptions</th>
<th>ITEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Sharing mother tongue with students</td>
<td>Not having good pronunciation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Sharing cultural background with students</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Having more knowledge about local education</td>
<td>Having better teaching skills</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 learning experience</td>
<td>Having experience in learning English as a second language</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language**

Four ITEs perceived themselves in terms of language aspect. Three of the four teachers thought that they do not have good English pronunciation. However, all of the four ITEs saw themselves positively as sharing mother tongue with their students.

**Not having good English pronunciation**

Three ITEs asserted that they had a weakness with regard to their English. The teachers thought that they do not have good pronunciation. Such a perception was mentioned by Vita, Hepti and Syaifur.

---

Vita

*Pronunciation is our weakness. Because English is not our mother tongue, we sometimes make mistakes.*

*In terms of pronunciation, of course, native speaker teachers are much better.*
The above excerpts indicate that the three ITEs perceived themselves as not having good English pronunciation with regard to their language. Such a self-perception is different from the views of participants in previous studies (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999; Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Ma, 2012). Future NNESTs in Samimy and Brutt-Griffler’s study perceived themselves as using their mother tongue excessively, while NNESTs in Arva and Medgyes’ research saw themselves as having low English language competence. Similar to teachers in Arva and Medgyes’ study, NNESTs in Ma’s (2012) research perceived themselves as having inadequate English proficiency. While the ITEs and participants of previous research focused on the same aspect, which is language, they had various self-perceptions with regard to this aspect. More importantly, the perceptions of the three ITEs indicate that the teachers are aware of their perceived language weakness. Such awareness is important in the process of social comparison as it becomes a psychological basis for the teachers to identify distinctive features which can maximize their positive views of themselves (Tajfel, 1978).
**Sharing a mother tongue with students**

While three of the four ITEs saw themselves as having a disadvantage with regard to language aspect, all of the four ITEs perceived themselves as having an advantage, which is sharing a mother tongue with students. Such a view was expressed by Vita, Hepti, Wahyu and Syaifur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td><em>But they [ITEs] have a special advantage. They can build close interaction with the students. Students... they feel more comfortable when asking questions to local teachers because the teachers understand their language.</em> Such as our Indonesian language that we use for helping students learn... bridging understanding, helping the teachers as well as the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepti</td>
<td><em>But we do have other things to offer, things that native English speakers don’t have, like our shared mother tongue. We talk in Indonesian language, which can help us become better teachers. But if we are asked to explain teaching materials, we are understood better by the students because we mix... we mix the languages. That’s our advantage.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahyu</td>
<td><em>It doesn’t mean that ITEs can teach the language to others... we have our first language.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syaifur</td>
<td><em>One thing, mother tongue helps me. I often experience, I use Indonesian language or even Javanese language to explain things to students, because they don’t fully understand English. That, native English speakers don’t do that, do they? Except if the native speakers learn Indonesian or Javanese language, but that's really difficult.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The views of Vita, Hepti, Wahyu and Syaifur indicate that they are able to identify their value differentials or distinctive features in terms of language; they perceived themselves as having an advantage in the form of a shared mother tongue with their students which they thought had various uses, such as helping them in their teaching, in understanding students and in building close relationships with students. Furthermore, they used such an advantage to maximize their positive ‘psychological distinctiveness’ by comparing themselves to NESTs whom the ITEs saw as not having such a feature. While such a social comparison process is implied in the responses Vita and Wahyu, it is explicitly shown by the responses of Hepti and Syaifur who are clear that NESTs do not share the first language with students.

Such views of the four ITEs are similar to the views of NNESTs in Arva and Medgyes’ (2000) study. The teacher participants of the study saw themselves as sharing the same first language with students, which the teachers thought could help them become more sensitive to students’ learning needs. Further, the views of Vita, Hepti, Wahyu and Syaifur are also similar to the views of NNESTs in Ma’s (2012) study. Teachers in Ma’s research saw the first language, which they shared with students, as an advantage. They thought that the language could help them communicate easily with local students and therefore understand more of the needs and difficulties of the students in learning English.

**Culture**

Four ITEs perceived themselves in terms of culture. The teachers saw themselves positively as sharing a cultural background with their students. They regarded the shared cultural background as an advantage.
Sharing a cultural background with students

That ITEs have an advantage with regard to culture was expressed by Vita, Mamik, Hepti and Asri. The teachers are clear that they shared a cultural background with their students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td>Also, our culture... we share the same culture with the students. That helps teachers understand the students. They, native English-speaking teachers, don’t have that. I think that’s a gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamik</td>
<td>The fact that I am from this place is very important for me. Because of that, I can understand my students. You know, in every knowledge transfer there shouldn’t be things to be scared of, so that students learn better. I know that thing. I understand more...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepti</td>
<td>One more thing, we grew up and learned in the same environment with the students. Our culture is the students’ culture. This makes us understand them much better. We are more sensitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asri</td>
<td>Because we were born here, in an environment which is also the students’ environment. Thus, we share the same social and cultural backgrounds with the students. Because of this, I feel that I have other things, different things, to offer, which become my strengths over native English-speaking teachers. I know native teachers can learn our culture, learn how to interact with the students. But it’s still different, not enough. They can’t be like us, who grew up naturally... acquire unconsciously. We acquire sociocultural values and understandings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While four ITEs in the previous section saw the first language which they share with their students as an advantage, four ITEs in this section perceived themselves as having an advantage in the form of a shared cultural background with local students. Vita, Mamik, Hepti and Asri were able to identify their distinctive features in terms of culture; they also maximized their psychological distinctiveness by comparing themselves to NESTs whom they saw as not possessing such an advantage. The social comparison process is implied by the responses of Mamik and Hepti, and is explicitly reflected by the responses of Vita and Asri.

With regard to previous research, such views of the four teachers are consistent with the views of participants in studies conducted by Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999), and Ma (2012). NNESTs in Samimy and Brutt-Griffler’s study saw themselves as knowing students’ cultural background. Similarly, NNESTs in Ma’s study also saw themselves as sharing the same cultural background with local students; they reported that the shared background could help teachers better understand students.

**Pedagogy**

Vita, Asri and Hepti perceived themselves in terms of pedagogy; they saw themselves as having more knowledge about local education and having better teaching skills.

**Having more knowledge about local education**

That ITEs have more knowledge about local education was expressed by Vita and Asri:

Vita  
_They also have background knowledge about local education... in this sense they are better, better than native English speakers_
Asri
Curriculum is also important. You know, in the school we have a formal purpose to learn, not just learning English. Our advantage, we know the purpose. We know that students must pass the exams.

Vita and Asri perceived themselves as having a distinctive feature with regard to pedagogy, which is having more knowledge about local education. The awareness that NESTs do not have such a characteristic was reflected by the response of Vita, while Asri did not explicitly mention it. Both Vita and Asri saw the distinctive feature as an advantage of ITEs. The views of Vita and Asri are similar to the views of participants in Ma’s (2012) study. The participants in Ma’s study perceived themselves as better understanding the local education system.

**Having better teaching skills**

Vita and Hepti perceived ITEs as having better teaching skills because they thought that ITEs know the local students better than NESTs:

**Vita**
Perhaps local teachers are better for local students because the teachers know how to teach, how to manage the class... I mean class management. I think our teaching skills are better because we understand our students.

**Hepti**
Once there were native English speakers at the school. Although they were native, they couldn’t teach... even they couldn’t explain grammar. When I asked them, they explained that it’s actually just like us speaking Indonesian language.

We know our students. We can teach them better.
That ITEs have better teaching skills because they know local students more than NESTs asserted by Vita and Hepti has not been mentioned by participants in previous studies. Furthermore, the views of the two ITEs indicate that they identified a particular characteristic of ITEs, which is knowing local students, as an advantage. They used the characteristic as a value differential for valuing ITEs over NESTs. In other words, the two ITEs perceived themselves positively as having better teaching skills because they thought that ITEs better know local students and that NESTs do not share this knowledge. Generally, this suggests that the process of social comparison plays an important role in the ITEs’ perceptions of themselves.

**L2 learning experience**

Two ITEs perceived themselves positively as having experience in learning English as a second language. The teachers saw the experience as an advantage of ITEs.

**Having experience in learning English as a second language**

That ITEs have experience as second language learners was expressed by Asri and Syaifur. The two ITEs reported that their language learning experience is an advantage for them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asri</th>
<th>I was once a student. That’s my motivation, I’m sure I can teach my students well, because I was once a student, I learned just like them. They study English. I also experienced the same thing. I studied too. Native English-speaking teachers never did that, learning English as a second language.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syaifur</td>
<td>But for students here, for teaching in Indonesia, I think</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indonesian teachers are better, more suitable for students. We have learning experience. We learned English just like our students do. So we do understand their difficulties, challenges which the students face. Did native English speakers experience this? I don’t think they did.

The views of Asri and Syaifur, that ITEs have experience in learning English as a second language, is consistent with the views of teacher participants in Ma’s (2012) study. The participants of Ma’s study saw themselves as having experience as second language learners which help them understand students’ needs and difficulties. Furthermore, the way Asri and Syaifur perceived themselves in terms of second language learning experiences indicate that they use these experiences as a basis for valuing themselves positively. Both of them were aware that NESTs do not have experience in learning English as a second language. They saw the experience as an advantage and use it for establishing positive self-perception.

Others in the selves: students as important part of ITEs’ professional identity

The second aspect which is likely to have contributed to the six ITEs’ positive perceptions of their professional identity is the way the teachers saw their students as significant others, part of the teachers’ selves as English teachers (Hermans, 2001). As presented in the literature review, in this study identity is seen as being socially shaped by other individuals (Hall, 1996; Norton, 1997; Varghese et al., 2005; Fina et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2011; Vignoles et al., 2011). Other individuals are thought of as being essential part of the selves; the individuals ‘play a constitutive role in the creation of meaning’ (Hermans, 2008, p.
Empirical findings from interviews with the six ITEs indicate that three ITEs perceived students as an important element of their identity as English teachers.

The views that students are significant others whom the ITEs saw as important part of their professional selves are reflected by the responses of Hepti, Asri and Syaifur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITE</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hepti</td>
<td><em>I feel safe. My students speak Indonesian language. I think Indonesian teachers are more suitable for Indonesian students.</em>&lt;br&gt;My students are my motivation for being a teacher. Every end of semester I ask them to give feedback, and that becomes my motivation to be a better English teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asri</td>
<td>A very important aspect, our students are just like us. Students are part of the teacher. Because they are from this place, from the same culture, I feel so sure that I can be a good teacher for them. I feel so comfortable teaching English, a language which is not my language, not my mother tongue, because it's not students’ mother tongue too, because they also don't speak English. They are from here, they speak Indonesian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syaifur</td>
<td>Sometimes I feel that they question me, doubt me. It seems that students often compare me with the native teachers. It feels like being judged, being evaluated. But that's ok... that motivates me. Every time I teach, I always try to be better. I always learn how to speak better, to pronounce words better. Every time I teach, before I enter the class, I always think about my students, my targets. I always think how I can be a good English teacher for them. That pushes me to keep learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.6. Chapter conclusions

This chapter has presented and discussed findings from interviews with the six ITEs, covering five themes: how the ITEs perceived English (7.1), how they conceptualized an ideal English teacher (7.2), how they understood the term ‘native English speaker’ (7.3), how they perceived NESTs (7.4), and how the ITEs perceived their own professional identity (7.5).

The chapter has demonstrated that the ITEs perceived English as an important language because they had particular views about English, including English as access to knowledge, English as providing study or job opportunities, and English as part of globalization. Based on the findings, it has been argued in the chapter that the way the ITEs saw English has been informed by the belief that knowledge is predominantly produced and transferred in English, their awareness of the status and functions of English in the context of the study, and the image of English as closely related to globalization.

Next, this chapter has indicated that the six ITEs conceptualized an ideal English teacher variously in terms of personal quality, pedagogical quality, language and knowledge of cultures. The native speaker fallacy was not visible among the ITEs. None of the teachers expressed that native English speakers are ideal English teachers.

This chapter has also shown that the ITEs’ understandings of the term ‘native English speaker’ are unproblematic. They defined a ‘native English speaker’ in terms of language and geographical context. Generally, the ITEs’ understandings align with the definitions of a ‘native speaker’ proposed by researchers.

With regard to the way ITEs perceived NESTs, the chapter has demonstrated that the ITEs’ perceptions depict a heterogeneous image of NESTs. They perceived NESTs as having strengths and weaknesses in terms of language, pedagogy and culture. The ITEs’ perceptions seem to be less informed by the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers. Rather, the way
the ITEs saw NESTs seems to have been predominantly shaped by the OSTs’ experience in interacting with NESTs.

Last, this chapter has demonstrated that despite the other participants’ various views of ITEs, generally, the six ITEs perceived themselves positively, indicated by their feelings about being English teachers and the way they saw themselves as English teachers who have different strengths and weaknesses rather than as less competent ones. Such self-perceptions of ITEs are likely to be related to two factors: ITEs’ awareness of different characteristics of NESTs and NNESTs, and the ITEs’ ability to see their distinctive features as strengths (Tajfel, 1978); and the ITEs’ ability to see other individuals, particularly students as an important element of their professional selves (Hermans, 2001).
Chapter 8
Discussion

This study involved four groups of participants: students, parents, OSTs and ITEs. Findings from data collected from each group have been presented and discussed separately in previous chapters. In this chapter, I present summaries of findings from the four groups of participants and discuss the way they align.

8.1. Review of research objectives and questions

As presented in the introductory chapter, this qualitative study explores the way various education stakeholders, including students, parents and OSTs, perceive the professional identity of ITEs. More importantly, it investigates the way ITEs perceive their own professional selves despite the other stakeholders’ perceptions. The study also explores related issues, such as the way the various stakeholders see English, the way they conceptualize an ideal English teacher, the way they understand the term ‘native English speaker’ and how the stakeholders perceive NESTs.

Guided by the research objectives, this study has addressed the following research questions:

1. How do the various education stakeholders perceive English?
2. How do they conceptualize an ideal English teacher?
3. How do they understand the term ‘native English speaker’?
4. How do they perceive native English-speaking teachers?
5. How do they perceive Indonesian teachers of English?
8.2. How do the various stakeholders perceive English?

For all participants involved in the research, English is more than a compulsory school subject in the education system. They perceive English as an important language to learn because they have particular views about the language. Five views were identified in the study (Table 28. Participants' views of English). Such views were not mentioned by all individuals from the four groups of participants. Rather, there are variations among the individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views of English</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>OSTs</th>
<th>ITEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English as an international language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as providing study and/or job opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as social status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as access to knowledge, particularly western knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as closely related to globalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The way the participants perceived English is complex, reflecting their ideas, beliefs and assumptions about the language. Their perceptions of English had been informed by various factors such as the ‘myth’ of English as an international language, the disparity of power between English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries, the dominance/hegemony of English, the status and functions of English in the context of the research and the way English is associated with globalization.

---

6 For all tables in this chapter, the shaded boxes denote which respondents identified particular views CHARACTERISTICS THEMES.
English as an international language

The view of ‘English as an international language’ was reported by some students and parents; such a view was not found among the OSTs and ITEs. While this view is dominant in the students’ perceptions, it was not dominant in the perceptions of the parents. With regard to this view, the way the students perceived English aligns with the way the parents saw the language in that there are two understandings underlying the perception.

As presented in subchapters 4.1 (students) and 5.1 (parents), two aspects with regard to ‘English as an international language’ were identified. The first aspect refers to the understanding of ‘English as an international language’ as reflecting the notion of English as a lingua franca (Widdowson, 1998; Sarifian, 2009). Such an understanding is in line with the notion of English as a language of intercultural communication (Sarifian, 2009); it refers to how English is used for communication by individuals across different cultures. The second aspect refers to ‘English as an international language’ as a taken-for-granted term which was identified among the students and parents. As argued in sections 4.1 and 5.1, the way some students and one parent saw English indicates that there is a ‘myth’ of English as an international language informing their perceptions. The ‘myth’ refers to the way English is repeatedly mentioned as ‘an international language’ (Pennycook, 2004); it implies ‘a construction, as a telling of a particular story about English’ (Pennycook, 2006, p 26). Because of such a ‘myth’ the term ‘English as an international language’ becomes an easily taken-for-granted term.

What factor has contributed to the myth of ‘English as an international language’? The myth can be attributed to how English is commonly referred to in the context of the research, particularly in the school community. As described in the literature review, in Indonesia, ‘English as an international language’ is a pervasive term, easily found in many official documents; the term is often mentioned by individuals in the local community. Parker (2014)
argues that ‘the reference to something, the simple use of a noun, comes to give that object a reality’ (p. 8). The way English is continuously mentioned as ‘an international language’ has produced a perceived ‘reality’ for individuals who take the term easily and uncritically. Furthermore, such a term ‘depoliticizes’ English (Pennycook, 2004, p. 31). It ‘does so, not by ignoring English, but by constantly talking about it, making English innocent, giving it a natural and eternal justification, a clarity which is not that of a description but an assumption of fact’ (p. 31).

**English as providing study or job opportunities**

The second view, English as a language which can provide study and job opportunities, was asserted by some participants from all the four groups: students (4.1), parents (5.1), OSTs (6.1) and ITEs (7.1). The view is dominant in the parents’ and OSTs’ perceptions of English. The perceptions of the participants from the four groups align with each other as they had a similar way of perceiving English.

The participants perceived English as being able to provide its users with material and social gain in the form of further study and job opportunities. English was seen by the participants as linguistic capital which can be converted into economic and social capital (Bourdieu, 1986). Because the participants perceived English as linguistic capital, in their view, English learning can be regarded as an ‘investment’ (Norton Pierce, 1995; Norton, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2006a, 2006b, 2010, 2013).

Why do the participants see English learning as an ‘investment’? Their view could be attributed to the status and functions of English in the context of the study. As Lie (2007) describes, English language proficiency is commonly regarded by employers in Indonesia as a factor which determines job positions. Furthermore, in the Indonesian education system,
English has a special status as a foreign language which students have to learn at almost all levels. Therefore, in Indonesia, learning English gives tangible benefits. The functions and status of English result from the way it is privileged in various domains in Indonesia, which could be related to two factors: first, the way English is seen as ‘a counter language’ to Dutch by Indonesia political leaders (Anderson, 1990, p. 125), and second, the power of English-speaking countries, particularly the US and the UK, which influenced the way Indonesia took its shape in the post-war era (Anderson, 1990; Philpott, 2000; Vicker, 2005). As argued in the literature review, after Indonesia gained its independence in 1945, the Indonesian Government preferred English to be the medium of international communication and the main foreign language to be taught in Indonesian schools (Paauw, 2009). Such a decision was due to the anti-Dutch movement taking place in Indonesia. Indonesian leaders regarded Dutch as the language of the enemy (Anderson, 1990; Mistar, 2005; Paauw, 2009). On the other hand, English was seen as ‘a counter language’ which has a special stature and advantage as a vehicle of international communication (Anderson, 1990; Paauw, 2009). The decision of the Indonesian Government with regard to English was also strongly influenced by the power of the US and the UK (Lauder, 2008; Paauw, 2009). In the 1950s, the US and the UK became two dominant countries which exerted their economic, cultural and political power on other countries, including Indonesia (Anderson, 1990; Philpott, 2000; Vicker, 2005). Although such factors are historical, they contribute to the discourse in which English is privileged. Subsequently, English has particular functions and status in the context of the study. Further, the functions and status of English have been received by the participants as ‘natural’ and ‘neutral’ (Pennycook, 1994, p. 9). They saw English as providing tangible benefits; therefore, they perceived English learning as an ‘investment’.

Pennycook (2004) argues that there is the ‘delusionary’ effect of English. English ‘deludes many learners through the false promises it holds out for social and material gain...
[it] holds out promise of social and economic development to all those who learn it’ (p. 26). It is important to acknowledge the existence of such an effect as the product of a complex discourse involving various aspects, including sociocultural, economic and political factors related to English, and that the effect might influence the way individuals perceive the language. However, as indicated by the empirical findings of the study, the participants’ view of English as providing study and job opportunities seems to be based on their understandings of the status and functions of English in Indonesia, and also of the benefits which individuals can get from learning the language. As the way the participants perceived English as providing study or job opportunities reflects an understanding of the actual discourse of English in Indonesia, the participants’ view cannot be seen as 'delusional'. In other words, the way the participants perceived English as providing study and job opportunities does not seem to be primarily influenced by the 'delusional' effects of English. Rather, the participants’ views seem to be predominantly informed by their awareness of the actual discourse of English in Indonesia. The participants were aware that, due to the status and functions of English in Indonesia, learning English could give them opportunities for social and material gain.

**English as social status**

The view of English as social status was found only among students and parents; none of the OSTs and ITEs expressed this view. Some students (see 4.1) and parents (see 5.1) perceived English as denoting high social status. The students’ perceptions of English align with the perceptions of the parents. English was seen by both the students and parents as being able to provide its users with symbolic profit which positions them better in the local
community; it is perceived as language capital which can be converted into social capital (Bourdieu, 1986). In their view, English is closely related to the positions of the speakers in the social structure (Bourdieu, 1986; Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991).

It has been argued in the previous section that because English was seen by the participants as linguistic capital, English learning can be regarded as a form of investment in terms of economic aspects. Taking this notion further, that English was perceived by the students and parents as representing high social status in the local community suggests that English learning is also an investment in terms of learners' identities. This aligns with Norton's (2001) assertion that a second language learner's investment in a target language is 'an investment in a learner's own identity, an identity which is constantly changing across time and space' (p. 166).

The way the students and parents perceived English as denoting high social status also suggests that English learning involves a process of social imagination. The students and parents saw English as being able to expand the identity of English learners, creating images of English speakers who have high status in the local community; they saw English as being able to generate 'imagined identities' (Norton, 1997, 2000, 2013). Therefore, not only does the view reveal the way the students and parents saw English, it also reflects how they perceived individuals who speak the language.

What factors have contributed to such a view of the students and parents? The view of English as denoting high social status in the local community expressed by the students and parents is closely related to the previously identified views of English as an international language and as providing study and job opportunities; the views are closely intertwined. As previously argued, English has been privileged in various domains in Indonesia, particularly in education and professional settings (Lie, 2007). Subsequently, individuals learning English
could potentially access material and social gain, in turn becoming associated with high social status.

Additionally, in order to understand why English could be seen as representing high social status in the local community, it is important to discuss how the language is often constructed by the media in general. Murray and Christison (2011) argue that English is often perceived as a language which indicates a high social or ‘modern’ lifestyle. It is a language which becomes a gatekeeper to prestige (Pennycook, 1994). In Indonesia, English has been promoted by ‘MTV-like stations’; it has been constructed by the media as a language which reflects an ‘urban lifestyle’ (Lie, 2007, p. 3). Such a circumstance can also be regarded as a factor which has shaped the way English is seen by individuals in the local community.

**English as access to knowledge**

The view of English as access to knowledge was asserted by some participants from all four groups. However, the beliefs of the participants underlying the view do not align with each other. The view of the OSTs and ITEs is based on the belief that knowledge is predominantly transferred via English. The view of the students is related to both the belief that knowledge is predominantly transferred in English and the belief that knowledge from English-speaking countries is superior, which reflects the disparity of power between English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries. On the other hand, the view of one parent is based only on the belief that knowledge from English-speaking countries is superior to that from non-English-speaking countries, in this case from Indonesia.

As the empirical findings have indicated, the way the participants saw English as access to knowledge is likely to have been shaped by two factors. First, there is a belief among the students, OSTs and ITEs that knowledge is predominantly communicated in English.
Therefore, English is seen as providing access to such knowledge. This belief can be attributed to the image of English as a dominant/hegemonic language in the world (Pennycook, 2004). Second, there is a belief among the students and parents that knowledge from English-speaking countries is superior to that from non-English-speaking countries. The way some participants perceived knowledge from English-speaking countries and non-English-speaking countries unequally reflects the fact that English is situated within a 'larger discursive framework' (Pennycook, 1994, p. 34). The language reflects the sociocultural, economic and political power of English-speaking countries (Pennycook, 1994, 1997; Graddol, 2006). As argued in the literature review, the sociocultural, economic and political power of the US and the UK has had a strong influence on Indonesia and, inescapably, on Indonesians (Vicker, 2005; Lauder, 2008; Paauw, 2009). The participants’ belief that knowledge from English-speaking countries is superior to that from non-English-speaking countries, specifically knowledge from Indonesia, can be regarded as an effect of the disparate power relations between English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries.

**English as closely related to globalization**

The last view identified in the study is English as being closely related to globalization. This view was found among the students and ITEs, but it was not expressed by the parents or OSTs. The way the students perceived English aligns with the way the ITEs saw the language. This view suggests that there is a ‘collusionary effect of English’ among the students and ITEs (Pennycook, 2004, p. 26); that is, English ‘colludes with multiple domains of globalization’ (Pennycook, 2007, p. 27). Such that, it is often seen by individuals as closely related to globalization (Wright, 2000; Sayer, 2012). It is often perceived as ‘a simplistic version of globalization’ (Pennycook, 2004, p. 26).
The way English was seen by the students and parents as closely related to globalization can be related to how English is socially constructed in the context of the research. As argued in the literature review, in Indonesia, there is a discourse where English is socially constructed as ‘the linguistic engine of globalization’ (Sayer, 2012, p. 2); it is seen as a linguistic commodity of globalization (Murray & Christison, 2011). Such a discourse has been described by Hamid (2012) and Candraningrum (2008). Hamid contends that, with regard to globalization, English in Indonesia is perceived as a language which helps the country interact with other countries. Candraningrum, on the other hand, describes the discourse more critically. She asserts that English is a colonial tool and globalization is a term legitimizing its imperialism. Both Hamid’s and Candraningrum’s views suggest that there is a discourse which relates English and globalization in the context of the research specifically, and in Indonesia more generally. The way the participants perceived English as closely related to globalization could be attributed to such a discourse.

8.3. How do the various stakeholders conceptualize an ideal English teacher?

The second issue explored in this study is the way the various education stakeholders conceptualize an ideal English teacher with regard to the native speaker fallacy, the belief that an ideal English teacher is a native speaker of English. This is a central issue for the research because of the focus on investigating the way the stakeholders perceived the professional identity of ITEs in relation to the strong preference for NESTs. More importantly, the participants’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher shed light on the complexity of the native speaker fallacy and reflect their expectations of English teachers. In this section, I
discuss two aspects: the presence of the native speaker fallacy among the participants and the perceived characteristics of an ideal English teacher.

The presence of the native speaker fallacy

The native speaker fallacy, the belief that ideal English teachers are native speakers of English, is visible in this study only among the students. Possibly, this is because the other participants were aware that being a native English speaker does not necessarily make an individual an ideal English teacher; instead, parents and teachers seem to understand that being a good English teacher requires various qualities, not only English language nativeness. The presence of the fallacy among the students is indicated by findings from interviews, which include image and textual data (see 4.2.1), and findings from group discussions (see 4.2.2).

The native speaker fallacy found among the students is not only based on their assumptions of the English language competence of native and non-native English speakers. There are also misconceptions underlying the native speaker fallacy. The misconceptions are:

1. Native English speakers are ‘white’ Caucasians. This misconception suggests that there is a racial dimension to the students’ various conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher. This aligns with Filho’s (2002) and Amin’s (2004) research. Filho found that participants in his study believed that NESTs are ‘white’ monolingual teachers. In Amin’s study, the participants believed that only ‘white’ Caucasians are native English speakers. The empirical findings of this study emphasize that race is a problematic aspect in the participants’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher, contributing to the native speaker fallacy.
2. The racial/physical features of native English speakers indicate the English language competence of the speakers. Some students conceptualized the speakers as ‘white’ Caucasians and related the speakers’ racial/physical features to their competence in English. They thought that ‘white’ speakers have good English language competence.

3. Because native English speakers have good English language competence, they are able to teach English well.

4. English learning involves learning cultures related to the language. Native English speakers are preferred by students because the speakers were seen as having knowledge of English cultures.

5. Native English speakers have broader knowledge and ‘advanced’ cultures because they were born and raised in English-speaking countries. This suggests that not only has the disparity of power between English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries influenced the way some students and parents perceived English (see 8.2), it has also influenced the way some students conceptualized an ideal English teacher.

6. Native English speakers speak with particular accents which the students regarded as ‘real’ or authentic.

*Perceived characteristics of an ideal English teacher*

Although the native speaker fallacy was found among the students, it was not dominant in the participants’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher. This study reveals that the participants had complex and multifaceted concepts of an ideal English teacher. They characterized the teacher in terms of seven aspects: personal quality, pedagogical quality, racial/native English speaker, language, experience, professionalism and knowledge of English-related cultures (Table 29).
Table 29. Perceived aspects of an ideal English teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>OSTs</th>
<th>ITEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/native English speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of English-related cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 29 indicates, three aspects are dominant in the participants’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher: personal quality, pedagogical quality and language. They can be found across all four groups of participants. This suggests that these perceived aspects are the most important; they reflect the participants’ expectation that the teacher should have certain characteristics in relation to personal quality, pedagogical quality and language aspects.

Various characteristics of an ideal English teacher were outlined by participants of the four groups with regard to the seven aspects. The characteristics are further presented in the following sections and discussed in terms of how the conceptualizations of the four groups of participants align.

**Personal quality**

Personal quality is a pervasive aspect in the participants’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher. The aspect can be found across the four groups of participants (Table 29). Various characteristics of an ideal English teacher in terms of personal quality were mentioned by participants from the four groups (Table 30).
This study has identified the following perceived personal characteristics of an ideal English teacher: friendly, patient, care about students, motivating, having discipline, close to students, funny, humorous, firm, nice, not strict, kind, understanding students and having a desire to learn. Such characteristics reflect the characteristics of a good teacher in general (Mullock, 2003; Arnon & Rachel, 2007; Barnes & Locked, 2013; Mahmoud & Thabet, 2013). It seems that, in conceptualizing a good English teacher in terms of personal quality, the participants drew on the characteristics of a good teacher. Additionally, the study also reveals that parents’ and OSTs’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher have been informed by the culturally-specific philosophy of ‘Guru’ – teachers as role models who should be imitated and followed.

As the findings indicate, the variations of the perceived personal characteristics of an ideal English teacher which the participants identified could be attributed to the following aspects:
1. The participants’ belief of personal characteristics which individuals in general and teachers in particular should have for establishing and maintaining good interpersonal/social relationships with other individuals, especially with students;
2. The participants’ belief about ideal processes of English language teaching or learning;
3. The participants’ views of the general characteristics of local students;
4. The participants learning and teaching experiences;
5. The culturally-specific philosophy of ‘Guru’.

**Pedagogical quality**

Besides personal quality, pedagogical quality is also a pervasive aspect in the participants’ conceptualizations of an ideal English teacher. Like personal quality, pedagogical quality can be found across all four groups of participants (Table 29). Various characteristics of an ideal English teacher in terms of pedagogical quality were reported by participants from the four groups (Table 31).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>OSTs</th>
<th>ITEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching interestingly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching innovatively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being practical in teaching (not theoretical)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching interactively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having the ability to manage class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having the ability to recognize students’ ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to pedagogical quality, this study identified such characteristics as teaching interestingly, teaching effectively, teaching innovatively, being practical in teaching,
teaching interactively, having the ability to manage a class and having the ability to recognize students’ ability as perceived pedagogical characteristics of an ideal English teacher. These identified characteristics also reflect the pedagogical features of a good teacher in general.

The various perceived pedagogical characteristics of an ideal English teacher which the participants mentioned could be related to:

1. The participants’ views of what good teachers in general should be able to do;
2. The participants’ views and beliefs of ideal processes of learning or teaching;
3. The participants’ experiences of learning or teaching English;
4. The views of the participants, particularly parents, OSTs and ITEs, of the general characteristics of local students.

**Language**

The third dominant aspect in terms of which the participants characterized an ideal English teacher is language. Similar to the personal quality and pedagogical quality aspects, language aspects can be found across all four groups of participants (Table 29).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>OSTs</th>
<th>ITEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having good English competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking fluently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using English frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Indonesian language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regard to language aspects, this study identified such characteristics as having good English competence, speaking fluently, using English frequently and speaking Indonesian as characteristics which the participants considered important (Table 32). That an ideal English teacher should have good English language competence was asserted by some participants from all four groups. However, three of the four characteristics, which are speaking fluently, using English frequently and speaking Indonesian, were only identified from interviews with the students. These perceived characteristics reflect the participants’ expectation of the teacher in terms of English language.

The various characteristics with regard to language aspects which the participants identified could be attributed to the following factors:

1. The view or belief that ideal English teachers should become role models for students with regard to the English language;
2. The participants’ English language learning experiences.

**Knowledge of English-related cultures**

The characterization that an ideal English teacher should have knowledge of English-related cultures was identified among the students and ITEs; it was not found among the parents and OSTs (Table 33).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>OSTs</th>
<th>ITEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having knowledge of English-related cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The way the students and parents characterized an ideal English teacher with regard to this aspect could be attributed to their belief that English learning includes learning cultures which are related to the language. It is important to acknowledge that some students held a misconception that there is a homogeneous culture related to English. The students were not aware that there are various cultures related to the language.

**Experience**

The characterization that an ideal English teacher must have teaching experience was found among the students (Table 34). Interestingly, it was not found among the parents, OSTs and ITEs. Such a perceived characteristic seems to be related to the students’ own learning experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>OSTs</th>
<th>ITEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienced in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professionalism**

The professionalism aspect was identified only by the OSTs (Table 29). An ideal English teacher was characterized by some OSTs as having the ability to do administrative tasks and to interact with other stakeholders (Table 35).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>OSTs</th>
<th>ITEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having the ability to do administrative tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having the ability to interact with other stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Such perceived characteristics could be attributed to the OSTs’ own profession as teachers at the context of the research. The way the OSTs characterized an ideal English teacher in terms of the professionalism aspect seems to have been informed by their professional experiences and views as teachers.

8.4. How do the various stakeholders understand the term ‘native English speaker’?

The participants understood the term ‘native English speaker’ variously in terms of five aspects: geographical context, language, race, culture and infancy (Table 36). While generally their understandings are in line with the definitions of a ‘native speaker’ proposed by researchers, it is found that there are some misconceptions among the students and parents. The misconceptions found among the students are related to three aspects: geographical context, race and language. On the other hand, the misconceptions found among the parents are related to two aspects: geographical context and race.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>OSTs</th>
<th>ITEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographical context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Geographical context**

Descriptions of a ‘native English speaker’ in terms of geographical context were mentioned by some participants from all four groups (Table 36). A closer examination reveals some variations in their understandings. Generally, the understandings of OSTs and ITEs are consistent with the definitions of a ‘native speaker’ proposed by Edge (1988) and Rampton (1990). Both Edge and Rampton propose that an individual’s association with particular contexts where a language is used is an important part of language nativeness. A native English speaker was defined by some OSTs and ITEs as an individual coming from a context in which English is used as a daily language; a similar description was also expressed by some students.

Misconceptions about the term ‘native English speaker’ were found among the students and parents. A native English speaker was defined by some parents and students simply as an individual coming from abroad, regardless of the speaker’s first language. Such an understanding is problematic, as the parents and students regard an individual as a native English speaker merely because that person comes from a place that is not Indonesia and where any language could be spoken. On the other hand, some students defined a ‘native English speaker’ as an individual coming from England. This understanding is also problematic in that it excludes native English speakers from other English-speaking countries; moreover, such an understanding ignores the fact that English has many varieties (Graddol, 2006).

**Language**

Some understandings of the term ‘native English speaker’ in terms of language were identified from all four groups (Table 36). First, native English speakers were defined by
some ITEs as individuals who acquire English during their childhood. Such an understanding is consistent with the definitions of a 'native speaker' proposed by Edge (1988) and Davies (2003, 2004). Second, some students and ITEs described native English speakers as generally having good English language competence. The students’ and ITEs' understanding is in line with the definitions suggested by Stern (1983), Rampton (1990), Crystal (2003), and Davies (2003, 2004). Third, native English speakers were defined by some parents and OSTs as individuals who speak English as their first language; additionally, some ITEs mentioned that the speakers use English as a daily language. Such an understanding reflects Edge’s (1988) and Crystal’s definitions of a ‘native speaker’. Despite such understandings which align with definitions proposed by researchers, it is found that there is a misconception with regard to language aspects. As Lippi-Green (1997) argues, language nativeness is often valued by the presence or absence of an accent. The findings of this study confirm Lippi-Green’s view; some students asserted that native English speakers have good pronunciation and speak with a particular accent which they regarded as ‘real’. Such an understanding is problematic, as English has many varieties and native English speakers from various different contexts speak with various accents.

**Race**

In terms of racial aspects, the study reveals that there is a misconception about the term ‘native English speaker’ among students and parents. In the views of some students and parents, the speakers refer to individuals who have a ‘white’ complexion. This emphasizes the findings on misconceptions underlying the native speaker fallacy (see 8.3). As demonstrated in section 8.3, some students had the misconception that native English speakers are ‘white’ Caucasians, indicating that there is a racial dimension to the students’ various concepts of an ideal English teacher. This suggests that, with regard to English
language nativeness, race is a problematic aspect because it is often used as a basis for defining native speakers of English and excluding speakers of English who are not ‘white’ (Amin, 2004; Kubota & Lin, 2006, 2009; Holliday, 2006, 2009; Braine, 2010). Furthermore, this finding is consistent with Amin's (2004) study. Participants in Amin's research believed that native speakers of English are ‘white’ Caucasians. Such a view is problematic because physical characteristics do not indicate language nativeness. ‘Whiteness’ is not equivalent to English language proficiency. The students and parents might mistakenly regard an individual as a native English speaker because of the individual’s ‘white’ complexion, or dismiss a native English speaker who does not have a ‘white’ complexion.

**Culture**

There is an understanding among the students that knowledge of English-related cultures is an important part of English language nativeness. Such an understanding was reflected by the responses of two students in the interviews (see 4.3.1). The way the students associated English language nativeness with knowledge of English-related cultures seems to reflect Rampton's (1990) and Nayar’s (1994) views about language nativeness. Rampton suggests that native speakers of a language are born into a particular sociocultural group; therefore, the speakers have knowledge of that group’s culture and their language nativeness is closely related to the culture. On the other hand, Nayar argues that language acquisition involves acculturation, in which individuals acquire knowledge of cultures of the speech community; hence, native speakers of a language have internalized knowledge of cultures related to the language. Such an understanding of the students is likely to contribute to the strong preference for NESTs, as they might see NESTs as having more knowledge of cultures related to English compared to NNESTs.
Infancy

The understanding that native speakers of English must be born in contexts where English is used as a daily language by individuals was found only among the OSTs. This understanding is consistent with Rampton's (1990) contention that being born in a particular sociocultural context associated with a language is an important part of language nativeness. Therefore, being born in an English-speaking country could be one of the characteristics of native speakers of English.

8.5. How do the various stakeholders perceive NESTs?

This study reveals that the participants’ perceptions of NESTs are complex and multifaceted, informed by their experiences of being taught by and interacting with the teachers, and influenced by the rigid stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers.

The stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers has distorted the way the students and parents perceived them. As the findings of this study have demonstrated in previous discussion sections, the perceptions of students and parents tend to reflect a positive image of NESTs (see 4.4 and 5.4). The teachers were seen by the students and parents as having more strengths than weaknesses in terms of various aspects. It should be acknowledged that the students had experience in being taught by NESTs; therefore, their first-hand experience contributed to their perceptions. On the other hand, the parents had never been taught by these teachers. However, it seems obvious that the students’ and parents’ perceptions have been shaped by the stereotype of NESTs. The way students and, particularly, parents saw NESTs, shows how stereotypes can operate without proof, confirming Bhabha’s (1983) view
that a stereotype is ‘a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always in place, already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated’ (p. 18). It is ‘a regime of truth’ which does not need proof and ‘can never really, in discourse, be proved’ (p. 18). The study demonstrates that the stereotype of NESTs is rigid; it is ‘a fixed reality... knowable and visible’, operating without evidence (p. 23).

While the perceptions of students and parents depict a positive image of NESTs, OSTs’ and ITEs’ perceptions of NESTs tend to reflect a heterogeneous image of the teachers as having strengths and weaknesses in terms of various aspects. However, it seems that the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers has informed the OSTs’ perceptions, particularly with regard to language (see 6.4). This is shown by the fact that the OSTs involved in the study did not have high English proficiency, which made it difficult for them to assess NESTs in terms of language. Nevertheless, five of the eight OSTs perceived NESTs as having good English language competence. In this case, the OSTs are likely to have adopted biased perceptions of NESTs. On the other hand, ITEs’ perceptions of NESTs can be regarded as being more credible and less influenced by the stereotype of NESTs as better teachers, particularly with regard to English language competence, because the ITEs involved in this study had sufficient competence of English for valuing NESTs in terms of English language.

8.6. How do the various stakeholders perceive ITEs?

This final section addresses two topics: the way students, parents and OSTs perceived ITEs, and the way the ITEs perceived their professional selves.
8.6.1. The way students, parents and OSTs perceived ITEs

This study reveals that the perceptions of students, parents and OSTs are complex and multifaceted. While the experience of the students, parents and OSTs of being taught by and interacting with ITEs could be regarded as a factor contributing to their perceptions, the way they perceived ITEs also seems to have been informed by the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers and NNESTs as less competent. It is obvious that NESTs were seen by some participants as a good standard or a benchmark against which to assess ITEs.

As chapter 4.5 has shown, students’ perceptions depict a heterogeneous image of ITEs. ITEs were seen by the students as having advantages and disadvantages in terms of the following aspects: language, culture, pedagogy, L2 learning experience, knowledge and roles. ITEs were seen positively by the students as sharing a mother tongue with students, sharing the local culture, knowing local teaching materials and students’ needs, and having experience in learning English. Such positive perceptions are most likely based on the students’ learning experience and awareness of the characteristics of ITEs. On the other hand, ITEs were also perceived negatively by the students as having low English competence, using ‘different’ English, speaking accented English, not having English-related cultures, being too focused on the curriculum, being too theory-focused in teaching, possessing the image of second language learners, having less knowledge and being like parents (that is not professional). These negative views are related to students’ experience of being taught by ITEs and informed by the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers.

Unlike the students’ perceptions, the parents’ perceptions of ITEs in terms of language, pedagogy and culture tend to reflect a negative image (see 5.5). ITEs were seen positively by some parents as sharing a mother tongue and the local culture with students. Such positive perceptions could be related to the parents’ experience of being taught by ITEs
and interacting with the teachers; it seems that the parents had an awareness of particular characteristics which ITEs share with students. On the other hand, ITEs were perceived negatively by some parents as having low English competence, speaking accented English, focusing on grammar and not being familiar with English-related cultures. When perceiving ITEs negatively, the parents compared them to NESTs; it is obvious that the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers was present among the parents, informing the way the parents valued ITEs.

Generally, the OSTs perceived ITEs in similar ways to the students in that the perceptions depict a heterogeneous image of ITEs (see 6.5). The OSTs perceived ITEs as having strengths and weaknesses with regard to three aspects: culture, language and second language learning experience. ITEs were seen positively by some OSTs as sharing culture with local students, sharing their mother tongue and having experience in learning English as a second language. Such positive perceptions seem to be related to the OSTs’ awareness of characteristics which ITEs have. On the other hand, ITEs were perceived negatively by some OSTs as having low knowledge of the cultures of English-speaking countries and having low English language competence. While the negative perceptions could be attributed to the OSTs’ personal experience of ITEs, they also seem to have been informed by the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers, particularly in terms of English language competence. The findings of this study have indicated that the OSTs saw NESTs as a point of opposition/reference for ITEs. In evaluating ITEs, some OSTs employed the image of NESTs as a benchmark or yardstick (see 6.5).

Generally, the way the students, parents and OSTs perceived ITEs demonstrates that their negative views are not only based on their awareness of particular characteristics of ITEs; they have also been influenced by the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers. The negative perceptions which they had derive from comparative perspectives which the
participants employed when valuing ITEs; the participants used the stereotypical image of NESTs as a benchmark against which to evaluate ITEs in their perceptions. This suggests that not only does the fixity of the stereotype of NESTs as superior teachers have implications for the way NESTs are seen by individuals, it also influences the image of ITEs. The comparative perspectives which the participants had when perceiving ITEs indicate that there is a rigid ‘paradoxical mode of representation’ (Bhabha, 1983, p. 18). The stereotypes of NESTs and NNESTs, in this case ITEs, are maintained by the interdependence of ‘colonial subjects’: the NESTs and NNESTs, who are continually involved in tensions and interactions (Bhabha, 1983). The stereotypes of NESTs and NNESTs require ‘an articulation of forms of difference… which should be continual and repetitive’ (p. 19). In this study, the ‘forms of difference’ can be attributed to the participants’ comparative perspectives in their perceptions of ITEs. In generating the images/representations of NNESTs, the participants used ‘a regime of truth’ – a rigid image of NESTs – as a standard, ‘a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always in place, already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated’ (p. 18). Furthermore, the way the students, parents and OSTs perceived ITEs demonstrates that stereotyping can operate as a negative process (McGarty, Yzerbyt & Spear, 2004); individuals taking cognitive shortcuts in perceiving others can adopt biased perceptions.

From the findings of this study, it is obvious that the way the participants perceived ITEs has also been shaped by the complex discourse which influenced their perceptions of NESTs. As argued in section 8.5, there is a complex discourse involving the disparity of power between English-speaking and non-English speaking countries. This discourse contributes to the construction of the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers. Because the participants employed a comparative perspective in their perceptions of ITEs, comparing ITEs to NESTs as a good standard, it can be argued that the identity of ITEs is also subject to this complex
discourse. This suggests that the image of ITEs as 'less competent' teachers is not only related to the actual disadvantages or weaknesses of the teachers, but also related to the unequal power of English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries.

8.6.1. The way ITEs perceived their professional selves

Sherman, Hamilton, and Lewis (1999) argue that a social group which is seen negatively will affect the self-esteem of individual members of the group, causing the individuals to also perceive themselves negatively. This research complicates their contention, demonstrating that the perceptions of individuals from other social groups (students, parents and OSTs) of a particular social group (ITEs) do not seem to be the only factor affecting the self-perceptions of individual members of the social group. Despite the negative perceptions of ITEs which some participants had, the ITEs involved in this study perceived themselves positively. Their positive self-perceptions are indicated by their feelings of being English language teachers and the way they perceived themselves as different English teachers, rather than as less competent ones (see 7.5.1).

What aspects contributed to the ITEs’ perceptions? In this study, identity is regarded as complex ‘both in its contents and its derivations’ (Tajfel, 1978, p. 63); the self-perceptions of ITEs are understood as being shaped by various factors. Using Tajfel’s (1978) social identity theory and Herman’s (2001) dialogical self theory, the study has identified two factors which are likely to have shaped the way ITEs perceived their professional selves:

1. ITEs’ awareness of different characteristics of NESTs and NNESTs, and the ITEs’ ability to see their distinctive features as strengths (Tajfel, 1978); and
2. The ITEs’ ability to see other individuals, particularly students, as an important element of their professional selves (Hermans, 2001).

Social identity theory proposes four aspects related to individuals’ identity in a social context: social categorization, social identity, social comparison and psychological group distinctiveness. Social categorization refers to the formation of categories or the process of grouping individuals in a way that makes sense to them; it is ‘a system of orientation which helps to create and define the individual’s place in society’ (Tajfel, 1978, p. 63). This study has demonstrated that, in the process of social categorization, the six ITEs could identify themselves as being individual members of a particular social group consisting of Indonesians who have professions as English teachers. The ITEs were aware of their membership of the group. This is indicated by the way they perceived themselves (see 7.5) and the way they identified other individuals who belong to other social groups, shown by the way the ITEs defined ‘native English speakers’ (see 7.3) and the way they perceived NESTs (see 7.4). The ITEs’ awareness of their membership of a particular group is important in social divisions between ‘us’ and ‘them’ – between ITEs and NESTs. Further, the ITEs’ status in the non-native English teacher group could be regarded as their ‘in-group membership’. On the other hand, the native English teacher group is considered as the ‘out-group’ (Tajfel, 1978).

The ability of the ITEs to perceive themselves and the way they identified other individuals who belong to other social groups suggest that they were aware of their social identity. As Tajfel (1978) argues, social identity refers to ‘that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his or her knowledge of his or her membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership’ (p. 63). As presented in section 7.5.2, the six ITEs involved in this study perceived themselves as having strengths and weaknesses. From the lens of social identity theory, this indicates that
the ITEs were able to recognize their value differentials, which is important when it comes to recognizing the ‘in-group’ and the ‘out-group’, and to understanding the characteristics of the two groups. The ITEs saw themselves positively as sharing a mother tongue and a cultural background with their students, possessing more knowledge about local education, having better teaching skills or teaching skills which are appropriate for local students, and having a direct experience in learning English as a second language. On the other hand, some ITEs perceived themselves negatively as not having good pronunciation. While the negative view indicates that the ITEs were aware of their weakness in terms of language, it also shows that in evaluating their ‘pronunciation’, they compared themselves to NESTs. This suggests that the ‘paradoxical mode of representation’ was also present among the ITEs (Bhabha, 1983); NESTs were seen by the ITEs as a good standard against which to evaluate themselves in terms of pronunciation.

Social identity is based on the comparative perspective in the process of social comparison, which relies on individuals' awareness of the ‘in-group’ and the ‘out-group’ (Tajfel, 1978; McNamara, 1997). The social comparison process generates psychological group distinctiveness; individual members of the ‘in-group’ will use their value differentials to maintain their identity; they will maximize a positive sense of themselves by emphasizing distinctive features favouring their in-group membership (Tajfel, 1978; McNamara, 1997). As section 7.5.2 demonstrates, the ITEs employed their perceived strengths as distinctive features for establishing and maintaining positive self-perceptions. Therefore, it can be proposed that, from the theoretical lens of social identity theory, the ITEs’ awareness of the different characteristics of NESTs and ITEs, and the ITEs’ ability to see their distinctive features as strengths are important factors which contribute to the way they perceived themselves positively as ITEs.
While social identity theory has generated an understanding of the way identity is constructed and maintained through social categorization and comparison at a group level, dialogical self theory provides a theoretical framework for understanding how identity is constructed and maintained at an individual level. From the perspective of dialogical self theory, identity is not determined by a single self, but results from a dynamic dialogue between voices (Dimmagio, Fiore, Salvatore & Carcione, 2007). Individuals are regarded as being shaped by dialogues, both within themselves and in relation to other individuals. Every individual is thought to have multiple voices; other individuals are regarded as not purely being outside the self, but as being an important part of the self (Hermans, 2001, 2008). Other individuals become ‘imagination and imaginary figures’ (Hermans, 2008, p. 187); they are intrinsic parts of the self. According to Hermans (2008), the other individuals ‘play a constitutive role in the creation of meaning’ (p. 187). As presented in section 7.5.2, some ITEs perceived their students as ‘significant others’, helping them to construct and maintain their professional selves. The ‘imaginary figures’ of the students could be regarded as playing important roles in the ITEs’ creation of their professional meaning. Therefore, through the lens of dialogical self theory, the way the ITEs saw students as ‘significant others’ can be understood as a factor contributing to the ITEs’ positive self-perceptions. Furthermore, the ITEs’ view of the students emphasizes the notion that identity is socially constructed; it is situated in a social discourse and shaped in part by other individuals (Hall, 1996; Norton, 1997; Varghese et al., 2005).
Chapter 9
Conclusions

In this chapter, conclusions arising from the study are proposed. I also present implications of the study based on the discussion of findings, and address limitations of the research which become the basis for suggesting recommendations for further research.

*The way the various education stakeholders perceive English*

Based on the discussions of findings, it can be concluded that the participants’ perceptions of English are not isolated from sociocultural, economic and political factors related to the language. English, a school subject which NESTs and ITEs teach, is a language which is located in a discourse closely intertwined with such complex factors. The way the participants perceived English is evidence of the existence of the discourse in classrooms. Therefore, the process of English language teaching or learning is also subject to the sociocultural, economic and political factors related to English. Inevitably, the images of NESTs and ITEs are likely to be influenced by this discourse, as both NESTs and ITEs are involved in the process of English language teaching. With regard to the professional identity of English teachers, the sociocultural, economic and political factors which shape the way the participants perceived English can be regarded as factors which contribute to the identities of NESTs and ITEs.

The findings also show that there is a close connection between power and the way a language is used in a particular context (Norton, 2013). They demonstrate that language learning is a social practice located in a complex discourse and informed by sociocultural,
economic and political aspects related to the language; it is a ‘practice that engages the identities of [language] learners in complex and sometimes contradictory ways (Norton, 2001, p. 167). Generally, the way the participants perceived English shows ‘the socially and historically constructed relationship of [English language] learners to the target language, and their sometimes ambivalent desire to speak, read and write it’ (Norton, 2013, p. 86).

More importantly, findings on the way the participants perceived English contribute to the understanding of second language learning motivation. This research challenges Gardner’s (1985) theory of motivation in second language learning. According to Gardner, second language learners have two motivational orientations toward learning a second language: the integrative orientation, which refers to individuals’ desire to learn a second language in order to interact and identify with the community of the target language, and the instrumental orientation which refers to individuals’ practical goals for learning a second language. This research, however, suggests that there are many other orientations besides the integrative and instrumental. The participants had various orientations for learning English, reflected by the various views which they had. Furthermore, the findings of this research emphasize that there are ‘meaningful connections between a learner’s desire and commitment to learn a language and their changing identities’ (Norton & Toohey, 2011, p. 420).

The way the various education stakeholders conceptualize an ideal English teacher

With regard to the way the participants conceptualized an ideal English teacher, this study reveals that the native speaker fallacy is visible only among the students and that there is a racial dimension to the students’ concepts. The belief identified among the students that
ideal English teachers are native speakers of English is based on misconceptions which the
students held, rather than their understandings of the strengths and weaknesses of NESTs
and NNESTs. Race is clearly a problematic aspect in the students’ conceptualizations of an
ideal English teacher. Nevertheless, the native speaker fallacy was not dominant in the
participants’ conceptualizations. The participants had various multifaceted concepts. They
classified an ideal English teacher in terms of seven aspects: personal quality, pedagogical
quality, racial/native English speaker, language, experience, professionalism and knowledge
of English-related cultures. Three of the seven aspects are dominant: personal quality,
pedagogical quality and language. These three aspects can be found across all four groups of
participants, reflecting the participants’ expectations of characteristics which an ideal English
teacher should have. Generally, the perceived characteristics of an ideal English teacher
identified in this study favor neither NESTs nor NNESTs. This suggests that there are
opportunities for both NESTs and ITEs to be regarded as ‘good’ English teachers.

*The way the various education stakeholders understand the term ‘native English speaker’*

The participants understood the term ‘native English speaker’ variously in terms of
five aspects: geographical context, language, race, culture and infancy. Generally, the
participants’ understandings of a ‘native English speaker’ align with the definitions of a
‘native speaker’ proposed by researchers. However, some misconceptions were identified
among students and parents. The misconceptions found among the students are related to
three aspects: geographical context, race and language. On the other hand, the misconceptions
among the parents are related to two aspects: geographical context and race. The
misconceptions which the students and parents held are likely to have implications for the
way they perceive NESTs. Their perceptions of NESTs are problematic as they are clearly founded upon misunderstandings of what a ‘native English speaker’ is.

**The way the various education stakeholders perceive NESTs**

The way the various education stakeholders perceived NESTs reflects the way sociocultural, economic and political factors related to English contribute to the stereotype of NESTs. The image of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers underlying the native speaker fallacy and the strong preference for NESTs has often been seen by researchers as being caused by the Chomskyan notion that a native speaker of a language is the authority of the language (Braine, 1999, 2010; Canagarajah, 1999; Mahboob, 2005). Canagarajah (1999), for example, proposes that ‘Noam Chomsky's linguistic concepts lie at the heart of the discourse that promotes the superiority of the native speaker teacher’ (p. 78). According to Mahboob (2005), ‘the ‘native’ speaker was centralized in Applied Linguistics and TESOL as a result of the Chomskyan paradigm’ (p. 60). Proposing a similar view, Braine (2010) states that ‘this “superiority” of NS [native speaker] teachers had been bolstered by Chomsky's (1965) notions that the native speaker is the authority on language and that he/she is the ideal informant on grammar’ (p. 3). This research, however, shifts the focus from the Chomskyan notion to a complex discourse involving the disparity of power between English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries, in this case Indonesia, as a factor which contributes to the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers. As has been demonstrated by the findings of this research, the participants’ perceptions of NESTs are not only related to the notion that native English speakers have better English language competence, but also founded upon the view that the speakers have a close association with English-speaking countries which the participants regarded as ‘superior’. It is obvious that the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers is closely related to the sociocultural, economic and political aspects of English-speaking and
non-English-speaking countries. A complex discourse originating from the disparity of power between English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries has shaped the images of NESTs.

The way the various education stakeholders perceive ITEs

It can be argued that a social group which is valued negatively does not necessarily lead individual members of the group to perceive themselves negatively; perceptions of others are not the only factors affecting the way ITEs perceive their professional selves. That ITEs saw themselves positively, despite some negative perceptions which some other education stakeholders had, suggests that there are other factors involved in the ITEs’ self-perceptions. This study has identified two factors: (1) ITEs’ awareness of different characteristics of NESTs and ITEs, and the ITEs’ ability to see their distinctive features as strengths (Tajfel, 1978); and (2) the ITEs’ ability to see other individuals, particularly students, as an important element of their professional selves (Hermans, 2001). Overall, this study has demonstrated that individuals’ perceptions of identity are as complicated and multifaceted as the concept itself. Therefore, as Hall (1997) suggests, they should be understood in terms of their multiplicity.

Concluding remarks

This research has contributed to the understanding of the complexity and multifacetedness of ITEs’ professional identity. It suggests that the professional identity of ITEs is located in a discourse informed by the perceived disparity of power between English-
speaking and non-English-speaking countries. Therefore, it is influenced by complex sociocultural, economic and political factors. The professional identity of ITEs does not stand in isolation. Rather, it is both personal in that it is established and maintained by teachers themselves, and social in that it is also established and maintained by others.

The way the ITEs’ professional identity is perceived by education stakeholders is problematic as the native speaker fallacy is visible among students and that there is a racial dimension to the students’ concepts of an ideal English teacher. The belief identified among the students that native English speakers are ideal English teachers is based on misconceptions which the students held, rather than their understandings of the comparative strengths and weaknesses of NESTs and NNESTs. Furthermore, misconceptions about ‘native English speakers’ inadvertently influence their perceptions of ITEs.

That there are ill-founded or unjustifiable perceptions among the education stakeholders is indicated by their perceptions of NESTs and ITEs which have been influenced by the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers. NESTs were seen as having more strengths, particularly by students, parents and OSTs. ITEs, by contrast, were perceived as having more varied strengths and weaknesses. The students, parents and OSTs used the stereotypical image of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers as a benchmark against which to assess ITEs.

ITEs perceived themselves positively despite the presence of negative perceptions. Others’ perceptions of ITEs are not the only factor affecting the ITEs’ self-perceptions. Rather, there are various factors contributing to the way ITEs perceive themselves. The ITEs have a psychological capability which helps them see themselves positively; they establish and maintain their positive self-perceptions by: (1) being aware of the different characteristics of NESTs and ITEs, and seeing their distinctive features as strengths; and (2) seeing other individuals, particularly students, as an important element of their professional selves.
Demonstrating the way ITEs establish and maintain their positive self-perceptions, this research could serve as a template/model for non-native English teachers. It helps ITEs better understand themselves and provides an opportunity for them to become 'good English teachers'.

9.1. Implications of the study

The empirical findings and discussions of this study have several implications for the understanding of important issues and practical aspects related to the research topic. The study has demonstrated that the way the participants perceived English is complex, informed by various factors, including the ‘myth’ of English as an international language, the disparity of power between English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries, the dominance/hegemony of English, the status and functions of English in the context of the research and the way English is associated with globalization.

This has implications for the way English learning/teaching should be seen and understood. English learning/teaching should not be seen as a process which is isolated from such complex factors; rather, it should be understood as a process which is located in bigger sociocultural, economic and political discourses. Furthermore, the study has shown that such complex discourses can shape the participants' views of English. While some views represent the actual status and functions of English in a particular social context, there are views which are ill-founded/unjustifiable. With regard to the latter views, classrooms could be understood and treated as sites where teachers in general and English teachers in particular can ‘neutralize’ the ill-founded/unjustifiable views of English. Additionally, the findings of this study should inform research exploring similar issues. Research for understanding the
learning/teaching of English and individuals involved in the process should take the various factors into account.

The findings related to how the participants conceptualize an ideal English teacher and understand the term ‘native English speaker’ shed light on the complexity of the native speaker fallacy underlying the strong preference for NESTs. They contribute to a better understanding of misconceptions from which the fallacy derives. This study has revealed that the native speaker fallacy is present among the students and that there is a racial dimension to the students’ various concepts of an ideal English teacher. The fallacy which the students held is based on misconceptions about native English speakers. Further, the study also reveals that there are misunderstandings among the students and parents about the term ‘native English speaker’. Such findings should inform the hiring practices of NESTs and NNESTs. The hiring practices of English teachers should not be based on the native speaker fallacy, particularly on the misconceptions and stereotypes of NESTs and NNESTs. Rather, they must be based on professional aspects of the teachers. Furthermore, with regard to the way the participants conceptualize an ideal English teacher, this study has identified various perceived characteristics of an ideal English teacher, reflecting the participants’ expectations. The findings on the perceived characteristics of an ideal English teacher should be useful for English teachers’ self or reflexive professional development and for teacher training institutions, particularly institutions having English language teachers’ professional development programs or preparing future English language teachers. In terms of professional practices, the findings can be used as guidance for recruiting good English language teachers.

Findings on the way the participants perceive NESTs and ITEs depict the professional ‘images’ of the teachers in the context of the research. The study has revealed the perceived strengths and weaknesses of both NESTs and ITEs. While some of the participants’
perceptions seem to be credible, the findings indicate that the rigid stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ English teachers distorts the way the participants perceive NESTs and ITEs. The credible perceived strengths and weaknesses of NESTs and ITEs should be useful for the teachers, particularly for their self/reflexive professional development. Furthermore, the perceived strengths and weaknesses of NESTs and ITEs identified in this study should inform the way both NESTs and ITEs are seen in English language teaching, especially in the context of this research. As NESTs and ITEs have different perceived advantages and disadvantages, they should be seen as ‘different’ English teachers rather than NESTs as ‘professional’ teachers and ITEs as less competent. In Medgyes’ (1992) term, NESTs and ITEs should be perceived as ‘two different species’ (p. 25); therefore, both NESTs and ITEs can be ‘good’ English teachers. On the other hand, this study also demonstrates that the participants’ perceptions can be distorted by the rigid stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ English teachers. When valuing ITEs, some participants compared ITEs to NESTs; they saw NESTs as representing a good standard. As a consequence of the comparative perspective which the participants employed, negative ‘images’ of ITEs emerged. This contributes to the understanding of the social constructions of NESTs’ and ITEs’ professional identities. In practice, the biased or groundless negative perceived ‘images’ of ITEs and the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers should be revealed, discussed openly and addressed critically, particularly in settings where English language teaching takes place, so that both NESTs and ITEs can be seen as professionals in the field of English language teaching. Last, the way ITEs perceive themselves demonstrates how the teachers can maintain their positive self-perceptions despite the complex and multifaceted perceptions of other education stakeholders and, particularly, the stereotype of NESTs as ‘superior’ teachers and NNESTs as ‘less competent’ ones by perceiving their distinctive features as advantages and seeing others, especially students, as important parts of their professional identity. This should help ITEs in particular and NNESTs more generally establish and maintain positive self-perceptions of
their professional identity as English teachers. More importantly, by contributing to the understandings of the complexity and multifacetedness of ITEs’ professional identity and how ITEs can maintain positive self-perceptions, this study should encourage the teachers to become better English teachers.

9.2. Limitations of the study and recommendations for further research

This qualitative study has some empirical and methodological limitations which form the basis for recommendations for further research. The empirical limitations are related to the availability of participants. The study only involved 3rd year students who had the experiences of being taught by NESTs and ITEs. Because of access and time constraints, it did not involve students of different levels. It might be useful for further research dealing with the stereotype of NESTs to involve students of different levels, particularly those who do not have the experience of being taught by NESTs. Further research could investigate how the perceptions of students who have the experience of being taught by NESTs differ from the perceptions of students who do not have the experience of being taught by NESTs, or how the two groups of students perceive NNESTs. As for the ITEs, there were only six English teachers at the school. All were involved in this study.

In terms of methodology, this research is purely a qualitative inquiry. While a qualitative approach can provide deeper understandings of an issue, the results of the study are only relevant to the context of the research and participants involved; the findings cannot be generalized to bigger contexts. However, they could inform other contexts. It might be useful for further research to employ a different design, involving larger numbers of participants from various contexts. With regard to data analysis, this study is limited by my
subjectivity. Because in qualitative research subjectivity is regarded as an important part of the design, the interpretation of data in this study is based on my analytical perspective as the researcher. Other researchers will approach and interpret the research data differently.

Furthermore, the methodological limitations of this study are also related to the theoretical frameworks employed in the research. While Bhabha’s (1983) concepts of stereotype and colonial discourse, Tajfel’s (1978) social identity theory and Hermans’ (2001) dialogical self theory have provided useful analytical lenses for understanding the research topics, they also become theoretical boundaries of the study. The empirical findings of this study result from the process of data analysis using concepts from the three theories. It would be useful for further research to employ different theoretical frameworks which give different insights into the issues and generate different understandings.
Epilogue

I conducted this research because of my personal concern about the issue of NESTs and NNESTs in the field of English language teaching in Indonesia. Prior to the fieldwork, I was aware that NESTs are often stereotyped as ‘professional’ teachers while NNESTs are often seen as ‘less competent’. I am also aware that in certain contexts, such as in Japan (see Figure 1), the issue of NESTs and NNESTs involves racial aspects. I started the research with some expectations: that the preference for NESTs in the context of the study was based on professional aspects, that I would not find misconceptions among the participants, and that the issue of NESTs and NNESTs would not involve racial aspects. I was wrong.

Doing data analysis of this study was both a pleasure and shock. I enjoyed reading the data, giving me opportunities to explore and understand the participants’ views of various aspects which I investigated in the research. On the other hand, the analysis led me to a point where I could not accept the research findings. I was disappointed. The study discloses many misconceptions underlying the issue of NESTs and NNESTs in the research context, not the least of which are racial aspects.

Despite my displeasure, I have presented all the findings of this research, so that they could inspire other researchers to explore the issue, particularly in Indonesia. Obviously, there is a lot of work needs to be done with regard to the issue of NESTs and NNESTs.
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Appendices
CONSENT FORM FOR STUDENTS

(Please see a translated version of this form overleaf)

1. I have read the attached Information Sheet and agree to take part in the following research project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>The Professional Identity of Indonesian English Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Approval Number:</td>
<td>HP 2012-012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I have had the project, so far as it affects me, fully explained to my satisfaction by the research worker. My consent is given freely.

3. I have been given the opportunity to have a member of my family or a friend present while the project was explained to me.

4. Although I understand the purpose of the research project it has also been explained that involvement may be of any benefit to me.

5. I have been informed that, while information gained during the study may be published, I will not be identified and my personal results will not be divulged.

6. I understand that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time.

7. I agree to the interview being audio/video recorded. Yes ☐ No ☐

8. I am aware that I should keep a copy of this Consent Form, when completed, and the attached Information Sheet.

Participant to complete:

Name: __________________________ Signature: __________________________ Date: ______________

Researcher/Witness to complete:

I have described the nature of the research to______________________________

(print name of participant)

and in my opinion she/he understood the explanation.

Signature: __________________________ Position: __________________________ Date: ______________
Ok, we can start now. Thank you for coming.

I would like to remind you that participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you may withdraw at any time if you feel the questions are intrusive or too personal for you.

To begin with, I would like to know some information about you and your background, can you tell me about yourself?

How long have you been learning English?

Tell me, why do you learn English?

Besides in schools, have you learned English in any other institutions? Do you learn English in any other institutions, other than schools? If yes, could you tell me why?

Using FaceGen, ask the participant to choose a facial image of his/her ideal English teacher.

Now, I would like you to use the software on that laptop. The software can create infinite numbers of facial images. When you click the generate button, it will show a facial image randomly. I want you to choose a face which you think best represents your ideal English teacher, a face that you think is your ideal English teacher. You can click the button as many times as you like. Tell me if you have picked one, ok.

Now, tell me. Why do you think the face represents your ideal English teacher? Why is the face your ideal English teacher?

Could you please mention some characteristics which your ideal English teacher should have?

Have you met NESTs? Or been taught by NESTs?

How do you feel being taught by NESTs?

Tell me, what do you think about NESTs? How do you see NESTs?

Now, what do you think about ITEs? How do you see ITEs?

How do you feel being taught by ITEs?

Who was the best English teacher you had? Why him or her?

In your opinion, what is an ideal English teacher? What is the definition of an ideal English teacher?

In your opinion, what is a native English speaker? What is the definition of a native English speaker?

Do you have any other comments?
GROUP DISCUSSION PROTOCOL

Data Identity
Date: 
Site/Venue: 
Duration: ± 60 minutes
Participants: 

Type of Discussion
Semi-structured

Language Used
Indonesian Language

Themes/questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is English important? Why do you learn English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What is an ideal English teacher?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What is ‘native English speaker’?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How do you feel being taught by NESTs? How do you see NESTs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>How do you feel being taught by ITEs? How do you see ITEs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>