

# NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKER TEACHERS (NESTS) AND NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKER TEACHERS (NNESTS) IN INDONESIA: PREFERENCE AND DILEMMA

Kartika Septarini

*kartika\_septarini@yahoo.co.id*

Monash University

## ABSTRACT

*Issues about native English speaker teachers (NESTs) versus non-native English speaker teachers (NNESTs) have become a never ending debate. Whether native English speaker teachers or non-native English speaker teachers who are more appropriate to teach English in outer or expanding circle countries have been discussed and researched by some scholars. This paper discusses about people's preference towards both of them by investigating previous research about people's perception towards native English speaker teachers and non-native English speaker teachers. This paper also explores another issue arising from the dichotomy of native and non-native i.e. Whose English and what English should be taught in Indonesia. Whether English Native or other varieties of English is best taught in Indonesia.*

**Keywords:** *Native English Teachers, Non-Native English Teachers, World Englishes.*

## ABSTRACT

Isu-isu yang terkait dengan guru bahasa Inggris penutur asli (NESTs) dan guru bahasa Inggris yang bukan penutur asli (NNESTs) merupakan salah satu topik yang sudah lama dan tidak pernah berhenti diperdebatkan. Persoalan tentang siapa, NESTs atau NNESTs, atau keduanya, yang lebih sesuai untuk mengajarkan bahasa Inggris di negara yang bahasa Inggris bukan sebagai bahasa pertama telah banyak diteliti dan dibahas. Makalah ini membahas preferensi terhadap NESTs atau NNESTs melalui telaah pada hasil-hasil penelitian tentang persepsi terhadap kedua kelompok guru bahasa Inggris tersebut. Makalah ini juga menyoroti isu lain yang timbul dari pendikotomian guru penutur asli dan bukan penutur asli, yaitu bahasa Inggris siapa dan bahasa Inggris yang mana yang harus diajarkan di Indonesia—Bahasa Inggris asli atau variasi-variasi bahasa Inggris lain yang harus diajarkan di Indonesia.

**Kata Kunci:** *Guru bahasa Inggris penutur asli, Guru bahasa Inggris bukan penutur asli, World Englishes*

## INTRODUCTION

People preference towards native English speaker teachers or NESTs in Indonesia is reflected in the advertisement in printed and electronic media about job vacancy offered to native English speaking teachers in private schools and English courses in Indonesia, particularly in urban areas. The need of native English teachers to fill the vacancy in these schools and course centers is due to these institutions want to attract parents to enroll their children to learn in their 'prestigious institutions' for the sake of marketing strategy. In addition, hypothetical preference towards NESTs reflected in the newspaper ads (Moussu & Llurda, 2008) is due to benchmark or label given by the L2 speakers that native speakers are the "brand" of good

English that they can be models for L2 learners in terms of speaking. As cited in Moussu and Llurda (2008, p.316) who affirm that "... social recognition is often based on judgments of the speakers' accent", thus, it can be assumed that people justification of 'good English' speakers given to NESTs are based on their accent as it is believed that accent is a signifier between NESTs and NNESTs (Moussu & Llurda, 2008). Moreover, Takada (2000); Tang (1997); Widdowson (1992) cited in Ellis (2002) agree that people prefer native speaker teachers because they are perceived as having 'fluent, idiomatic spoken and pronunciation' (p.71).

This paper will address a debate about NESTs and NNESTs, how people in many countries including in Indonesia perceive them as le-

gitimate English teachers, who are more suitable to be employed in Indonesia will also be discussed in this paper. At the end of this paper, it will also discuss about native English variety and non-native English variety and their implication in English teaching and learning in Indonesia. However, prior to discussing these three main points, the definition about who native and non-native speakers are will be discussed by using Hall's notions (1997) about language, culture, and identity as a framework of this paper.

### **Hall's notion about language, culture, and identity**

Language, identity and culture are closely connected. Hall (1997) argues that language is one of the media in which people who have the same thoughts, feeling, and idea make meaning. According to Hall (1997) everything in this world was meaningless until people who share the same culture give meanings to things. Culture is about 'shared meanings (p.1)'. It means that there is an agreement within people who have the same thoughts, feelings, and idea about the way they see and make meaning about things. Hall (1997) maintains that people from the same culture may interpret things in more or less the same way; they give meanings to the world in a way that they understand each other. In addition, Kramsch (1998) agrees to what is said by Hall. According to Kramsch, people who belong to members of a social group view the world in the same manner through their interactions with other members who belong to the same group.

Hall (1997) adds that people give meaning in two ways. First, by 'the way they use things in everyday practice' (p.3) such as language. People who share the same language give meanings to things in the way that they can understand. Secondly, people give things meaning by 'the way they represent them' (p.3). For instance, the language registers, jargon, English native speaker variety, or local English variety. English native speaker variety represents the users, the native English speaking people. Local English variety represents its users, the 'other' speakers of English. *Bahasa Gaul*, language register spoken among young people in Indonesia, represents Indonesian urban young people, and so forth. We give things meaning by how we represent them, in terms of how we use them, how we feel them, and how we think about them.

Furthermore, through the circuit of culture meanings are produced and circulated.

Meaning is produced by people who share the same culture through their language and at the same time, meaning also gives us sense of our identity; who we are, with whom we belong to. Moreover, Woodward (1997) maintains that identity is marked by difference. The difference between native and non-native speakers is in their accent in terms of speaking. Accented is associated with non-native speakers' identity. It is also constructed by language and symbolic systems, the existence of another identity by denying similarity against other groups (who is included, who is excluded), things used by members of social groups (signifiers). Identity, in one part, is fixed and unchanged. Yet in another part, it is unfixed, it changes, and it is historical (Woodward, 1997; Norton Pierce, 1995).

Identity is sometimes marked by nature (nationality, race, ethnicity), thus it can be said that identity is fixed, unchanged. For example, people often associate 'white' as native speakers. Whiteness is a natural marker which is attached in the physics of most native speakers. Nevertheless, because of history, identity can change, it is unfixed. For instance, children who were born in an English speaking country from parents who are non-English speakers are native speakers by history. They were born as non-English speaker, but as they grew up, they use English and perhaps, their parents' language as well for communication. They become fluent users of English because English could be their first language and it could be a language they learned first when they were little. As a result, they can be called native English speakers. Furthermore, identity is also shaped by culture (Woodward, 1997, p.15) and language (Kramsch, 1998). People's identity can be constructed by differences in culture and language. Woodward (1997) mentions that difference can be seen as negative and positive. It is seen as negative if it is used to exclude people by stereotyping and marginalizing people or group. On the other hand, difference can be seen as positive if it is used to 'enrich' or if we interpret it as 'the source of diversity, heterogeneity, and hybridity' (p.35). For example, the use of variety of Englishes other than native English variety. Like the use of Singlish which is seen as the marker of 'inferiority', 'language of social marginal', being prejudiced as 'deficient speaker as vulgar, stupid, lacking refinement and culture of the speaker of good English' (Hoon, 2003, p.55). On the other hand local variety like Singlish can be regarded as the source of diversity, heterogeneity, and hybridity. Singlish can also be seen as a repre-

sentation of Singaporean identity. Similar to *bahasa gaul*, a register used among urban young people in Indonesia, which is seen as the representation of Indonesian youth and modernity.

Now, let us see who native speaker is, how people perceive native and non-native teachers, what advantages and disadvantages of having both of them.

### **Who is native speaker?**

It is difficult to define who exactly native speaker is. Medgyes (1992) argues that the issue about native speaker is controversial and debatable in sociolinguistic and pure linguistic point of view. He maintains that native and non-native division can be clearly seen in countries where English is spoken as a second or foreign language, but in countries where English is used as the first language, it is difficult to break the homogeneity of native/ non native division. Medgyes (1992) takes an example of a 9 year old-boy whose his parents are Mexican and Norway. This boy has been living in the United States for five years. Which native language he has is ambiguous; it can be English, Spanish, Norway, or all three of them. As Bloomfield (1933) cited in Cook (1999) claims that native language is the first language which is learned by a person. Furthermore, Davies (1996) called this as "bio-developmental definition" (cited in Cook, 1999, p.186). Ellis (2002) citing Davies (1991) gives a distinction between the native and non-native speakers, she quotes from Davies' circular definition of non-native speakers (1991) that 'being native speakers means not being a non-native speakers' (p. 72). Shuck (2006) uses Said (1978) and Pennycook's (1998) concept of binary opposition to describe more about the dichotomy between native and non-native concept. Shuck (2006) argues that oppositional pairs such as native and non-native have 'generative power' to produce hierarchical social orders (p.261). He uses linguistic concept of 'markedness' (p.261) to give a description that oppositional pairs are hierarchically related. According to Shuck (2006) the unmarked term is often seen as neutral, while the marked term represents narrower categories. Thus, the distinction between native and non-native can be seen as unmarked and marked categories. Native as the unmarked category is neutral; it does not have color, culture, and accent. While non-native as the marked category is the opposite of native. It is narrowed to something which has color, culture, and accent. As a result, it is not surprising that people often associate 'whiteness'

as native speaker teachers (Holliday & Aboshiha, 2009, p.670). Or in other words, it is often that people, especially in the countries of expanding circle, think that white people are native speakers.

Due to the difficulty in defining the term of native speakers, some writers such as Edge (1988), Kachru (1985), Paikeday (1985), Rampton (1990) cited in Medgyes (1992, p.342) suggest to replace the term native speakers as 'more or less accomplished users', 'more or less users of English', 'expert speakers and affiliation', and 'English-using speech fellowship'. The replacing of the term native speakers becomes 'multi competent users' (Cook, 1999), 'accomplished users' (Medgyes, 1992), 'language experts' (Rampton, 1990), and 'proficient users' (Paikeday, 1985) also shows the writers' dissatisfaction of the terms native speakers as it leads to devaluing the non-native speaker teachers (Selvi, 2011, p. 187). This is evident in Firth and Wagner (1997) cited in Selvi (2011) who argue that non-native speaker teachers are stereotyped as being deficient in communication. The participants in Figueiredo's research (2011) who are Brazilian English teachers working in the United State felt insecure relating to their confidence and authority of being English teachers because they are non-native. According to Figueiredo (2011) the dichotomy between native and non-native is marked by speaking proficiency (accented and unaccented), hence the Brazilian NNESTs felt unconfident due to their accent in speaking English. Furthermore, as cited in Selvi (2011), Suarez (2000) and Bernat (2009) agree that non-native speaker teachers or NNESTs often suffer from 'impositorsyndrom' due to native speaker teachers or NESTs are seen as a 'benchmark for teaching employment' (p. 187). As a result, NNESTs often face discrimination by 'employers' and 'customers' and this leads to NNESTs have to compete for jobs with less qualified NESTs (Phillipson, 1992; Holliday, 2008, p.121).

Moreover, discrimination towards NNESTs is seen from the appreciation given to NNESTs in forms of salary and the acknowledgement of expertise. NNESTs in Indonesia receive lower salary and less acknowledgement of expertise compare to their peers, the NESTs (Dewi, 2007). Additionally, discrimination towards non-native speakers in English pedagogy is not only addressed to the non-NES teachers, but also to the non-NES students of TESOL programs who are conducting practicum. Brady & Gulikers (2004) cited in Moussu and Llur-

da(2008) said that many teacher educators do not let non-NES students to do the practicum in their institutions due to non-NES students are seen as having poor linguistic skills and they are afraid this deficiency would obstruct the students' learning.

However, the belief which assumes that NESTs are better English teachers than NNESTs is not always true. By using Phillipson's term (1992), 'native speakers fallacy', (p.185) which best describes an assumption that ideal English teacher is a native teacher, I would like to say that I agree that native speaker teachers *are not always* ideal teachers of English, as we will see from people's perception about native and non-native English teachers in many countries in the following section.

### People's perception towards NESTs and NNESTs

Based on his research, Üstünlüoğlu (2007) finds that his participants who are the students in Turkey give positive attitudes towards NNESTs in terms of 'in-class teaching role' and 'in-class management roles'. On the other hand, the participants feel that NESTs are better than NNESTs in terms of 'in-class communication' (p.70-71). Some interesting findings in Üstünlüoğlu's study (2007) about students' perception towards NESTs and NNESTs were found in the answers of his participants which reflect that students prefer NNESTs because they can understand NNEST speaking more easily compare to NESTs. The researcher assumes that NESTs might speak too fast and their accent could be an obstacle for students' understanding. Additionally, NNESTs in Turkey's classrooms can use their ability to translate the material into their mother tongue to explain difficult terms. Moreover, according to the participants, NNESTs maintain order and discipline in the classroom better than NESTs. This represents Turkey's educational system in which authoritarian teachers are more respected than lenient teachers (Üstünlüoğlu, 2007). Additionally, NNESTs are perceived as better prepared and know the topic well compared to NESTs. Üstünlüoğlu (2007) assumes that the NNESTs are better prepared because they need to study more than native teachers because they teach a language which is not their native language, thus they have to study harder in order to be well prepared and informed about the subject they are about to teach in class.

However, the study also showed that NESTs have some positive values in terms of

communication skills. According to the participants, NESTs are more communicative, they often praise the students, make lesson enjoyable and treat students respectfully. NESTs also emphasize more on communication in the classroom and disregard grammar errors (Üstünlüoğlu, 2007).

Similar studies were also conducted by Grubbs, et al., (2010) among Thai students about their perceptions towards NESTs and NNESTs in Thailand. The research findings showed that students perceive NESTs, compared to NNESTs, are better in oral skills (speaking, pronunciation, and vocabulary usage), thus the Thai students prefer NESTs to teach pronunciation, reading, speaking and listening. On the other hand, Thai students prefer NNESTs to teach grammar and writing. Similarly, in Indonesia, based on a study conducted in a blog in the website, Indonesian students agree that NESTs have a good ability in conversation skill; as a result, they think that NESTs are better in teaching listening, speaking and pronunciation, while according to Indonesian students, NNESTs are good in grammar (2011). Moreover, both Thai and Indonesian students agree that NESTs know better about the culture of the English-speaking worlds, they can provide students' demand of learning colloquial English or slang. However, NESTs are also seen as having weaknesses in knowledge and awareness of their students' culture (Grubbs, et al., 2010) as well as inability to detect difficulty faced by their students. As it reflects from one of the respondents in the blog who says 'they [NESTs] may not be able to understand the common mistakes of learners'. On the other hand, NNESTs in Indonesia, according to them, can explain differences between L1 and target language. In addition, NNESTs know fundamental grammar and can clarify basic rules of English grammar in L1 (2011).

Furthermore, there are some other researchers who conduct similar study to find out people's perception towards NESTs and NNESTs, such as Rao (2010) who conducted a research on students' perceptions towards NESTs in China, Han (2005) in Korea, Ying and Braine (2007) who conducted research about students' attitudes towards NNESTs in Hong Kong. Based on their research, it is found that the students in China, Hong Kong, and Korea could distinguish the advantages and disadvantages of having NESTs. The advantages of having NESTs are: 1). Most of them have qualities and skills which show that they are efficient language teachers, they are friendly and helpful,

fluent and idiomatically appropriate in using English language, be able to appreciate the cultural connotations of the language, and in assessing whether a given language form is acceptably correct or not (Rao, 2010), 2). NESTs can teach students 'real English' based on native-like pronunciation, spontaneity in speaking (without hesitations), and cultures of English-speaking people (Han, 2005). Conversely, some disadvantages of having NESTs are: 1). NESTs are insensitive to students' linguistic problems due to their lack experience of learning English as second language, 2). NESTs are ignorant of their students' mother tongue, it makes difficult for NESTs to compare and to highlight differences between the students' mother tongue and the target language, 3). NESTs' lack of familiarity and understanding of students' culture and educational systems leads to a disparity between teaching and learning styles of the NESTs and preferred way of teaching and learning in the socio-cultural context of their students (Han, 2005; Rao, 2010).

In contrast, Yin and Braine (2007) find that the participants in their study in Hong Kong mentioned some advantages of having NNESTs, which are: 1). NNESTs are effective English teacher (they do not have difficulty in understanding and answering the students' questions), 2). NNESTs can apply effective strategies in teaching English as they have the experience of learning English through the same education system, the same cultural background, as a result NNESTs can understand the difficulties faced by the students, 3). NNESTs can explain difficult terms or issues using the students' L1. NNESTs are also able to design teaching materials according to the need and the learning style of the students.

However, the participants in Yin and Braine (2007) research also mentioned some shortcomings of NNESTs such as the NNESTs tend to spoon-fed their students, they also see NNESTs as 'exam-oriented teachers' because NNESTs put more emphasize on practicing past examination questions. NNESTs are also perceived as over-reliant on textbooks. Finally, the participants critically stated that NNESTs are over-correcting the mistakes of the students in English usage.

The studies conducted by some researchers above about the perceptions towards NESTs and NNESTs in several countries proved that NESTs are not always better than NNESTs. As said by Rampton(1990) that 'being born into

language does not mean that one inherently speaks it well' (cited in Moussu and Llurda, 2008, p.321), it appears that Reis' participant (2011) has the same idea. Reis' participant (2011), in order to challenged native speaker myth, states that being good reader and good writer in English is through the process of acquiring in schools, not automatically gained by someone because he or she has a native status. Thus, it can be concluded that being a native speakers alone does not guarantee one can be a good English teacher; to become a good English teacher one should have skills and qualifications.

## DISCUSSION

### Who should be employed in Indonesia? NESTs or NNESTs?

Both NESTs and NNESTs have their own strengths and weaknesses as English teachers. As Canagarajah (1999) cited in Moussu and Llurda (2008) argues that NESTs are ideal teachers because of their unique cultural knowledge, while NNESTs can also be ideal teachers because they have multicultural experience.

Widdowson (1992) cited in Ellis (2002) maintains that a teacher is both informant and instructor, he also argues that NESTs have more experience as English users thus they may be better informants, whereas NNESTs have more experience as English learners hence they may be better instructors. Thus, it can be said that ideally both NESTs and NNESTs should be hired in Indonesia. They can collaborate in using their own strengths in teaching English in the classrooms. As Medgyes (1992) suggests that 'ideal school, there should be a good balance of NESTs and NNESTs, who complement each other in their strengths and weaknesses' (p.349). He contends that NNESTs have strengths in providing a good learner model, teaching language learning strategies more effectively, anticipating and preventing language difficulties, using their mother tongue to explain difficult terms, being more empathetic to the needs and problems of learners (Medgyes, 1994 in Moussu & Llurda, 2008). Liu (1999) and Widdowson (1992) cited in Ellis (2002) also agree that NNESTs' experiences in learning target language are helpful for teaching the learners. While the strengths of NESTs as mentioned earlier are in their proficiency in speaking, pronunciation, vocabulary usage, culture of English-speaking worlds, and so forth.

However, Indonesian government restricts the number of native speakers to teach in Indonesia. It is regulated in the policy issued by Indonesian Ministry of Education PP no.78/2009 which says that foreign teachers cannot be more than 30 percent in compositions with local teachers. Thus, it would be difficult to place duo teachers (native and non-native teachers) to do collaborative teaching in all schools in Indonesia. Secondly, not all schools in Indonesia can afford to pay native speaker teachers since most of schools in small towns and villages are shortage of funds to pay the native teachers. For an illustration, some schools in Papua, East Indonesia can only afford to pay their contracted teachers (guru honor) for approximately IDR 3000 to IDR 5000 per hour (it equivalent with approximately AUD 50 cents per hour).

Nevertheless, native versus non-native teachers' dichotomy has become a never ending debate. As Miller (2007) argues that it does not matter who the teacher is, whether he/ she is NEST or NNEST. The most important thing is whether he/ she is competent in speaking, reading and writing in English, have excellent knowledge in grammar, and have good teaching knowledge and skill since both NESTs and NNESTs are facing the same problems in English teaching and learning. Some common problems faced by both NESTs and NNESTs according to Miller (2007) are: 1). In choosing appropriate materials for students (the materials should be engaging, have socio-cultural context which is understood by both students and teachers), 2). In determining the purpose of the lesson and making a cohesive tie of each lesson.

Hence, it can be concluded that even though NESTs teachers are needed to do cooperative teaching in Indonesia, it seems that it contradicts government regulation in hiring native teachers in schools. However, both NESTs and NNESTs should have language teaching qualifications in order to be able to serve Indonesian schools. Ellis (2002) argues that it is necessary for all ESL teachers, native and non-native, to have training, experience, understanding of language, and teaching skills. Thus, it becomes no matter who teach in Indonesia, whether they are NESTs or NNESTs as long as they have appropriate teaching qualification, skills, and experience.

The fact that it is not really necessary to debate whether NESTs or NNESTs who are more suitable to be hired in Indonesia, another issue arising now is about which English and

whose English should be taught in Indonesia. Is it English native speakers (ENS) or local variety of Englishes? The following section will discuss about English native speakers, variety of Englishes, and the dilemma faced in Indonesia in choosing which English should be taught.

### **English native speakers (ENS) or local variety of Englishes?- A dilemma**

English in Indonesia is used as the first official foreign language. It is used for international communication, and as a medium to acquire knowledge, particularly science and technology. In addition, English is also used as sources for lexical development of Bahasa Indonesia (Sadtono, 1976; Diah, 1982 cited in Lowenberg, 1991). Furthermore, Sadtono (1976) cited in Lowenberg (1991) believes that English will never be a social language in the Indonesian community nor as the second official language of the administration of Indonesia.

English was identified as the first foreign language in Indonesia soon after Indonesian independence in 1945 replacing former colonial languages of Dutch and Japanese. Hence, English became a compulsory subject in the secondary curriculum from the early years of independence and it continues become one of the most significant subjects at schools and universities in Indonesia (Lamb and Coleman, 2008). Schools and other formal & informal institutions in Indonesia refer to English Native Speaker (ENS) varieties such as American English (AmE) and British English (BrE) to be used in English classrooms. However, ENS varieties which are learned in class are not used in daily conversation. As a result, people in Indonesia create local variety which uses English as an additional language (Lowenberg, 1991). It becomes a challenge for English language professionals to determine whose English, which English should be taught to the students in Indonesia. Should it be local variety or ENS variety? Regarding that now, English as Lingua Franca (ELF) which uses local variety seems effective to be used in worldwide communication (Young & Walsh, 2010).

Moussu and Llorca (2008) point out that before the beginning of 1990s native-like command is used as a parameter of the success of learning English. More recently, language professionals have been starting to question the usefulness of a native speaker model in English pedagogy, regarding the fact that non-native speakers are outnumbered native speakers (Graddol, 2006 cited in Moussu & Llorca, 2008; Maley, 2009), thus Moussu and Llorca (2008);

Prodromou (1997) cited in Timmis (2002) believe that currently communication in English is occurred between NNS and NNS, as a result the norms and usage of ENS should not be the focus for NNS to pursue. Moreover, using non-native English variety orso called by Maley (2009) as non-standard, is not seen as negative prejudice or discrimination.

It will be a benefit for NNEST to teach local variety since the NNEST does not have to be as perfect as NES especially in accent which is very difficult to be gained, as argued by Kramsch (1997) cited in Moussu and Llorca (2008) that it is not possible for non-native speakers to be exactly like native speakers especially in speaking competence. She suggests that it would be better for non-native speakers to retain their uniqueness and become competent in a new language. Moreover, the teaching situation in Indonesia where the classes are large, teachers have minimal English proficiency and most of them cannot afford to travel abroad to learn 'real English' or native English norms, limited contact time, and exam-oriented teaching, other variety of English is more suitable to be taught. As Bruthiaux (2010, p.368) agrees that 'to learners in developing, resource-poor EFL setting especially, it matters very little who says *tomahito* and who says *tomayto*. Knowing the word *tomato* is achievement enough'.

However, there is a disparity between the use of English as an additional language which leads to the emergence of new variety of English and the Bourdieu's cultural capital (Norton Pierce, 1995) of learning English. Learning English is an investment for getting better job and going to a higher level of education. English is also seen as the 'mark of well-educated man', a symbol of the 'new elite' (Tanner, 1967 cited in Lowenberg, 1991). The common standard tests of English used in job industry or higher degree of education are IELTS and TOEFL, and these two tests follow the NS models. Thus, there is a dilemma in which, in reality, local variety of English is used among people in Indonesia; on the other hand, if someone wants to succeed in life, they must learn ENS variety because to be able to enter the 'gate' of higher degree of education and get a better job, one has to show his/ her mastery of English which is measured by the standard tests such as IELTS and TOEFL.

## CONCLUSION

People preference on NESTs is due to NESTs are seen as a 'brand' or benchmark of

'good English'. The brand of good English speakers given to NESTs is measured by accent as a marker which distinguishes NESTs and NNESTs, fluency in speaking, and so forth. On the other hand, NNESTs are often seen as deficient English speakers because they speak with accent, less fluent in speaking compared to NNESTs, and so forth. As a result, negative prejudices given to NNESTs lead to discrimination to NNESTs in teaching employment.

Nevertheless, based on some studies about people's perception towards NESTs and NNESTs, it can be seen that *native speaker fallacy* is true. NESTs are not always ideal teachers. On the other hand, NNESTs are not always worse than NESTs. In fact, both NESTs and NNESTs have their own strengths and weaknesses as English teachers. Some researchers suggest hiring NESTs and NNESTs in each English class because they can collaborate and complement each other. However, most schools in Indonesia, especially state schools cannot apply collaboration between NESTs and NNESTs due to government policy which restricts the number of foreign teachers to teach in Indonesia. In addition, most schools in Indonesia, due to financial difficulty or shortage of funding, cannot afford to hire foreign teachers.

However, the most important thing in choosing good English teachers is based on the qualification, skills, and experience of teaching; no matter they are native or non-native. A problem which arises now is in determining which English should be taught. It is dilemmatic in determining variety of Englishes and native English variety since there is a disparity between the consumption of English as additional language and the cultural capital of learning English among Indonesian community.

## REFERENCE

- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209.
- Dewi, A. (2007). Shifts in NNESTs' professional identity: an impact of language and culture immersion. *The Asian EFL journal quarterly*, 9(4), 111-125.
- Ellis, L. (2002). Teaching from experience: a new perspective on the non native teacher in adult ESL. *Australian review of applied linguistics*, 25(1), 71-107.
- Figueiredo, E. H. D. d. (2011). Nonnative English-speaking teachers in the United

- States: issues of identity. *Language and Education*, 25(5), 419-423.
- Grubbs, S. J., Jantarrah, V., & Kettem, S. (2010). Studying English with Thai and native-speaking teachers. *Teachers and Teaching*, 16(5), 559-576.
- Hall, S. (1997a). Introduction. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: SAGE.
- Hall, S. (1997b). The work of representation. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: SAGE.
- Han, S. A. (2005). Good teachers know where to scratch when learners feel itchy: Korean learners' views of native-speaking teachers of English. *Australian Journal of Education*, 49(2), 197-213.
- Holliday, A. (2008). Standards of English and politics of inclusion. *Language teaching*, 41(1), 119-130.
- Holliday, A. & Aboshiba, P. (2009). The Denial of ideology in perceptions of 'nonnative speakers' teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(4), 669-689.
- Hoon, C. H. (2003). "You see me no up". *Language problems & language planning*, 27(1), 45-62.
- Kramsch, C. (1998). The relationship of language and culture. *Language and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lowenberg, P. H. (1991). English as an additional language in Indonesia. *World Englishes*, 10(2), 127-138.
- Lamb, M., & Coleman, H. (2008). Literacy in English and the transformation of self and society post-Soeharto Indonesia. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(2), 189-205.
- Miller, J. (2007). Identity construction in teacher education. In Z. Hua, P. Seedhouse, L. Wei & V. Cook (Eds.), *Language learning and teaching as social interaction* (pp. 148-162). Basington, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Medgeyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, 46(4), 340-349.
- Moussu, L., & Llorca, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking language teachers: history and research. *Language teaching*, 41(3), 318-348.
- Native speaking teacher vs non native speaker. (n.d). Retrieved August 25, 2011, from www.englishbaby.com/forum/AskEnglish/thread/434175
- Norton Pierce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9-31.
- Paikeday, T. (1985). *The Native Speaker is Dead!* Toronto, Canada: Paikeday Publishing Inc.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Rampton, M. B. H. (1990). Displacing the "native speaker": expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, 44(2), 97-101.
- Rao, Z. (2010). Chinese students' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers in EFL teaching. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 31(1), 55-68.
- Reis, D. A. (2011). Non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) and professional legitimacy: a sociocultural theoretical perspective on identity transformation. *International Journal of the sociology of language*, 208, 139-160.
- Selvi, Ali Fuad. (2011). The non-native speaker teacher. *ELT Journal*, 65(2), 187-189
- Shuck, G. (2006). Racializing the nonnative English speaker. *Journal of language, identity, and education*, 5(4), 259-276.
- Timmis, T. (2002). Native-speaker norms and international English: a classroom view. *ELT Journal*, 56(3), 240-249.
- Üstünlüoğlu, E. (2007). University students' perceptions of native and non-native teachers. *Teachers and Teaching*, 13(1), 63-79.
- Woodward, K. (1997). Introduction. In K. Woodward (Ed.), *Identity and difference*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Ying, C. L., & Braine, G. (2007). The Attitudes of university students towards non-native speakers English teachers in Hong Kong. *RELC Journal*, 38(3), 257-277.
- Young, T. J., & Walsh, S. (2010). Which English? Whose English? An investigation of 'non-native' teachers' beliefs about target varieties. *Language, culture and curriculum*, 23(2), 123-137.