English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 17, No. 4 Winter 2011

Learners' Different Views on Korean and Native Teachers of English*

Ree-Na Kim**
(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)
Haedong Kim**
(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Kim, Ree-Na & Kim, Haedong. (2011). Learners' different views on Korean and native teachers of English. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 17*(4), 157-175.

The purpose of this study is to compare learners' view on Korean and native teachers of English with regard to competence of teaching skills. A total of 166 high school students attending the same high school in Korea participated in a questionnaire survey. The students were asked a series of questions about their five Korean teachers of English and three natives. The analysis of the results indicates that the learners believed Korean English teachers would be better in teaching vocabulary, grammar and reading than native English teachers. The learners answered native English teachers would be better in teaching speaking, listening, and writing. In the areas of the accuracy of classroom language, the level of teacher-centeredness, and the amount of cultural information given in a classroom, there were no significant differences in the learners' responses between Korea and native teacher of English. By recognizing the differences of the learners' views on two different types of ELT teachers, we suggest that it would be beneficial for learners if we would utilize their views in designing and administrating a team-teaching program.

[Korean teacher of English/Native teacher of English/Leaner view]

I. INTRODUCTION

A teacher plays a vital role in any ELT classrooms. Especially in a team-teaching situation, it is important to identify and balance the roles between nonnative and native

* This study is supported by Hankuk University of Foreign Studies.
** First author: Reena Kim, corresponding author: Haedong Kim. This study includes a part of the first author's unpublished MA thesis.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

teachers of English. However, not many studies have been conducted for the comparison of nonnative and native teachers of English within the context of secondary school in Korea. This study starts from the recognition of lack of information on the comparative roles of Korean and native teachers of English for high school students. To be specific, this study aims to identify what the learners' perception is regarding preferences for nonnative and native teachers of English in a Korean high school environment.

A comparison will be made in the learners' perception of both Korean and nonnative teacher of English. We will cover the aspects of teacher's competence with reference to the literature on the characteristics of nonnative and native teachers of English (e.g., Davis, 2003; Medgyes, 2001). The specific aspects asked to the learners in this study are i) overall ability, fluency of English, levels of training and degree of preparation, ii) teaching skills of listening, speaking, reading, writing, vocabulary and grammar, and iii) the appropriateness of giving directions, the level of teacher-centeredness and the amount of cultural information given in the classroom. The results of the study may give us ideas to make suggestions for English teachers and curriculum managers in high schools in Korea.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. The Nonnative Teacher of English

To ask about the aspects of teachers, we have to set up the aspects we need to concern. In literature, the characteristics of nonnative teacher of English are mainly related to the language, educational and social aspects. We first present the definition of nonnative teacher of English and then deal with the relevant issues in literature.

Medgyes (2001) says that it is difficult to decide who should be considered a nonnative teacher of English in ELT. He says that typically "a non-NEST[nonnative English Speaking Teacher] may be defined as a teacher…for whom English is a second or foreign language; who speaks in an EFL environment; whose students are monolingual groups of learners; and who speaks the same native language as his or her students" (p. 433). He goes on to add that this definition is applicable only partially to nonnative teachers of English who work in second language contexts. In focusing on the language aspect, Saraswathi (1991) further states that "Most teachers are not aware of the fact that their own English is of a very poor standard and that they provide very bad models for their own learners." (p. 77).

However, the assumption that native teachers are automatically better language teachers is questioned in literature. Shaw (1979) says, native teacher of English may lack

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

"the kinds of insight necessary for an English language teacher to prepare and execute his classes" (p. 12). He also states that "nonnative speaker teachers are typically better able…to control the complexity of their speech in an elementary class" (*ibid.*). Murphy-O'Dwyer (1996) says that native teachers of English have just as much to learn (and in many cases much more) than nonnative teachers, and claims, nonnative teachers of English have a distinct advantage over monolingual native teachers in that they already have a successful language learning experience behind them, which they can draw on to inform their teaching. Bailey (2006) criticizes a phenomenon for looking for native teachers of English by stating "there is no justification for this practice other than the folk belief that native-speaking teachers are somehow inherently superior" (p. 306). Therefore, we should be cautious about a possible mistake that may happen by focusing on a language factor only when we investigate the characteristics between nonnative and native teachers of English.

In literature, we may notice other characteristics related to nonnative teachers of English. Medgyes (2001) notes aspects of nonnative teacher's classroom practices and coursebook preference. He points out that nonnative teacher of English is reluctant to loosen his or her grip over the class due to language difficulties. A similar reason is claimed to account for the nonnative's preference for standard course books, which by their very nature provide security (*Ibid.*).

Social and cultural aspects related to nonnative teachers of English are also mentioned in literature. Kamhi-Stein, Aagard, Ching, Paik, and Sasser (2001) say nonnative teachers of English may experience teacher bashing and the media's distrust of public education, and "burn out" trying to meet the needs of bilingual programs while working under the stigma of teaching in a "bilingual" rather than a "regular" program. In similar vein, Saville-Troike (1992) mentions nonnative teachers of English have difficulty in communicating with native speakers because they do not share the native speaking community knowledge. He points out that even though nonnative teachers of English have mastered the forms of the new language, they might still have difficulty in meeting the social expectations of speakers from the new speech community. Kramsch (2000) indicates that even nonnative teachers of English who have had many years of experience with a second language and culture "may have to find their 'own place'" (p.257) at the intersection of their natal and target cultures. Byram (1989) also argue that attempts to speak like a native cannot take the place of the socialization process in foreign language contexts.

Based on the argument in literature, the following implication can be made. Being concerned only with the fact that the teacher is either native or nonnative will make us overlook other very important issues. Being a native or nonnative speaker of a particular target language is not as important as whether he or she is proficient in that language.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Proficiency is "knowledge, competence, or ability in the use of a language, irrespective of how, where, or under what conditions it has been acquired" (Bachman, 1990, p. 16). Since the teacher's language proficiency is only one element of professionalism, we must also consider whether the person has the appropriate preparation to be a teacher. Other key issues to take into consideration are classroom management and knowledge about target language society and culture.

2. The Native Teacher of English

There are two main issues related to native teacher of English in literature. The one is the issue of nativeness and the other is that of standard native English. By reviewing those issues in literature, we may be able to set up the areas for checking different characteristics between native and nonnative teachers of English.

As Bailey (2006) has said, "the issue of nativeness is far more complex than folkloric beliefs make it seem" (p. 294). Ferguson (1983) indicates that "Linguists…have long given a special place to the native speaker as the only true and reliable source of language data" (p. vii). Bloomfield (1933) states that to be the native speaker of a language means to speak it from your mother's knee as your mother tongue or your first language. If we were to state the definition of a native speaker as someone who is the 'only true and reliable source of language data', there would be few people who would be able to refer to themselves as a native speaker.

Therefore, there can be many other different characteristics that may fit the ability of the native speaker. Davies (2003) characterizes the native speaker in six ways; He or she acquires the L1 of which he or she is a native speaker in childhood, has intuitions about his or her Grammar 1, has intuitions about those features of the Grammar 2 which are distinct from his or her Grammar 1, has a unique capacity to produce fluent spontaneous discourse, has a unique capacity to write creatively, and has a unique capacity to interpret and translate into the L1 which he or she is a native speaker.

Now that the native speaker has been defined, it is also important that we look into the "thing" that the native speaker is speaking. Based on sociolinguistic research, it can be conferred that languages are not usually singled out to one geographic or social standard as the "thing" native speakers speak. According to Lowenberg (1990), in the past, standard English was defined as "the linguistic forms which are the accepted models for official, business, journalistic, and academic writing, and for public speaking before an audience or on radio or television" (p. 157). The English used by educated native speakers is often assumed to be "the universal target for classroom instruction, and the benchmark for attained proficiency in Standard English around the world", but Lowenberg continues "such an assumption is no longer sociolinguistically valid" (*ibid.*).

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Instead there are different native speaker norms that provide the target models for language learners, and in some instances, learners may have a choice of models (Goldstein, 1987). Tay (1982) also makes a more specific definition of native speakers of English who are not from one of the traditionally native speaking countries. He (*ibid.*) states that a native speaker is a person who learns English in childhood and continues to use it as his dominant language and has reached a certain level of fluency. All in all, these different types of views show a contrast between what a native speaker of English may physically appear to be and the idealization definition.

One thing that is impossible to overlook when stating the characteristics of the native speaker is pronunciation. Being considered to have more accurate pronunciation, the native teacher of English is considered to be ideal for repetition and echoing exercises. Sullivan (2000) claims the teacher and the students become more successful in maintaining topical coherence and building a base of shared knowledge when they echo or reformulate each other's utterances in reciprocal ways. Davies (2003) states, "The native speaker is also expected to exhibit normal control especially in fluent connected speech, and to have command of expected characteristic strategies of performance and of communication" (p. 207).

In consideration of the aspects discussed above, it seems to be necessary for us to see whether native teachers of English would be perceived by Korean high school students as better English teachers than their nonnative speaking counterparts. As Amin (2001) says, "the 'native speaker of English' is such a powerful construct, one so embedded in myth" (p. 90). Therefore, it probably needs to attempt to disentangle fact from fable. This necessity justifies the need of the present study.

3. The Previous Studies on Nonnative and Native Teachers of English

There have been many studies on Korean teachers of English in literature (e.g., Chang, 1996; KICE & KATE, 2008; Yang, 2006). In this part, we will focus on major studies conducted outside Korea by using a survey to collect learners' views. Among the studies, Medgyes' study (2001) is comprehensive one. Based on a learner survey, Medgyes (*ibid.*) identifies differences between native and nonnative teachers of English. According to his learner-respondents, they felt that "NS[native speaker]s used real language and used English more confidently" and nonnative teachers of English were judged as "speaking poorer English, using 'bookish' language, and using English less confidently" (p.435). In terms of general attitude, Medgyes' reports that "native-speaking teachers adopt a more flexible approach, are more innovative and less empathetic, attend to perceived needs, have unrealistic expectations, are frequently more casual, and are sometimes less committed to teaching" (*ibid.*). On the contrary, nonnative teachers of

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

English "adopt a more guided approach, are more cautious, are more empathetic to the students, attend to real needs, and have realistic expectations … and are more committed to teaching" (*ibid.*). His data also suggests that "native speaking teachers often focus on fluency, meaning, language in use, oral skills, and colloquial registers. They will teach items in context, favor group work or pair work, prefer free activities and use a variety of materials. In comparison to nonnative speaking teachers, native speaking teachers tolerate errors and give fewer tests. They use less of the students' first language, assign less homework and resort to translation less often. With regard to teaching culture, native speakers do supply more cultural information than nonnative speaking teachers" (*ibid.*). His study also shows that nonnative teachers of English have a tendency to "focus on accuracy, including attention to grammatical rules. They emphasize the printed word and formal registers and often teach items in isolation. They prefer using controlled, teacher-centered activities, give more tests and may rely on one single textbook. They resort to translation and use more of the students' first language" (*ibid.*). Overall, we can generalize to say that Medgyes' study (2001) illustrates nonnative teachers of English prefer teacher-centered activities with emphasis on the written language, discipline, and academic hierarchy.

Other studies focus on a particular aspect of nonnative teacher of English. For example, Boxer and Codes-Conde's (2000) study reveals that bringing motivating topics relevant to the learner's sociocultural world to the classroom help learners invest in their community of learners. They say the learners become active agents of their sociocultural awareness and knowledge of which is essential to their success as English language learners and users. A study by Duff (2000) demonstrates that "repetitions, echoes, reformulations, and paraphrases of all or part of their own and each other's utterances" (p. 109) generate cognitive benefits for both the teacher and the students.

In reviewing the literature that presents the difficulties for the nonnative teacher of English and the strengths of native teacher of English, we may conclude that the claims proposed by the scholars and the finding by the researchers outside Korea should be checked within the Korean context. Especially, a replication of Medgyes' study (2001) is needed because it can be helpful if we check our findings with referring to the findings in another context. These aspects support the needs of the present study.

To achieve the aim of the present study, the research questions are set up. They are as follow:

1. Are there differences in the learners' views on nonnative and native teachers of English teachers with regard to their overall ability, fluency, the level of preparation and the degree of training?

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

2. Are there differences in the learners' views on nonnative and native teachers of English teachers with regard to teaching skills of speaking, listening, reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar?

3. Are there differences in the learners' views on nonnative and native teachers of English teachers with regard to the accuracy of classroom language, the level of teacher-centeredness, and the amount of cultural information given in a classroom?

III. RESEARCH DESIGN

1. Setting and Subjects

The subjects of this study consisted of one hundred and sixty-six high school students attending the same high school in Seoul, Korea. The students were asked a series of questions regarding their teachers who included five nonnative and three native teachers of English. These teachers were in charge of teaching the first and second graders in the school. All students were in either their first or second year of high school. The school adopted a team teaching for English classes. Differentiated-level classes were also adopted. Native teachers of English mainly taught a speaking skill class and nonnative teachers covered reading, listening, and writing classes. All teachers taught all differentiated-level classes. The learners had experience of being taught by nonnative and native teachers of English both. It means that it was possible to ask the learners to compare characteristics of nonnative and native teachers of English.

The learner-respondents had various backgrounds of English education. Some of the students were not able to speak in complete English sentences and there were a few students who were as comfortable speaking English as they were speaking Korean. There were twenty-five (15% of the total respondents) female students and one hundred and forty-one (85%) male students.

The teachers involved in the learner questionnaire survey consisted of five nonnative teachers of English and three natives. The following table 1 illustrates personal backgrounds of teachers.

In case of Korean teacher of English, there were three males and two females. The average age was 40.2 and the average of their experiences in English Education was 12.6 years. The average of teaching at this particular high school was four years. All of them had a bachelor's degree in English education as a minimum. In case of native teacher of English, there were two females and one male. The average age was 39.3 and the average of their experiences in English Education was nine years. The average of

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

teaching at this particular high school was four years. They were from USA and Australia. Their major was not English education.

TABLE 1

Backgrounds of Nonnative and Native Teachers of English

Teacher of English	Gender	Age	Teaching Experience	Length of Stay in the school	Major (degree)
Nonnative	female	39	14	4	English Education (BA and MA)
	female	39	12	2	English Education (BA)
	Male	43	15	4	English Education (BA)
	Male	33	4	3	English Education (BA)
	Male	47	18	7	English Education (BA and MA)
Native	female	39	9	7	Hotel Management (BA) from Australia
	female	37	15	4	Business Administration (BA) from USA
	Male	42	3	1	Communication (BA) from USA

As a group, there were no gender or age differences between two groups. They also had the same average four years of teaching at the school. Korean teachers had a bit longer period of teaching experiences than native teachers. Unlike native teachers of English, all Korean teachers majored in English Education. The small number of the teacher-subject is a limitation of the present study. It, however, was assumed that this group could be a typical sample group participating in a team teaching program at a high school in Korea.

2. Questionnaire and Data Collection Procedures

The items on the questionnaire survey were designed to identify the learners' views on their English teachers. The first part was designed to answer the research question one of the present study – the learners' views regard to teacher's overall ability, fluency, the level of preparation and the degree of training. The students were asked to circle on a five point Likert-scale. One was equivalent to strongly disagree, two was equivalent to disagree, three was neutral, four was equivalent to agree and five was equivalent to strongly agree. The statements were as follows:

- *My teacher is fluent in English.*
- *My teacher's ability in English is excellent.*
- *My teacher is well trained as an English teacher.*
- *My teacher is well prepared for the class.*

The next part was related to the research question two of the present study – teacher's ability in teaching speaking, listening, reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Instead of using a Likert-scale item, by ranking the skill that the student perceived their teacher to be strongest in to weakest in, the responses were collected.

The last set of items was related to the research question three of the present study – the accuracy of classroom language, the level of teacher-centeredness, and the amount of cultural information given in a classroom. The students again were asked to circle a number from one to five on a Likert-scale, equivalent to strongly disagree to strongly agree. The statements on the survey are as follows:

- *It is necessary to be perfect in English to be an English teacher.*
- *Language is just a form of communication. It does not have to be accurate.*
- *I prefer teacher-centered activities.*
- *Cultural information is important when learning English.*

The questionnaire was one page long and administered at four different classrooms. As asking about their teacher may lead a bias-response to please their teachers (Skehan, 1989), cares were given in the questionnaire administration. First, the survey was administered not by a classroom English teacher but by the co-researcher of the present study at the classrooms. By doing so, the learners thought that the questionnaire was aiming for a study purpose – not for evaluating their teachers. It was believed that it could lead relatively honest responses from the learners. Second, the learners were asked to choose whether their answers were about nonnative or native teachers of English (of the same school) and then answered the items. It can be pointed that, for the comparison purpose, the same questions should be asked twice for two types of English teachers. However, it has been reported that asking the same question twice may cause an unreliable response, especially from the learner-respondents (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1991). In consideration of this aspect, the particular administration technique was employed. We assumed that the used technique would not seriously contaminate the reliability of the results - even though it may remain as a limitation of the present study -, because the questions were not about certain facts but about their views. It turned out that among 166 respondents, 63 students chose a native teacher of English for their answers and 103 students did a nonnative teacher.

Raw data was conceived from the results of the surveys and then it was observed if the differences from the samples also statistically applied to the population. To calculate the results of the survey, SPSS 12 was used. To compare the learners' views on two groups of English teachers, the comparison of the means and independent sample *t*-test were executed. The learners' responded scores were treated as dependant variables and two groups were as independent variables. In case of ranking frequency of strong teaching skill, Chi-squared test was utilized. The learners' ranking responses were treated as dependant variables and two groups were as independent variables.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

In interpreting the statistical results, interviews with the teachers in the school were carried out. As the co-researcher of the present study was working with the teachers at the same school, the interviews were held over the statistical findings. The type of interview was non-structured, and it could provide rich qualitative findings.

IV. RESULTS

By looking at Table 2, it can be observed that native teacher of English received higher response scores in all of the four areas in question – teacher's overall ability, fluency, the level of preparation and the degree of training. Independent *t*-tests were carried out to see if there was a significant difference in the responses.

TABLE 2

Results of Comparison Between Korean and Native Teachers of English: Overall Aspects I

		Mean	t-value	*p*
My teacher is fluent in English.	Native	4.79	13.32	.000
	Korean	3.04		
My teacher's ability in English is excellent.	Native	4.33	7.190	.000
	Korean	3.39		
My teacher is well trained as an English teacher.	Native	4.16	3.995	.000
	Korean	3.63		
My teacher is well prepared for the class.	Native	4.10	2.460	.015
	Korean	3.73		

* Students answers on Korean teacher of English (N = 103) and on native teacher of English (N = 63)

The results of independent sample *t*-tests showed that there was a significant difference of the mean in all four aspects, favoring native teacher of English.

Frequency and expected frequency of the scores for the areas of speaking, listening, reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar were calculated. Table 3 presents the results of frequency on each skill.

The results for speaking show that native teacher of English received 34.9% of the highest scores out of 38% of the total respondents. Although the expected frequency was 23.5, 58 students actually answered their native teacher of English would be better at speaking than any of the other areas. Korean teacher of English on the other hand received only 4 responses which ranked the teaching of speaking skill best out of 103 students. The expected frequency was 39.1, but 63 students ranked speaking as being the

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

poorest area for Korean teacher of English. This difference of the learners' answers was statistically significant, with the value of $x = 135.76$ ($p < .05$).

TABLE 3

Results of Comparison Between Korean and native teachers of English: Teaching Skills

			Ranking								
			6th	5th	4th	3rd	2nd	1st	Total	X^2	p
Speaking	Native	F	0	0	4	0	1	58	63	135.7	.00
		EF	23.9	7.2	4.2	1.9	2.3	23.5	63.0		
		T%	0%	.0%	2.4%	.0%	.6%	34.9%	38.0%		
	Korean	F	63	19	7	5	5	4	103		
		EF	39.1	11.8	6.8	3.1	3.7	38.5	103.0		
		T%	38.0%	11.4%	4.2%	3.0%	3.0%	2.4%	62.0%		
Listening	Native	F	0	2	5	11	41	4	63	76.00	.00
		EF	4.6	14.1	14.1	8.8	19.5	1.9	63.0		
		T %	.0%	1.2%	3.0%	6.7%	24.8%	2.4%	38.2%		
	Korean	F	12	35	32	12	10	1	102		
		EF	7.4	22.9	22.9	14.2	31.5	3.1	102.0		
		T %	7.3%	21.2%	19.4%	7.3%	6.1%	.6%	61.8%		
Reading	Native	F	19	20	16	6	2	0	63	79.64	.00
		EF	7.7	10.8	11.1	8.1	9.2	16.1	63.0		
		T%	11.6%	12.2%	9.8%	3.7%	1.2%	.0%	38.4%		
	Korean	F	1	8	13	15	22	42	101		
		EF	12.3	17.2	17.9	12.9	14.8	25.9	101.0		
		T%	.6%	4.9%	7.9%	9.1%	13.4%	25.6%	61.6%		
Writing	Native	F	3	11	16	22	11	0	63	13.06	.00
		EF	7.6	14.1	16.8	15.3	8.4	.8	63.0		
		T%	1.8%	6.7%	9.7%	13.3%	6.7%	.0%	38.2%		
	Korean	F	17	26	28	18	11	2	102		
		EF	12.4	22.9	27.2	24.7	13.6	1.2	102.0		
		T%	10.3%	15.8%	17.0%	10.9%	6.7%	1.2%	61.8%		
Vocabulary	Native	F	10	10	18	21	4	0	63	43.29	.00
		EF	4.6	6.1	10.7	22.1	11.8	7.6	63.0		
		T%	6.1%	6.1%	10.9%	12.7%	2.4%	.0%	38.2%		
	Korean	F	2	6	10	37	27	20	102		
		EF	7.4	9.9	17.3	35.9	19.2	12.4	102.0		
		T%	1.2%	3.6%	6.1%	22.4%	16.4%	12.1%	61.8%		
Grammar	Native	F	30	20	7	3	3	0	63	73.87	.00
		EF	14.5	10.7	6.9	6.9	11.8	12.2	63.0		
		T%	18.2%	12.1%	4.2%	1.8%	1.8%	.0%	38.2%		
	Korean	F	8	8	11	15	28	32	102		
		EF	23.5	17.3	11.1	11.1	19.2	19.8	102.0		
		T%	4.8%	4.8%	6.7%	9.1%	17.0%	19.4%	61.8%		

Note: F=Frequency, EF=Expected Frequency, T%=Total Percent

The skill of teaching listening was the second strongest area for native teacher of English. It had an expected frequency of 19.5 but 41 students answered the second strongest area for the native teacher of English to be listening. However, Korean teacher of English had an expected frequency of 31.5 but only 10 students answered the teaching

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

of listening to be the second strongest area for their nonnative teacher of English. Again, a Chi-Square test was conducted and it is shown that the teacher type does had a significant influence on the responses ($x = 76.00$, $p < .05$).

The area of teaching reading shows interesting results. While the expected frequency for teaching reading being the strongest area for native teacher of English was 16.1, none of the students perceived reading to be the strongest area for their native teacher of English. However, Korean teacher of English had an expected frequency of 25.9 but 42 students perceived their nonnative teacher to be strongest in the area of reading. The difference was statistically significant, with the value of $x = 79.64$ ($p < .05$).

In case of teaching writing, the students perceived it to be the third strongest area for native teacher of English. They perceived the skill of teaching writing to be the fourth strongest area for nonnative teacher of English.

For the area of teaching vocabulary, native teacher of English had an expected frequency of 7.6 and 11.6 for this area being the strongest and second strongest area. However, the actual frequency response was only 0 and 4. For Korean teacher of English, they had an expected frequency of 12.4 and 19.2 for vocabulary being their strongest and second strongest area but their actual frequency was a higher 20 and 27.

For the area of teaching grammar, the frequency of both the lower and higher areas of rankings was different from the expected frequency for Korean and native teachers of English. More students perceived grammar to be the weakest or second weakest area for native teacher of English. 30 students perceived grammar to be the weakest area for their native teacher when the expected frequency was 14.5. Also 20 students perceived grammar to be the second weakest area for their native teacher when the expected frequency was only 10.7. More students ranked their nonnative teacher of English to be strongest or second strongest in grammar than the expected frequency. The expected frequency for grammar being the strongest area for Korean teacher of English was 19.8 but 32 students perceived grammar to be the strongest area for their nonnative teacher. Also the expected frequency for grammar being the second strongest area for their nonnative teacher of English was 19.2 but the actual frequency was 28.

All in all, the results show that ranking the area that Korean and native teachers of English did better. Native teacher of English was ranked higher in speaking, listening and writing while Korean teacher of English was ranked higher in reading, vocabulary, and grammar. It is interesting to notice that some skills areas were considered to be strong teaching areas for Korean teacher of English.

The following Table 4 shows the learners' views in regard to the accuracy of classroom language, the level of teacher-centeredness, and the amount of cultural information given in a classroom between Korean and native teachers of English. The

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

mean scores of the learners' responses on both teacher groups are shown with the statistical test results.

TABLE 4

Results of Comparison Between Korean and Native Teachers of English: Overall Aspects II

		Mean	t-value	*p*
It is necessary to be perfect in English to be an English teacher.	Native	3.67	1.324	.187
	Korean	3.73		
Language is just a form of communication. It does not have to be accurate.	Native	3.25	1.183	.238
	Korean	3.46		
I prefer teacher-centered activities.	Native	3.78	-.049	.961
	Korean	2.02		
Cultural information is important when learning English.	Native	2.84	1.363	.175
	Korean	3.79		

* Students answers on Korean teacher of English (N = 103) and on native teacher of English (N = 63)

The results of this part of the survey shows even there were differences in actual mean scores, especially in cases of the level of teacher-centeredness and the amount of cultural information given at the classroom, there was no statistical significance in the learners' views on all four items. It means scores received by each teacher did not vary according to the teacher type.

V. DISCUSSION

It is an oversimplification to talk about hiring only native speakers of a particular target language (Flynn & Gulikers, 2001). In fact, doing so is to subscribe to 'the native speaker fallacy' (Braine, 1999) and the unquestioned assumption that "the ideal English teacher is a native speaker" (p. 23). Canagarajah (1999) has called this notion 'linguistically anachronistic' and said that "it creates a disjunction between research awareness and professional practice" (p 79).

The results of the present study support the idea that it is important to keep in mind that nonnative and native teachers of English have different strengths and weaknesses. Both have contributions to make. While encouraging the learners to participate in and collaborate through classroom activities, the effective teacher is found to play the role of an indispensable medium in constructing the shared knowledge that, in turn, lends itself to an effective process of learning the foreign language. By expanding shared knowledge

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

within each learning group, both native and nonnative teachers of English enable students to make the most of their learning experience. The successful teacher enables their students to make learning process the most successful and the most efficient it can be.

Our survey results show that native teacher of English was given higher scores in teaching speaking, listening and writing while Korean teacher of English was regarded as better in teaching reading, vocabulary and grammar. Native teacher of English were considered better in the area of overall ability, fluency, the level of preparation and the degree of training. However, there were no significant differences in the learners' responses in the areas of the appropriateness of classroom language, the level of teacher-centeredness, and the amount of cultural information provided in classroom.

In Medgyes' study (2001), the respondents documented six areas in which they felt nonnative teachers of English are better equipped than most natives: They can provide a better learner model; teach language-learning strategies more effectively; supply more information about the English language; better anticipate and prevent language difficulties; be more sensitive to their students; and benefit from their ability to use their students' mother tongue. Interestingly, in the present study, the respondent answered that Korean teacher of English is better in teaching reading, vocabulary and grammar. And, even though it was not statistically significant, Korean teacher of English was considered to be more teacher-centered. The present study illustrates that even though Korean teacher of English may be considered to have a few handicaps, he or she plays a vital role in teaching reading, vocabulary and grammar. From this information we can see that nonnative teacher is perceived to be better in areas that they have more experience in. Therefore, it can be said the appropriate skills of English that may be taught by nonnative teachers more effectively at a high school in Korea are reading, grammar and vocabulary.

Throughout the interviews with the teachers involved in the survey questionnaire, it was noted that because Korean teachers of English had shared common knowledge of Korean culture, they could approach Korean students in a more cooperative and inviting manner. With that knowledge Korean teacher of English was able to bring up topics relevant to the learner's world of interest. The teacher was then able to motivate the students to voice their knowledge and by doing so, the students could become active agents in their own language development. The willingness of the teacher to tap into the cultural and linguistic knowledge of the learners, as is discussed in McCormick and Donato (2000), is more likely to work for a successful classroom teaching rapport between teachers and students.

Finally, as educators we must try to find the most effective and efficient solution to try to help our students achieve the most with the environment we provide. We propose that

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

teachers who are native speaker of English can benefit from further education, because they can learn a great deal about teaching, the target language, and language acquisition (Tinker-Sachs, 2002). We also propose that Korean teacher of English should show genuine interest in the students' view on English teachers. When the student realizes he or she has something the teacher wants to listen to, he or she develops a sense of empowerment. This creates an environment where the learner feels safe to participate in interactional exploration and in turn fosters the establishment of secure bonds between the teacher and learner.

VI. SUMMARY AND SUGGESTION

1. Summary

This study aims to identify what the learners' view is in relating to nonnative and native teachers of English in a Korean high school environment. This research proposed three questions: Are there differences in the learners' views on nonnative and native teachers of English teachers with regard to (1) their overall ability, fluency, the level of preparation and the degree of training?, (2) teaching skills of speaking, listening, reading, writing, vocabulary, and grammar?, and (3) the accuracy of classroom language, the level of teacher-centeredness, and the amount of cultural information given in a classroom?

The questionnaire was designed in hopes to compare the learners' preferences for native or nonnative teacher of English teacher. The questions on the survey were grouped into three sections based on the research questions. For the first research question, the results from the survey conclude that native teacher of English was perceived to be stronger in all four areas in question: their overall ability, fluency, the level of preparation and the degree of training. Even though the nonnative teachers of English were all educated from one of the top universities in Korea, their scores from the learners did not exceed the scores of the native teacher of English. For the second research question, Chi-square tests were performed to determine if the type of teacher was significant variable in speaking, listening, reading, writing, vocabulary and grammar. At the level of $p<.05$, the value of Chi-Square was statistically significant for all six areas. Native teacher of English received the highest ranking frequencies in speaking (28%), listening (22%), and writing (16%). Nonnative teacher of English on the other hand received the highest ranking frequencies in reading (11%), vocabulary (14%), and grammar (9%). With regard to the third research question, the scores on each teacher

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

group received by the learners did not vary according to the teacher type. Whether the teacher was native or nonnative, the learners' perceptions were about the same.

2. Suggestions for Further Research

The need for good quality teacher of English in Korea is unquestionable. We need to know which teachers, with what qualifications and experience provide the best learning atmosphere for learners of different levels. Further continuous research on the topic of Korean and native teachers of English is imperative for providing the most effective and efficient method of learning. By studying which English comprehension levels can benefit most from different types of teachers, we can break the cycle of many Korean students being exposed to so many hours of English education yet not being confident in the target language. In the present study, the effect of different type of English teachers on the learners of differentiated-level was not systematically investigated. So, we propose a further study on this topic.

Some Korean schools have now employed native teachers to teach in English at public elementary schools. The method of language immersion is automatically instilled due to the lack of knowledge of Korean on the part of the native speaker. The controversy between whether English should be taught in English or if L1 should be used as a tool to learn the second language is an ongoing controversy. Further research in all of these issues is necessary to help shorten the learning time consumed by the learner.

REFERENCES

Amin, N. (2001). Nativism, the native speaker construct, and minority immigrant women teachers of English as a second language. *CATESOL Journal*, *13*(1), 89-90.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bailey, K. (2006). *Language teacher supervision: A case-based approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Boxer, K., & Cortes-Conde, F. (2000). Identity and ideology: Culture and pragmatics in content-based ESL. In J. K. Hall & L.S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 203-219). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Braine, G. (1999). *Nonnative educators in English language teaching.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Byram, M. (1989). *Cultural studies in foreign language education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). Interrogating the "native speaker fallacy": Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G Braine (ed.), *Nonnative educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77-92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Chang, Kyung-Sook. (1996). Content and process in language teacher training. English. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 2,* 193-212.

Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: Myth and reality*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Duff, P. (2000). Repetition in foreign language classroom interaction. In J. K. Hall & L. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 109-138). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ferguson, C. (1983). Language planning and language change. In H. Cobarrubias & J. Fishman (Eds.). *Progress in language planning: International perspectives.* (pp. 29-40). Berlin: Mouton.

Flynn, K., & Gulikers, G. (2001). Issues in hiring nonnative English speaking professionals to teach English as a second language. *CATESOL Journal*, *13*(1), 151-160.

Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1991). An instrumental motivation in language study: Who says it isn't effective?: *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*, 266-272.

Goldstein, L. (1987). Standard English: The only target for nonnative speakers of English? *TESOL Quarterly*, *21*(3), 417-436.

Kamhi-Stein, L. D., Aagard, A., Ching, A., Paik, Myoung-Soon A., & Sasser, L. (2001). New voices in the classroom: Nonnative English-speaking professionals in the field of teaching English to speakers of other languages. *CATESOL Journal*, *7*(1), 12-18.

Korea institute for Curriculum and Evaluation & Korean Association of Teachers of English. (2008). *Research on the development of certificate test for secondary English teachers*. Seoul: KICE.

Kramsch, C. (2000). The privilege of the nonnative speaker. In C. Blythe (ed.) *The soiolinguistics of foreign-language classrooms* (pp. 251-262). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Lowenberg, P. (1990). Nativization and interlanguage in Standard English: Another look. In James E. Alatis (ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on languages and linguistics 1990: Linguistics, language teaching and language acquisition: The interdependence of theory, practice and research* (pp. 157-168). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

McCormick, J., & Donato, R. (2000). Teacher questions as scaffold assistance in an ESL classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language*

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

learning through classroom interaction (pp. 183-202). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Medgyes, P. (2001). When the teacher is a nonnative speaker. In Marianne Celce-Murcia (ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.) (pp. 415-427). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Murphy-O'Dwyer, L. M. (1996). Putting the T in TESOL, *TESOL Matters, 6*(2). p. 21.

Saraswathi, V. (1991). Coping with teacher resistance: Insights from INSET programmes. In E. Sadtono (ed.), *Language teacher education in a fast changing world* (Anthology Series 29) (p. 77). Singapore: Regional Language Centre.

Saville-Troike, M. (1992). Cultural maintenance and 'vanishing' Englishes. In C. Kramsch & S McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Test and context*; *Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 145-155). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Shaw, P. A. (1979). Handling a language component in a teacher training course. In S. Holden (ed.), *Teacher training* (special issue No. 3 of Modern English Teacher) (pp. 12-15). London: Modern English Publications.

Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Sullivan, P. (2000). Spoken artistry: Performance in a foreign language classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 73-90). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tay, M. (1982). *The uses, users and features of English in Singapore.* Boston, MA: Newbury House.

Tinker-Sachs, G. (2002). Learning Cantonese: Reflections of an EFL teacher educator. In D. C. S. Li (ed.), *Discourses in search of members: In honor of Ron Scollon* (pp. 509-540). Lanham, MS: University Press of America.

Yang, Eun-Mi. (2006). Effects of instructional intervention in low-level college students' learning of request acts. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 12*(2), 215-235.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Secondary

Ree-Na Kim
Graduate School of Education, English Education
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
270, Imun-dong, Dongdaemun-gu
Seoul 130-791, Korea
Tel: (02) 2173-2420
Fax: (02) 2173-3505
Email: reena3200@yahoo.com

Haedong Kim
Graduate School of Education, English Education
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
270, Imun-dong, Dongdaemun-gu
Seoul 130-791, Korea
Tel: (02) 2173-3017
Fax: (02) 2173-3505
Email: khd@hufs.ac.kr

Received in October, 2011
Reviewed in December, 2011
Revised version received in December, 2011

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre