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Abstract
Teacher identity is complex, changeable over time, and a poly-component assembly like the social identity. Since there were some problems in analyzing teacher identity with the existing binary methods using NNEST (Non-Native English-Speaking Teacher) and NEST (Native English-Speaking Teacher), various analyzing methods were adopted in this study, such as investigating the linguistic identity of the participants. The primary purpose of the study was to investigate teacher identity of two female professors teaching English conversation in Korea and find out how their different teacher identities and learning and teaching experiences affected their teaching practices. Data collection consisted of six semi-structured interview sessions with two participants and one classroom observation for six months. To triangulate the data, the study analyzed the classroom observation field notes and background survey sheets along with the transcripts of the interviews. The present study discovered that the first participant (EB-elective bilingual) positioned herself as a NNEST and Korean who spent most of her lifetime practicing and teaching English in Korea with studying experience for about three and half years in the U.S. In the meantime, the second participant, a circumstantial bilingual, perceived herself as a NEST and Korean, who studied and practiced English in the U.S. and in some Asian countries but taught English language mostly in Korea. Even though both professors confessed that a well-prepared class was important, their different linguistic identities, learning and teaching experience caused the different teaching practices. In addition to such findings, the present study attempted to uncover the relationships between teachers’ NNEST identity and their actual teaching practices in the classroom. Hence, this study offers important implications for teaching English conversation in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) contexts.

Introduction
Identity is the perception of who we understand ourselves and others to be. It is perceiving where individuals place themselves in social relationships and how they distinguish themselves from others (Ahn, 2014). As Norton (1995) indicated, early identity-related studies were focused on learners. That is because identity is closely connected to the learners’ language acquisition. Since the 2000s, not only studies on learner identity, but also those on teacher identity have been increasingly carried out.

According to Ahn (2014), teacher identity is an important element in the professional development of teachers in social, cultural, and political aspects. In addition, it has a great impact on second language education because it affects teachers’ self-efficacy, motivation, commitment, and job satisfaction. For this reason, teacher identity is not only shaped by who language teachers think they are, but also the way other...
people see them (Ahn, 2019). Teacher identity is also a continuous process of interpreting and reinterpreting individual experiences (Beijaard et al., 2004).

Teacher identity-related studies have been conducted on NNESTs, (Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers), NESTs, (Native English-Speaking Teacher) or both. However, most teacher identity-related studies selected NNESTs as research participants and analyzed their interviews accordingly (Choi, 2009; Duff & Uchida, 1997; Golombek & Jordan, 2005; Li & De Costa, 2017; Meanard-Warwick, 2008; Park, 2012; Park & Bang, 2016; Tsui, 2007; Zacharias, 2010). There have been some studies with NESTs as the research subjects, while some were conducted only with NESTs (Canh, 2013; Kim, 2011), and others were with both NESTs and NNESTs (Duff & Uchida, 1997). However, all of these studies did not deviate from the dichotomous thinking of NEST/NNEST. This is because NEST and NNEST have different beliefs and thoughts about their teaching and learning according to their teacher identity.

In addition to the dichotomous analysis of NEST/NNEST, analysis methods with more diversified and broad perspectives were necessary to investigate teacher identities. According to Ellis (2016), the dichotomy of NEST/NNEST is no longer required because teacher identities are diverse and complex. The representative examples of analysis methods are translingualism and plurilingualism. Plurilingualism refers to a unique aspect of an individual's language repertoire including the importance of L1 (Taylor & Snoddon, 2013). This emphasizes the important role of L1 in L2 learning. According to plurilingualism, just as NNESTs need good English fluency to become good English teachers, NESTs need to learn L1 to understand students better. In translingualism, the synergy is important, so different languages communicate and influence each other with immediate meanings and grammars (Zheng, 2017). The current study took the opinion of Ellis (2016) as stated above, and analyzed the linguistic identities of the participants based on plurilingualism.

In order to diversify and analyze teacher identity, it is also important to understand the teacher's learning, teaching and cultural experiences (Duff & Uchida, 1997; Ellis, 2016). These are directly related to their teaching practices in class. Duff and Uchida (1997) proposed that teachers' sociocultural identities are based on their previous cross-cultural, learning and teaching experiences and beliefs, and these sociocultural identities continue to be negotiated and reconstructed according to their changing contextual and institutional factors. Ellis (2016) pointed out that NEST and NNEST's previous language learning experiences made a far more useful and powerful contribution to teacher identity and beliefs than in their native or non-native status.

Strictly speaking, since the NEST of the current study was not a typical white monolingual person, it is necessary to look at linguistic identities, beliefs, learning and teaching experience to investigate their teaching practices from a broader perspective. Therefore, this study is an example of investigating teacher identity from a different angle, out of the frame of comparing existing NEST/NNEST identities in EFL (English as a Second Language) context. The primary purpose of this case study is to investigate the teacher identity of the two English conversation teaching professors and find out how these two different identities, teaching and learning experience affected their individual teaching practices using qualitative research methods.

**Literature Reviews**

**Identity and teacher identity**

Traditional SLA (Second Language Acquisition) research has used experimental studies that focused on a cross section of a small number of language inputs and outputs such as native speakers and non-native speakers, or other attributes based on the laboratory studies concentrating on a certain part of language acquisition. Socio-cultural factors were not sufficiently considered, so those studies were criticized by the later researchers (Shin & Park, 2013). In contrast to the traditional theories of SLA that attempt to observe and study learners' individual variables such as motivation, post-structuralists have tried to observe language learning in a social context. Norton (1995, 1997) established her identity theory by building on the concepts of West (1992), Bourdieu (1977), Cummins (1996), Weeden (1987). Since then, many language educators have tried to use identity theory to investigate English learning in their own contexts. According to Norton (1997), “identity refers to how people understand their relationship to the world, how that relationship is formed through time and space, and how people understand their possibilities for the future” (p. 140).

Several important terms are used regarding identity: subjectivity (i.e., conscious and unconscious thoughts and feelings of individuals as changing over time), investment (i.e., the desire to learn or practice the target language which has been historically and socially constructed in society), and imagined communities (i.e.,
the ideal communities people want to belong to). (Norton, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2010, 2013). Norton (2013) briefly summarized the characteristics of identity studies as follows. First, many identity studies have rejected the view that any study can claim to be objective or unbiased. Second, many researchers who study identity aim to investigate the complex relationship between social structures and human agency, rather than relying on deterministic or reductive analysis. Third, identity researchers have tried to better understand how power relationships within society, construct or enable human behaviors. In addition, Norton (2013) suggested that studies on teacher identity should be noticeable. Since then, research on teacher identity has emerged as an important topic and has been studied by many researchers around the world.

As with social identity, language teacher identity is a complex and poly-component assembly, as it captures the negotiation and duplication of various egos including native speakers or non-native speakers, gender roles, being an expert, or a beginner (Ahn, 2019). Zacharias (2010) insisted like other identities, the characteristics of teacher identities are movable and multivariate; teacher identities are co-constructed by themselves and others; teacher identities continue to struggle for positioning. Some researchers have studied teacher identity using the term ‘professional identity’ (Tickle, 2000; Volkmann & Anderson, 1998). To analyze the data of teacher identity studies, it is better to be concentrate on specific details such as small stories, rather than to study big stories because identity has always been negotiated and reconstructed through social interaction (Vasquez, 2011; Zacharias, 2010). In post-structural theory, discourse constitutes a teacher’s identity rather than determines it. Thus, many studies of teacher identity analyzed the discourse used by teachers (Morgan, 2004; Varghese et al., 2005).

Related studies on teacher identity

Many of the studies on teacher identity have been conducted with NNESTs as research participants, regardless of whether they were in EFL or ESL (English as a Second Language) contexts (Choi, 2009; Duff & Uchida, 1997; Golombok & Jordan, 2005; Joen, 2009; Li & De Costa, 2017; Meanard-Warwick, 2008; Park, 2012; Park & Bang, 2016; Tsui, 2007; Zacharias, 2010). The term NNESTs often refers to English teachers who were born and raised in a non-native speaking country, but who are engaged in English education (Joen, 2009). NNESTs identity studies have criticized the ‘native speaker fallacy’ (that the ideal English teacher should be a native English-speaking teacher) showing how NNESTs struggle, overcome and succeed professionally in their own teaching contexts (e.g., Shin & Park, 2013). NNEST identity studies have shown that being a NNEST has several more benefits than being a NEST because of they are often more empathic and more understanding learners’ needs; they can become role models; and because their teaching learning strategies are more effective (Jeon, 2009). Golombok and Jordan (2005)’s study was also about NNEST’s identity. It is a narrative of two Taiwanese who had studied in a TESOL program in the U.S. for two years and returned to their homeland to teach English. When they taught English pronunciation to students, they showed very contrasting styles. One emphasized the importance of practicing pronunciation with intelligibility, mimicking the native English speakers to the students because her imagined communities belonged to native English speakers. The other teacher emphasized 'credibility', focusing interaction and understanding, so she did not correct the students’ pronunciation during class if it did not interfere with the communication.

Tsui (2007) investigated the professional identity of an English teacher in the People’s Republic of China. The study analyzed from the participant’s childhood to the latest using ‘stories live by’. The study showed how the participant trained himself to be an English teacher to develop his Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) skills, how he handled his Traditional Method (TM) and his CLT in his class, and how he concealed his opinion about CLT his professional identity with his colleagues within the time change. Although he still implicitly believed TM was more effective in teaching English because of his previous English learning experience, he had shown an identity of using CLT in class very well to survive as a successful and exemplary English teacher in college. The content of these struggles was described using Wegner’s (1998) theory, which consists of engagement (investing ourselves to connect with other community relationship), imagination (connecting our experience with broader perspectives), and alignment (the process by which participants connect the broader institutions with their actions and practices).

Choi (2009) showed how an NNEST, who taught advanced English composition classes to international college students in the U.S., overcame her shy characteristic and negotiated her professional identity according to the discourse of ‘ESL should be fun’. Zacharias (2010) investigated the changes in teacher identity of twelve EFL graduate students taking the TESOL graduate program in the U.S. with narrative
analysis. He acknowledged that teacher identity is multifaceted, along with other identity categories: class, race, language, and cultural backgrounds. He also addressed that teacher identity is located, varied, and changed according to the social and cultural context in which teachers work and live. Park (2012) studied how five Asian women changed their identity before and after taking the TESOL program in the U.S. Their non-native identity became more and more confident and positively changed as multicompetent bilinguals after taking the classes over time. Park and Bang (2016) investigated how four Korean English teachers who were teaching English in college recognized their teacher identity. They had their own image of a good teacher. For example, they saw themselves teaching English language fluently with students using only English, like NESTs. However, in reality, it was not an English class for communication skills, but just teaching grammar and reading in the same way as other Korean English teachers. They thought this was because they did not have sufficient English proficiency. Finally, Li and De Costa (2017) studied the active interaction between teacher identity and teacher agency of an EFL Chinese teacher teaching test preparation for the IELTS at private English schools to help students achieve better scores, the school would not allow her professional teacher identity to develop. However, the participant finally was able to construct her own teacher identity according to her teaching beliefs.

Not all studies have been on NNESTs as the research subjects; some were conducted on NESTs or both NNESTs and NESTs (Canh, 2013; Duff & Uchida, 1997; Kim, 2011). Duff and Uchida (1997) studied the sociocultural identities of two Japanese NNESTs and two American teachers at a private institute in Japan using an ethnographic approach. The study analyzed how four teachers’ socio-cultural identities were constructed, understood, and changed over time. The study demonstrated that teacher identity is linked to teachers’ previous learning and teaching, and cross-cultural experience. Kim (2011) investigated how a native English teacher from New Zealand worked as an English teacher in a university in Korea, and how she was influenced by sociocultural factors while establishing her teacher identity. The study argued that NS (Native Speaker) and NNS (Non-Native Speaker) distinctions were still valid, and people had different beliefs and perceptions about NNESTs and NESTs in class. Canh (2013) studied how five native speaking professors who taught English at a Vietnamese university created their teacher identity over time. The study argued that teachers’ professional identity was understood through their differing understandings of themselves as English teachers. One of the participants, for example, perceived himself as a medium to connect to other cultures, not as an English teacher.

However, there are some studies of teacher identity that avoid the existing binary research method of NEST/NNEST. Among them, plurilingualism and translingualism are representatives (Ellis, 2013, 2016; Taylor & Snoddon, 2013; Zheng, 2017).

Plurilingualism emerged as the importance of L1 in teaching L2 in ESL contexts, so researchers began to use the concept of plurilingualism while seeking an answer to the question, “what is the role of L1 in L2 teaching?” (Ellis, 2013, 2016; Taylor & Snoddon, 2013). Plurilingualism refers to the repertoire of varieties of language which individuals use, and therefore is the opposite of monolingualism; it includes the first language and any number of other languages or varieties of languages (Council of Europe, 2012, as cited in Ellis, 2016). This is a movement to look at the teacher identity from a different angle outside the binary analysis of NEST/NNEST. Just as an existing NNEST needs multilingual competence to become a good English teacher, a NEST also needs plurilingualism to become a good English teacher when teaching NNS students. One of the biggest debates in plurilingualism is its distinction from multilingualism. Multilingualism focuses on separate language abilities, while plurilingualism allows researchers to deconstruct the perception of arbitrary boundaries within individual language repertoires and it is associated with a wider range of issues, such as individual agency, knowledge formation, and engagement (Taylor & Snoddon, 2013). Ellis (2013) investigated the professional knowledge and beliefs of 31 ESL teachers working in Australia through classroom observation and semi-structured in-depth interviews. Among them, eight were Circumstantial Plurilingual (CP), fourteen were Elective Plurilingual (EP) and nine were monolinguals. CB refers to a bilingual who has learned another language environmentally other than as an L1 for survival, and EB refers to a bilingual user who has learned another language other than the L1 by choice.

Regardless of whether they were NESTs or NNESTs, it was found that teachers’ language learning and language using experiences affected their professional identity. Ellis (2016), using their biographies, examined the linguistic identity of two English native TESOL teachers teaching in Japan and Canada. The first participant was a native English speaker from the U.K. an EB, so he had Japanese proficiency like a native Japanese speaker. He confessed that his L2 identity was the key to his being a successful English
teacher because he could understand what his students were going through while studying English. Another participant was the woman who had English as her dominant language and her English proficiency was similar to that of a native English speaker. Even though she had good skills and experience in teaching ESL subjects, she was being treated and perceived as a non-native speaker by the people around her for the Chinese accent and her Asian skin. The study argued that teachers’ learning experience affected teacher identity, and English native speaking teachers need to have plurilingual competence to become good English teachers.

In translingualism, the synergy is important, so languages are always in contact and influence each other with emergent meanings and grammars, so it is different from the multilingualism which recognizes the relationship between languages in an additive way (i.e., a combination of separate languages). Thus, a translingual teacher is different from a bilingual teacher in that his or her multiple linguistic identities are unseparated and integrated to create synergies (Zheng, 2017). Based on the ideas of translingualism, Zheng (2017) investigated the identity of two International Teaching Assistants (ITAs) in the U.S. and found that the participants had opposite attitudes regarding usage of the translingual identities in their writing classes. The first participant, Ming, from China did not use her translingual identity in her class and emphasized her interdisciplinary expertise in science and humanities to be a successful language teacher, so she spoke English only to her Chinese students in personal interactions. On the other hand, the second participant, Sara, fully used her translingual identity as a native Arabic speaker and her bilingual identity because of her British mom, so she could be a more effective language teacher by drawing her translingual identities as advantages and by positioning herself differently in a diverse teaching context. Only when ITAs recognized and criticized the connection between identity and pedagogy could they use their translingual identity in their classroom more completely that benefited both the teacher and their various students.

According to the ideas of plurilingualism and translingualism, it would be unreasonable to analyze the teacher identity simply by staying in the binary frame of NEST/NNEST. By accepting the opinion of Ellis (2016), the linguistic identity of the two teachers will be analyzed in the results section of the current study. Since Ellis said this dichotomy is not necessary since the linguistic identities of teachers are diverse and complex.

The purpose of this case study is to investigate the teacher identity of the two English conversation teaching professors of Korean nationality. However, they each positioned themselves as NEST or NNEST. The study analyzed their teacher identity based on their interviews and classroom observations. Since the participants of the study had different cultural backgrounds, language learning environments and experience, it would be difficult to simply analyze their teacher identity with existing binary methods of NNEST and NEST. Therefore, here, the linguistic identities of the participants, which were often used in plurilingualism studies, their beliefs as language teachers, their learning and teaching experience as well as their teaching practices, were chosen to explain the teacher identity. Recognizing the correlated relationship between teacher identity and teaching practice (Duff & Uchida, 1977; Ellis, 2013, 2016), the following research questions are suggested.

1. What is the teacher identity of the two English conversation teachers?
2. How does the teacher identity affect teaching practice? Besides teacher identity, what else influences the teaching practices of the two professors?

Method

Participants

The participant of the study were two female professors with different English learning and education backgrounds. At the time of the study, they were both teaching English conversation courses. Here, they have been anonymized Ms. Kim and Ms. Han.

Ms. Kim

Ms. Kim was a professor in her 40’s with a technical background working at a two-year college. She perceived herself as a Korean who spent most of her lifetime in Korea as a learner and a teacher with some studying experience in the U.S. In middle school she learned English from the alphabet. From that moment until she entered the university, her method of learning English was to memorize words, learn grammar, and translate English reading passages into Korean. Her uniqueness, compared with other adult Korean learners, was that in middle school she had memorized all the sentences her English textbooks and used an audio recorder to
practice native speakers’ pronunciation. Although she began to learn spoken English when she was over twenty years old, her English speaking was superior to ordinary adult Korean English learners or teachers due to her previous learning experience. She considered her speaking proficiency to be native-like. After finishing graduate school in Korea with English education major, she spent about three and half years in a TESOL master's degree program in the U.S. Then, she completed her PhD in Korea. She had taught English for more than fifteen years in the universities in Korea, and at the time of the interviews, she had been teaching English conversation for two years as a full-time teacher in college.

Ms. Han

Ms. Han was a professor with a Christian background in her 30’s, working at a university in Kyungi. She was the child of a Korean missionary serving in Nepal and had her own unique English learning story. She had Korean citizenship, but she perceived herself as an English native speaker because she completed most of her education in English-speaking countries and in some international schools in Asian countries. In her childhood, she interacted with Filipino children in English and went to international schools in the Philippines and Nepal. There, she received an English education from native English-speaking teachers from the U.S. and U. K. She went to high school in the U.K. Then she attended international schools in India and Nepal again. She repeatedly said “I did not take any ESL classes” in the background survey and during the interviews, emphasizing that the way that she learned English was natural. She spent only one and a half years in Korea as a child. She completed her university and graduate school in the U.S. In her youth, she spent her dual life speaking Korean with her parents at home and English at school. At the time of the interviews, she had been teaching English conversation full-time for more than four years.

The present study employed a case study methodology with ground content analysis to investigate the teaching experience of two female professors. Data collection consists of six semi-structured in-depth interviews and one six-month classroom observation session. The researchers tried to have the interviews at least once a month, and these were conducted in English. The interviews based on the pre-prepared interview questions were carried out in a free atmosphere in a café or a restaurant. During the interview sessions and the class observation, the researcher tried to observe and interview these two different teacher participants as a non-participatory observer (McDonough & McDonough, 1997). It means that the observer was introduced to the group observed, but did not interact or participate directly in any classroom activities. The various types of data were collected: interviews with the teachers, written background questionnaires, classroom observations, written or spoken post-interview after the classroom observations, the fields note about interviews, and classroom observations sheets which were kept by the researchers. The interview questions are in the Appendix.

Data Collection Procedures and Analysis

The study adopted a ground content analysis because it was easy to understand the whole interview data by grouping according to each concept. Based on the grounded content analysis, three stages of data analysis were performed: first, a pre-coding stage (e.g., transcripts of interviews), second, a coding stage (i.e., organizing categories), and third, a theorizing stage (e.g., interpreting data, drawing conclusions, and making theoretical frameworks) (Strauss & Corbin as cited Kim, 2013). In the pre-coding stage, the contents of the interviews were directly transcribed by the researchers. In the coding stage, the interview contents were grouped after reading and the transcripts and other data were discussed several times. In the theorizing stage, the researchers discussed how to apply grouped contents to the theory and tried to draw conclusions, some of which were discussed with the participants. To ensure the reliability of data, the study employed triangulation, such as double checking the qualitative data during the analysis and confirming the data with the participants during the interviews. Table 1 explains the detailed data collection procedures of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Kim</th>
<th>Ms. Han</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Background Questionnaire-L2 Learning History &amp; Perceptions as an English Teacher (by e-mail)</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Oct. 10, 2017: 100 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Semi-structured Interview (Jul. 12, 2017: 39 min)</td>
<td>Classroom observation (Nov. 2, 2017: 120 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Semi-structured Interview (Sep. 5, 2017: 30 min)</td>
<td>Semi-structured Interview (Nov. 2, 2017: 30 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Semi-structured Interview (Oct. 10, 2017: 30 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Classroom observation (Oct. 10, 2017: 100 min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Post interview (Dec. 21, 2017 by e-mail)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Semi-structured Interview (Nov. 2, 2017: 30 mins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Detailed data collection procedures
Results and Discussion

The purpose of this case study was to investigate the teacher identity of the two professors while teaching English and find out how these two different identities affected their individual teaching practices. This article first explores the linguistic identities of Ms. Kim and Ms. Han. Then the teacher identity of the two participants is discussed. Finally, the relationship among teacher identity, teachers’ beliefs, learning and teaching experience, and teaching practices is examined.

Identity of the two participants

Linguistic identities of the two participants

A reflection on the identity focused on the language use of the two participants, Ms. Kim was a Korean-dominant bilingual (Korean is the language of her inner-self), and Ms. Han was an English-dominant bilingual (both English and Korean of her inner-self). Using the concept of Valdes and Figueroa (1994), Ms. Kim was EB and Ms. Han was CB.

In the background questionnaire, Ms. Kim indicated her listening and speaking skills to be “native-like”. The following excerpt describes how Ms. Kim studied spoken English and how she was careful when speaking English.

Excerpt 1:

You know here [pointing at the survey sheet] I wrote down Hakwon [i.e., English language institutes] here! A lot of Korean students are exposed to their spoken language, conversation, in Hakwon setting. And I spent most of my time to learn spoken language in Hakwon in my colleges. That’s the reason why I wrote personal experience there [i.e., native-like]. Because of the good experience, I changed my major and I got to know that I got a talent in speaking English. I enjoyed teaching student a lot so I

I try to follow the way of speaking and I try to adopt the culture speeches and somehow, I try to be more accurate whenever I speak for example about the uses of articles or tenses but somehow. Nowadays I’m okay but I made so many mistakes when I was first, I tried to speak anything. That’s okay now.

Ms. Han said her level of English is ‘native-like’ in all areas of reading, listening, speaking, and writing. She emphasized that she had not taken any ESL classes in the background survey and never went to Hakwon like Ms. Kim during the interviews and mentioned that she did not see herself as an English learner. When she said taking ESL classes, it refers to studying English separately from regular classes for immigrant students in ESL situations. She identified herself as a native speaker in all four skills areas because she did not study English individually to catch up with the regular classes like other foreign immigrant students, and there was no problem in attending and understanding regular classes like native English speakers. On the other hand, she said that her second language was French. When she studied French as a language learner, she was not able to understand the learning process that her students experienced because she did not study as hard as her students did. The following excerpt is an interview related to this.

Excerpt 2:

Han: For me, I’ve never learned English, but I learned French as second language at schools, so my definition for good English learner I think, came from I would I happen to be a good French learner. I never was a good French learner, that is the reason, I wasn’t a good language learner when I was learning French, I wasn’t motivated, I didn’t know how I learned French, so I just took that class because I had to, so I never needed, I never understood why I need to study the language, so I was a bad French learner, so my definitions here, comes from what I wasn’t, I wasn’t a good French learner.

I don’t see myself as an English learner.

Koo: Then what would be your ultimate identification? If you’re not an English learner, what are you? English is your mother tongue?

Han: I always saw it as my mother tongue, but it’s not the first language I learn [sic], I don’t speak English at home.

Kim: Um, how about emotional language, is it definitely English?

Han: I don’t know, I think it’s both. (2017, 07, 12)

Both Ms. Kim and Ms. Han perceived themselves as Koreans, but they had different linguistic identities because of their different cultural and environmental backgrounds and learning experience. Ms. Kim studied
English selectively, so she could become a successful English learner as EB, and she was able to be a successful role model in understanding the difficulties of learning English for a student. In the case of Ms. Han, she was a CB who was born and raised into a missionary family, attended international schools in elementary, middle, and high schools, and went to college and graduate school in the United States. She studied English environmentally and naturally.

What was interesting while analyzing the linguistic identities of the two participants was that both participants did use L1 (Korean) differently in their educational setting (Ellis, 2013, 2016; Tylor & Snoddon, 2013). Ms. Han, who positioned herself as an English native speaker, allowed her students to use their L1 (Korean) in her conversation class while Kim, who referred to herself as an English learner, used Korean for accurate communication with her students. The following excerpts show this directly.

**Excerpt 3:**

> Even something small like “Men and Man” ... Is it M-E-N or M-A-N? I walk around and say that word, man, I think this, no I think it’s A, I think it’s E. they do it so kind of to get some motivated, once the Bible verse is shown, they check their spellings or whether they heard it or right then I answer, NOW you can speak in Korean I want you to try to translate this. So first, because in the past, I use to give a little talk on the Bible verse. It kind of helps them to guess what the Bible verse might mean, and then they try to translate, they ask each other what this means, what does this mean. So, it helps some interact. Anyway, I’m going to too many details. (2017, 08, 09, Ms. Han)

> So it’s somewhat Koreanized in that way. And also in the class, I use only English. But at the end of the class, I use Korean to communicate with them. Cause I got to know that so many students don’t know how to do their homework, what the assignment is about, what is going on during the classes, and to check their attendance I use Korean at that time. But in the class, I use only English. (2017, 08, 09 Ms. Kim).

Although Ms. Han could speak Korean, she taught only in English. When her students found it difficult to communicate with each other, she allowed them to use Korean. Then, she asked them to interpret their conversation to her in English later. Although Ms. Kim’s entire class was taught only in English, she used Korean at the end of the class to give the important information such as exams or assignments so that the students did not have any trouble following up the class every week. Both participants viewed the L1 (Korean) as a powerful pedagogical resource based on plurilingualism when they taught their English classes, but they used L1 differently to teach the students effectively because of their different identity.

**Ms. Kim**

During the interviews, Ms. Kim recognized herself as learner and Korean. Ms. Kim said that she could be a good role model for her students since she knew the difficulty of learning English, overcame it, and achieved a successful level of English proficiency later. She used synonyms such as moderator, entertainer, helper, and aunt to refer to herself in her classroom. She also mentioned some advantages of being NNEST. For example, she used Korean when delivering important information such as about exams in class so it was easy to communicate. The following excerpt is the part of her interview which describes her identity.

**Excerpt 4:**

> I spent time in high school and middle school when I was in and I guess it was normal things that other Koreans do but you know, when I think about myself as a kind to be a good English learner, I guess I have to spend more time and energy to learn more. (2017, 07, 12, Ms. Kim)

> I guess I can be a good role model, but not to all of them. Only because but because I’m not a native teacher. (2017, 09, 05, Ms. Kim)

> So it’s better for them to have the Korean teacher. I told you that I tell them the assignments and exams in Korean, so that’s the privilege to have the Korean teacher. (2017, 10, 10, Ms. Kim)

Koo: Could you try to LABEL yourself in one word? In one word like a facilitator.

**Kim:** Just teacher

**Kim:** Or helper

**Kim:** Yeah. But and... role model I guess.

**Kim:** ROLE MODEL! As a good English learner. I guess.

**Kim:** Yeah, yeah, yeah. Entertainer too... And... to entertain my student, you know? How I entertain my students

**Kim:** Yeah. For me? Yeah cause maybe Mother
During the interview, she often identified herself as Korean or NNEST. However, she compared herself with other Korean teachers in college, but not with other NES colleagues. Ms. Kim constantly interacted with native English-speaking professors, but she did not consider the native English-speaking teachers to be her imagined communities. To Ms. Kim, identity is situated and constructed more with the fellow college professors and her students, and her Korean identity was a relatively lower position with somehow negative characteristics. The following excerpt indicates this.

**Excerpt 5:**

*I compare with other Korean teachers! I feel like I can speak best among the teachers. English teachers with Korean identity but I don’t compare my identity with native teachers because I know I’m Korean.* (2017, 07, 12, Ms. Kim)

Another evidence that Ms. Kim’s identity was positioned by her colleagues and students is shown in the following example. This also shows that her Korean identity was not considered to be an advantageous position to becoming a good English teacher. One semester, she and a NES colleague taught students with the same major, two were taught by her and the other three classes were by the NEST. Some students in her class complained why they did not get classes from the native teacher like other students. They did not care about the teaching abilities or skills of professors, but they were concerned about the nationality of their teachers. According to what Ms. Kim said, “They just wanted to take the native teacher.” Ms. Kim confessed that she was relatively deprivileged by her students because she was not a native speaker of English for English conversation class.

**Excerpt 6:**

*Me? Did I tell you, you know, I couldn’t teach the students with the secretary management department because of somehow kind of not that, I don’t know it’s not that political issue anyway, because one of the students said “why we just got the lesson from different teacher why they did not have with the native teacher? Not because of the teaching ability? Anyway, I felt frustrated at that time, but as time goes on, I encounter the same students with the same major this semester several times. They missed me a lot. And I feel happy for that. And also actually one of the best students this semester (with another department), I could teach them, because I couldn’t teach the students with that department. Do you know what I am saying?* (2017, 11, 28, Ms. Kim)

This was a psychological wound for her for a while, just as Song (2016) investigated the mental trauma of an English teacher, and the above excerpt also shows how she overcame it over time.

**Ms. Han**

In Ms. Han’s case, she identified herself as a native speaker of English in her class, who, even if she recognized herself as a Korean. Positioning herself as Korean was much easier to control and manage the class as an English conversation teacher. In order to keep this identity position, she never used Korean language to students in class and on campus even though she could speak Korean. It is because, for Korean students, the best English teachers are not judged based on their skills or abilities, but there is a prejudice that native teachers from English-speaking countries, such as Americans and British people, are the best. Therefore, to continue this powerful position in Korea, she was comfortable to pretend to be non-Korean or American to her students at school. For Ms. Han, her imagined communities belonged to the native English speakers such as Americans or Canadians. In contrast to Ms. Kim’s case, Ms. Han’s identity was situated more individually, so she did not compare her and her Korean colleagues during the interviews. If necessary, she compared herself with her peers of other nationalities. The peers in Ms. Han’s story that appeared were whites- Australian or British. Considering that she had lived a significant amount of her life in Asian countries like India or Nepal even though she went to international schools during that time, this statement could be interesting. She confessed that she could not be a full role model because she learned English differently from the students. She identified herself as a guide, a facilitator or MC (Master of Ceremonies) in class. The following is part of Ms. Han’s interview which discusses her identity.

**Excerpt 7:**

*What I mean by real native speakers I mean; you know people who are born and raised in English speaking families. Whereas I’m NOT. my parents would not use English with me at home. So, for me I spoke Korean at home and then used English elsewhere.* (2017, 07, 12, Ms. Han)

*Because of my background, I can’t compare myself with the other Koreans. I don’t know learners who learned English at a school. I didn’t learn the conventionally then. through life experiences and just naturally.* (2017, 07, 12, Ms. Han)
I want to identify myself as Non-Korean English teacher. Non-Korean. I want to just say I’m American, it would be easier, cause I’m an English teacher. (2017, 10, 11, Ms. Han)

It is the always Koreans that would be sleeping in the class. I was wondering why is it the Koreans that would be sleeping in the class? I didn’t sleep in the class. I don’t know maybe I’m not Korean. I’m not sure. (2017, 11, 02, Ms. Han)

She asked me like which culture I identify myself with and I was telling her that I don’t identify myself with American cause I’m not. I don’t identify myself as Nepali or any other culture that I lived in. And now it’s just easier for me to just say Korean! And I identify myself as Korean because you know that’s actually true I am Korean. (2017, 11, 28, Ms. Han)

Oh... Me... I don’t think I am a good role model for my students because I really didn’t learn English the way they are learning English (2017, 09, 05, Ms. Han).

Koo: And what is YOUR role?

Han: A GUIDE, I guess? I mean I have everything done before them. So I know which way I wanna take them to. So I guide them through the activities. I don’t do... I mean I do some I guess teaching, like, this is this ... but I kind a want to... help them, like, discover on their own instead of trying to tell them everything. So I would... yeah. I would see myself more as a guide.

Koo: Okay.

Han: Yeah. So facilitator, I guess. MC! Hhhhhh [all three of them laugh] entertainer! (2017, 09, 05)

Looking at the above excerpt, it can be seen Ms. Han’s personal chaos when she was talking about her identity. On July 12th she perceived herself as a Korean and a native English speaker at the same time because of her family ethnicity and her job as an English teacher. Later, on October 11th and November 11th, she identified herself as a non-Korean or an American on account of her job as an English teacher. Then on November 28th she changed her perception as a Korean because of her nationality on. Ms. Han’s special situation is that she positions herself as a native speaker as an English teacher at school, but she is not a typical Caucasian, she uses Korean at home, and her nationality is a Korean. Table 2 simply summarizes the identity of two participants of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Kim</th>
<th>Ms. Han</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-EB</td>
<td>-CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Korean English teacher</td>
<td>-Not Korean/Korean with family influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-English language learner (L1= Korean)</td>
<td>-Not English language learner (L1= English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-English studying experience mostly in Korea+ some in the U.S. (ESL/EFL backgrounds)</td>
<td>-English studying experience mostly in English speaking countries and international schools (e.g., U.S., Britain, India, and no ESL education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-taught English more than 15 years, but taught English conversation for less than two years</td>
<td>-taught English conversation for 4.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Role model/ Moderator between NS teachers and Koreans /Helper/Entertainer/Aunt</td>
<td>-Guide/Facilitator/Entertainer/MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Not really a strict teacher</td>
<td>-Strict English teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Summary of the participants’ identities

Cross-case analysis

The important fact regarding identity is that identity is not formed independently or individually, but it is formed continuously based on interactions with others, that is, learning or experiencing life episodes. The participants of the current study could be good examples of how two participants identified relationships with others and created their own identity. The first participant, Ms. Kim positioned herself as a Korean who spent most of her lifetime in Korea, both as a teacher and a learner. If necessary, she compared herself with other Korean teachers, but not with other native teachers. For her, identity was situated and constructed more with the fellow college professors and her students than with other native teachers. On the other hand, Ms. Han identified herself as a native speaker of English and made a comparison with other native speakers. For Ms. Han, being Korean means that her family language was Korean.
While Ms. Kim situated herself as an English learner or a role model still, Ms. Han never identified herself as an English learner. For Ms. Han, learners’ definition was the one who acquired language through conventional education such as Hakwon or extra classes to practice English, which did not fit her case. Ms. Han emphasized the naturalistic background of her English education, so she emphasized “I never went to ESL classes. several times during the interviews. Ms. Kim thought that she had to study endlessly as an English learner as well as an English teacher, and that her students thought of her as a successful English learner and a role model. On the other hand, in the case of Ms. Han, it was appropriate to act as an English user by watching Netflix dramas and reading English books so that she did not lose her English ability. The following excerpt shows how Ms. Kim and Ms. Han worked hard to maintain or develop their English proficiency personally.

Excerpt 8:

Keep up my reading. And um. I try to listen to English sermons. Sometimes. But that all went, you know, down the drain. I was just like putting Netflix at the background. (2017, 09, 05, Ms. Han)

I guess every day. And not... I guess I try to read Bibles 1-2 chapters. But not, every day. 4-5 times per week, I guess. (2017, 09, 05, Ms. Kim)

Many related studies on teacher identity have demonstrated the superiority of NNESTs as a role model for language learning with multicompetence (Shin & Park, 2013). Still, a preference for NESTs in the process of recruiting English teachers at schools and institutions is a common feature in most EFL countries (Ahn, 2019). The best English teacher should be the one who possesses good, qualified teachers’ skills and abilities, but there is a prejudice that native English speakers from English-speaking countries such as Americans and British people are the best. Perhaps in Asian EFL countries, a Good Language Teacher (GLT) is a native English speaker (Ahn, 2019). In the present study, the participants’ Korean identity was a relatively lower position with somehow negative characteristics, so Ms. Kim worried about how the students perceived her identity since her students wanted to take the class from the NEST like other classes in the department. She was deprivileged by her students not because of her teaching skills or ability, but because of her Korean identity. However, Ms. Han had no choice but to adopt the imagined community of a native English speaker for her students because positioning herself as a native was easier to control or manage than an English conversation teacher. To keep this powerful position, she never used Korean with her students on campus. This discrimination against NNESTs created the native speaker fallacy, which could be potentially harmful for English education because native speaking English teachers, who are not trained or do not have qualifications, are potentially unaware of the structures of their mother tongue (Golombek & Jordan, 2005; Jeon, 2009).

On this, it is necessary to think about the issue of "What it means to be a good English teacher in Korea?" Interestingly, in the interviews of the two teachers, it was found that their Korean identity was evaluated as a somewhat negative or undesirable existence as a good English teacher in Korea. The Korean identity is relatively lower position than the native speaker as an English teacher in Korea. The details of the two English professors were very different, but the fact and identity of being Koreans were somewhat negative factors rather than positive ones for working in the teaching context of Korea. NNESTs who are well-educated can also be good English teachers because they know the linguistic structures of L1 and English, had a lot of learning experience and can be good role models for their students (Shin & Park, 2013). NESTs also need to learn L1 of the students to teach the students effectively. This gives them an opportunity to understand the difficulties their students feel while studying English. Through learning L1 of the students, NEST can get to know indirectly how their students are learning English in class (Ellis, 2013, 2016).

**It was teacher identities, learning and teaching experience that affected teaching practices**

The following participants’ teaching practices showed very different aspects and patterns while teaching the English conversation class. This seems to be because two participants of the study had different learning experiences and teacher identities. To demonstrate this, this section shows how two participants planned and taught their classes and their thoughts about the well-prepared class. Next, the study examines what they thought and did about the evaluation of the students. Finally, the study discusses how two participants think about smaller classes.

Ms. Kim

Ms. Kim said that she spent more than half of the class time lecturing during the interviews. In her teacher’s beliefs, she said that a well-prepared class was important. For her, being well-prepared was to teach
students a lot and give them a lot during class. It was a well-prepared class that she taught the students by dividing and preparing well using the textbook and based on the 15-week semester curriculum. She selected the vocabulary for teaching her class. She thought that she was also an English learner like her students, so she believed that she knew which words were important or necessary to teach. In the same way, she analyzed the basic words and basic sentence patterns in the textbook for her students. When it came to teaching English, she used computer software\(^4\) for her students to listen to native speakers’ voice because she thought she could not be a good language example since she was not NEST, so could not confidently say “Repeat after me”. In addition, she used Power Point slides (PPTs), which could be clearly understood in class, so that students would learn the contents of the class quickly even if they could not keep up with what the teacher explained. Therefore, visual aids were very important in her class. For her, a well-prepared class was to prepare the materials and props well to grab students’ attention and help them to stay focused. For the interactions and participation with students, the stamp system was used to give participation scores to students taking part in class. The stamp sheet was used to encourage participation by giving students a stamp each time they participated in the class and later giving them participation points by that number. Wake-up gums were provided to dozing students in class so that they could concentrate on classes. She also used wake-up gum and candies to make students stay focused during the class. Excerpt 9 shows how she was prepared and taught her conversation classes.

Excerpt 9:

*I guess, I spend more than half of time to lecture.* (2017, 09, 05, Ms. Kim)

(About what to adopt and leave out in your classes?)

*Uh, 'cause we only have 15 weeks. And 2 weeks with the exams, actually we only have 13 weeks to go through. And usually, textbook has more like 15 chapter that is the reason that I have to remove some chapters and some chapters they have longer contents. And some units they have shorter contents. So, I have to decide which chapter I just go through with one week, which chapter I go through with 2 weeks.* (2017, 09, 05, Ms. Kim)

*I try to use a lot of PPTs I am very well prepared as a teacher cause I got to know that cause students expect Korean teachers, they should be more prepared, so that’s what I am doing, and also right now in my class I use lots of softwares like to show the pronunciation of the native speakers I guess I am good at speaking but I can't be a kind of a very good example, you know of speaking what I am saying to my students, I cannot say repeat after me, but you know I just click on the software.* (2017, 07, 22, Ms. Kim)

*I try to just, you know, find out the words, student have to learn. And I have to just try to find the basic sentences from the textbook that my students teach it within the unit.* (2017, 09, 05, Ms. Kim)

*Actually, I am using the activities that already exist. I am not making the new stuff for the activities.* (2017, 11, 28, Ms. Kim)

*Kim: Stamp sheets.*

*Koo and Hur: Ahhhhhh.*

*Kim: So, when they say something during the class, and, during the break time, or at the end of the class [Kim chuckles while she speaks, making noise to press stamp onto the desk]*

**STAMP SYSTEM because I prepare the stamp sheet for every student you know, if they say something, if they answer something during the classes, I gave them the stamps.** (2017, 08, 09)

Ms. Kim took it seriously when it comes to an evaluation in class. She used the word *assessment* or *exam* often in her class as the way she used *learner* during the interviews. According to what Ms. Kim said, “Korean students are so sensitive about gradings, sometimes they complain about that to the Korean teachers, but they don’t complain about this to the native English teachers.” The following excerpt clearly shows how she prepared for her class exams with her eyes on relationships with others in mind.

Excerpt 10:

*Koo: Why does the evaluation matter to you? Because one interesting that I saw because I saw the date throughout the three interviews you never anything about evaluations. But every session it was about evaluations.*

---

\(^4\) The computer software (I-tools) used for the class was made so that the contents of the textbooks (Network series) could be used by clicking with the mouse. It was made so that not only the contents of the textbook, but also its audios and videos could be easily played.
Kim: Cause I am Korean, I guess also how can I say usually I take the written exam I have the time to give them the grades, cause the roles in my school, I am a coordinator kind of thing, I have to do some other things in my department, too. I need to kind of save the exam time during the midterm time, but for the final exam I guess you know I want to save the grading time. In speaking time, I don’t need a grading time. you know what it is? And then every time I concern about the exam is that students ask me about the exam at the beginning of the class, so. [...]

Han: I don’t think so. unless it is right before mid-terms.

Kim: They ask me at the even at the beginning of the classes, I guess, you know it’s because they can ask me the questions easily. (2017, 10, 10)

Regarding the number of students taking her class, teaching a smaller number of students was much easier than a larger number of students. Because she considered the number of students as a bundle, she felt more comfortable when she taught a small number of students.

Excerpt 11:

For me, I am very OKAY with the small number of students because uh how can I say? They are attitudes is good cause one of the reasons is the grading system I told them at the beginning. [...] You will just get the scores based on the Jul-Dae [absolute] system. The class has less than ten students. I don’t know if it’s because of that. Or it is because of the student itself. [...] Among five classes the smallest number is the last class I feel freer you know. I practice four times before I teach these students. (2017, 10, 10, Ms. Kim)

In Ms. Kim’s case, she thought if the number of students was large, more energy was needed, and if the number of students was small, less energy was required for each student. In particular, the above excerpt indicates that she could give better grading with a fewer number of students, so she felt freer to get less attention from the students.

Ms. Han

Ms. Han also indicated well-prepared class was very important in teacher’s beliefs. To achieve this goal, she prepared the perfect lesson plans with the detailed class sequences for class management in any case, and she spent more time on activities rather than lectures. A well-prepared class with student-centered activities and a detailed setting related to it was essential. The following excerpt 12 shows how she built interview questions for class activities, how she proceeded with class activities with these interview questions, and what kinds of interaction took place between students and the teacher. To be a guide, facilitator, and entertainer of the students, she kept a distance from the students and let the students participate actively in class.

Excerpt 12:

I have very detailed lesson plan with an estimated time like how much time the activity would take. And then. Um. so, I make sure that I have enough activities for that lesson. I kind of go through the whole class, in my head. (2017, 09, 05, Ms. Han)

First, we have like an interview time. And I have random questions about yourself, so like What kind of dreams did you have last night? Or where is your favorite place to eat around school? So these like five random questions. So they can... they have to talk about, they have to interview their partners uh. Using these questions. And I have the interview sheets, so after their interview their partners, they have to write the answers, so in this way I kind of want them to... it’s kind of fun time, it’s not. They are not serious questions. And then I have the same set of questions for four weeks, and then I changed the questions after four weeks. So they have the same questions that they have to ask for the four weeks, to give them kind of help them to repeat asking the questions or help them to repeat answering the questions. Um, but so they build more confidence, and they have to interview someone different every week. It’s not always the same person. So I make sure they are doing with someone else. In this way, I kind of try to build up class atmosphere I guess to make you feel more friendly. It’s not like I am grading them. I don’t even, maybe I walk around a little bit to make sure that they are speaking in English. But...You know. I want them to have fun. Getting to know each other in English so I have like an interview section at the beginning. I also use to do like the deviations I was talking about. But instead of ME just talking, what I did what I wanted to do. I do something called Bible dictations, so what I do is like I PICK like a Bible verse Um, and we do like... dictations. And they have a dictation sheet, so every week they do a dictation, so I dictate the Bible verse they write and then I say okay discuss with your group mates whether you got a right. So some people they didn’t catch some words, they ask each other, someone would read it for each other, or give some time to interact. (2017, 08, 09, Ms. Han)

Ms. Han did not put much emphasis on teaching English grammar to the students like Korean professors. In making a list of vocabulary for teaching the students, she let her students themselves choose the vocabulary they needed to learn. She knew she was not an English learner like her students, so she asked...
the students which vocabulary that they wanted to learn at the beginning of the semester. The following excerpt shows her selecting vocabulary selection procedure.

**Excerpt 13:**

The activities, that they choose in the class is not the typical lectures or grammatical features, because I feel the Korean students here have overwhelmed with the grammar, grammars, and grammars. (2017, 07, 12, Ms. Han)

So five per week, so week one, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Week two 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and then they fill the fifty expressions at the beginning of the semester, they submitted to me. Okay, these are the expressions I will learn the semester. And then every week, I give them not every week, I have a pop quiz, so they might be tested on those expressions on that day. so they have like a class number, so they write the class number, what I do is... I have all of their 50-expression sheet. And they have a copy for themselves, too. And so when I give them the Pop quiz, I just put their quizzes in order, their class work number 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. This is already in order. (2017, 08, 09, Ms. Han)

Ms. Han also did not emphasize the evaluation in class to the students. She did not even mention it during the interview. The following excerpt 14 describes the difficulties Ms. Han had in teaching a smaller number of students. There was a lot of energy that went into teaching smaller number of students because she needed to do genuine interaction.

**Excerpt 14:**

Yeah, this semester, I don't know why I have been really difficult to motivate the students, I don't know I think like I said the smaller classes are harder to motivate I said that and I feel it more, in smaller classes, when five people feel sleepy in smaller classes, it's about half the class, so it was really hard, if there are 25 students, five students feel sleepy, it's okay because the other 20 students are working hard, because the smaller classes are harder, I think, because when a lot of them are tired or sleepy then it affects the whole class, I think, so that's why it has been difficult, because I have two classes are about pretty small 11 to 12 students, and I have one class which started out with 29 students, now is down to like 13. (2017, 11, 28)

She felt it more difficult when she taught the small number of students. For her, teaching smaller students means that she had to interact with the students one by one, so she had to use more energy than teaching the larger number of the class which she was used to. In addition, it was the fourth year she had taught English conversation in college during the interview period, so she felt that she did not have enough energy to teach the students. As the number of the students became smaller, the interaction group of the students changed every time, and the class did not go as planned, so there seemed to be stressed about it.

**Cross-case analysis**

The participants of the current study used the same opinion, which was both professors agreed that well-preparedness was very important. However, the use of the same expressions does not seem to have the same meaning. The interpretation of a well-prepared class is fundamentally different in their teaching practices in terms of planning the class, class contents, and interaction with students. Ms. Kim thought, well-prepared class means that teachers prepare many types of material for the students, such as using PPTs, wake-up candies, or distributing many handouts to the students, so visual aids were very important in her class. On the other hand, Ms. Han believed that well-prepared class means that how to manage the students. For her, it was important to allocate appropriate activities for the class, to have student-centered interaction, and to let her students, not herself, speak in class. The difference in how the two participants prepared for their well-prepared classes is directly linked to differences in their identity, as well as to how they had previously acquired English. This can be seen in the line with the results of previous studies (Gilarkjani & Sabouri, 2017; Kim 2011; Shin, 2002), which argued that teachers’ learning experience was deeply related to their beliefs, and this was reflected in their teaching practices.

Regardless of whether teachers were NEST or NNEST, their previous learning experience had profound effect on teacher identity and their professional beliefs (Duff & Uchida, 1997; Ellis, 2013, 2016). In Ms. Kim’s case, she learned English from the alphabet in her middle school days. Most of her English learning consisted of memorizing vocabulary, practicing English grammar, and understanding reading passages by translating English into Korean in her middle school and high school days. For this reason, most of her English conversation classes were centered on lectures and textbooks. The way Ms. Han learned English generally happened as naturally other people learned their native languages. She needed a very detailed lesson plan with an estimated time to manage the class. This is similar to the fact that two Japanese English teachers in the study of Duff & Uchida (1997) who taught English conversation classes to students with the
grammatical system in mind that they had learned English as a learner, while two other native English teachers did not mention grammars at all.

Another important fact about teacher identity is that it is not formed individually, but it is constructed based on interaction with others and learning or perceiving in the episodes of our lives. The first example of this is that the identity of two professors made them have different perceptions about assessment and their interaction with the students or colleagues. Ms. Kim was more sensitive/aware of the eyes and evaluations of others (i.e., other faculty members’ English proficiency, students’ evaluation, or their comments about her class or Ms. Kim herself). On the other hand, Ms. Han did not mention at all the evaluation of her students or other faculty members, in terms of her English skills or about how her students felt about her. Evaluation-based thinking in English classes of NNESTs were also found in several previous studies (Li & De Costa, 2017; Park, 2017); in the study of Li and De Costa (2017), English teachers were described as teaching machines or testing skill trainers, and the participatory teacher’s test-oriented philosophy was criticized because it limited the possibilities of defining his work in a meaningful way.

So far this discussion has been more focused on the different teaching identity, teaching experience, and learning experiences of the two participants, however, there are also similarities between them. First, both of them constantly thought about what students needed and used strategies to grab their attention. They knew that interaction and a responsive class was desirable, so they used whatever teaching methods they had to make that possible. None of them were very big fans of spontaneous activities or situations in class. There were some changes over years in the ways the two professors interacted with students; their interactions with students were dynamic in nature, and dependent on changing contexts. Second, both participants constantly invested themselves to maintain or develop their English proficiency to be a good English teacher. In the case of Ms. Kim, she listened to the English Bible, taught English Only Please, a small English conversation classes with 5-7 students, like other native English-speaking teachers, and constantly interacted with other native colleagues. Ms. Han also watched American dramas on Netflix from time to time and read English novels or books so as not to lose her English proficiency. What is important here is that being a good teacher is not a matter of teacher identities such as NEST or NNEST. It is important here is that being a good teacher is not a matter of teacher identities such as NEST or NNEST. It is important how teachers prepare and continue to work on their classes for their students.

Conclusion

The study attempted to identify two participants’ teacher identity about their teaching practices by employing case studies with qualitative data, including six semi-structured interviews, one classroom observation, post-questionnaire, and field notes. The purpose of the study was to investigate the teacher identity of two female professors and examined how their teacher identity and previous learning or teaching experience affected teaching practices. Both professors identified their nationality as Korean, but they had a different definition of being a Korean. The first participant (Ms. Kim, EB-elective bilingual) identified herself as L1 Korean speaker and made a direct comparison with her competence with other Koreans. The other participant (Ms. Han, a CB) used both English and Korean as her emotional language. Ms. Kim’s identity was situated more within the fellow Korean professors and the students, while Ms. Han’s identity was situated more individually. While investigating the linguistic identities of the two participants, it was unusual to note that while Ms. Han allowed students to use L1 for communication, Ms. Kim used herself L1 to convey the important information of the class. Both participants interviewed agreed that well-prepared class was important, but their interpretation was radically different because of their different identities and learning or teaching experience. Ms. Kim was well-prepared with materials and props to grab the students’ attention and helped them to stay focused, whereas Ms. Han used details, sequences, and activities with the perfect lesson plans to manage her class. The diverse aspects and patterns of teaching practices of the two participants stem from their different identities, learning and teaching experience. Although the overall research results of this study have focused on the differences between the two participants, they both had in common that they prepared well for classes to become good teachers and made continuous efforts to maintain or develop their English proficiency. According to the results of the current study, using only NNST/NNEST dichotomy is no longer desirable in the field of English education. As wider perspectives, such as plurilingualism or translingualism, will be needed to understand our class.

The limitations of this study are as follows. First, there should be more observations on classroom to see the changes in teachers’ identity and teaching practices if possible. Second, the study needs to be investigated for a longer period of time in order to observe the process of various social identities being negotiated, constructed, and changed over time. Nevertheless, the present study is meaningful because it
attempted to uncover the teacher identity of two English professors with different cultural backgrounds and learning experience related to their actual teaching practices. The study dealt with essential topics in English language teaching, and it attempted to provide information on how the participants set up their identities in class and how their teacher identity and learning and teaching experience affected their teaching practices.
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Appendix

Background questionnaire

Part 1. Your L2 learning history

1. How do you identify yourself as a L2 English learner? Please rate your proficiency according to these sub-categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Mediocre</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>Native-like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Try to recall your English learning experience, as much as you can remember. List and briefly describe the most influential institutions (either positive or negative) that you have learnt English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the institution</th>
<th>Location of the institution</th>
<th>Years attended (e.g., 199X-200X)</th>
<th>Brief description or the most memorable features of the education from there</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In your own words, what is the definition of ‘good English learner?’

PART 2. You as an English teacher.

1. How many years have you taught English? _______

2. What are the most common activities that you do in your conversation classes? Rank the choices given below (0=never, 1=seldom, 5=frequently)
   a) Lecture on grammatical features_______
   b) Lecture on conversation phrases and expressions ______
   c) Lecture on speaking/presentation strategies ______
   d) Lecture on vocabularies___________
   e) Listening comprehension drills/exercises on textbook ______
   f) Speaking exercises on textbook ______
   g) Games on speaking_______
   h) Games on listening_______
   i) Student-led projects facilitation ______
   j) Others (Specify and rate) ______
   k) Pattern drills ______

4. In your own words, what is the definition of ‘good English teacher?’ How would you identify yourself as a teacher?
Interview Questions

(2017, 07, 12)

What it means to be a good teacher?
What it means to be a bad teacher?
How do you teach your class?

(2017, 08, 09)

Can you explain the course you are teaching?
How do you teach your conversation course?
How do you think about yourself as a language teacher?

(2017, 09, 05)

How do you prepare your class?
How do you keep up your English?
Are you a good English learner? Do you think you are a good role model for your students?

(2017, 10, 10)

Tell me about your students.

(2017, 11, 28)

Can you describe a particularly successful classroom occasion when you think teaching and learning are going well? Was it close to your ‘ideal’ class?
Do you have any difficulties/ or good points when you teach the students during this semester?
Do you have any comments or opinions about these interviews?
Identity question: Who do you identify with yourself in your culture?