

Chapter 2

Conceptualizing (Non-)Native Speaker Identity

2.1 Theorizing Identity

The last few years have seen the appearance of a significant strand of applied linguistics research devoted to the topic of language teacher identity. Varghese et al. (2005) have identified two lines of thinking which helped the emergence of scholarly interest in this topic. First, with classroom-based research gaining ground, it became increasingly obvious that classrooms were in fact “very complex places in which simplistic cause–effect models of teaching methodology were inadequate” and language teachers could not be seen as merely technicians who only needed to “apply the right methodology in order for the learners to acquire the target language” (p. 22). This kind of research revealed that the teachers played a huge role in the constitution of classroom practices and thus became the focus of research attention. Initial explorations of teachers in the classroom showed that the teachers’ whole identity was at play in the classroom (Johnson 1992; Woods 1996). In other words, teacher identity is a crucial component in determining how language teaching is played out.

The second line of research was about the sociocultural and sociopolitical dimensions of teaching (Norton 1997; Pennycook 1994, 2001). This research has revealed that many aspects of identity, such as race and gender, were of “utmost importance in the language classroom” (Varghese et al. 2005, p. 22). As Duff and Uchida (1997) argue, language teachers and students in any setting naturally represent a wide array of social and cultural identities: as teachers or students, as gendered and cultured individuals, as NSs or NNSs, as individuals with political convictions, as members of families, organizations, and society at large. The identities and ideologies that become foregrounded depend “in large measure on the institutional and interpersonal contexts in which individuals find themselves, the purpose for their being there, and their personal biographies” (Duff and Uchida 1997, p. 452).

One of the most notable theories of social identity is developed by Tajfel (1974, 1981), a social psychologist who believes that identity is derived from group membership. According to Tajfel (1974, 1981), a given social context provides categories through which individuals, by learning to recognize linguistic or other behavior cues, allocate others and themselves to category membership and learn the valuation applied by the in-group and salient out-groups to this membership. In other words, people categorize the social world and, hence, perceive themselves as members of various groups. Such knowledge of oneself as social members is defined as his social identity, and it may be positive or negative according to how his in-group fare in comparison with relevant out-groups. Tajfel (1974, 1981) maintains that because individuals' identities are derived from in-group memberships, individuals may choose to change group membership if their present one does not adequately satisfy those elements of social identity that they view positively. Language comes into the picture when a group regards its own language or speech variety as a dimension of comparison with out-groups. Hence, when people encounter a member of another ethnic group, if they value their language as a core aspect of its identity, they will wish to assume a positive identity by means of adopting various strategies of psycholinguistic distinctiveness such as switching to the in-group language, and accentuating ethnic dialect and slang.

Drawing heavily on the influential theory of Tajfel's (1974, 1981), Giles and Johnson (1981, 1987) have developed their ethnolinguistic identity theory, which focuses on language as a salient marker of group membership and social identity. They also discuss group membership, hypothesizing that individuals compare their own social group to out-groups in order to make their own favorably distinct and that distinctiveness enables individuals to achieve a positive social identity.

In recent years, there has been a movement away from the structuralist notions of identity as static or essential and social theorists and sociologists, such as Anthony Giddens and Chris Weedon, have all contributed to the development of a general poststructuralist take on identity. Unlike structuralist approaches, which seek to establish universal laws of psychology or social structure to explain the individuals' fixed identity, a poststructuralist approach sees identity not as something fixed for life, but as an ongoing lifelong process in which individuals constantly attempt to maintain a sense of balance, what Giddens (1991) calls "ontological security," the possession of "'answers' to fundamental questions which all human life in some way addresses" (p. 47). This ongoing search for ontological security takes place at the crossroads of the past, present and future, as in their day-to-day interactions with their environments. Individuals are constantly reconciling their current sense of self and their accumulated past, with a view to dealing with what awaits them in the future. According to Block (2006), this process is "necessarily conflictive in nature" and the outcome is "not generally neat and tidy, and it often leads to feelings of ambivalence" (p. 35). The ambivalence of identity is "the tension between self and other, desire and lack, life and death, consciousness and unconsciousness" (Elliot 1996, p. 8). Ambivalence is thus the natural state of human beings who are forced by their individual life trajectories to make choices where choices are not always a simple half-and-half proposition whereby the individuals

becomes half of what they were and half of what they have been exposed to (Block 2006). Rather, the result is emergent in that it arises in a not-altogether predictable way and it cannot be reduced to the constituent parts which make it up. It occupies a “third place” (Bhabha 1994), which results from the “negotiation of difference,” within which “elements encounter and transform each other” (Papastergiadis 2000, p. 170). Block (2006) points out that this mention of negotiation of difference and the idea that individuals strive for a coherent life narrative, seeking to resolve conflicts and assuage their ambivalent feelings, raises the issue of the extent to which identity is a self-conscious, reflexive project of individual agency, created and maintained by individuals. Some researchers argue strongly for human agency. Giddens (1991), for example, suggests that even in the most extreme of life conditions, there is some space for individual choice and the “reflexive constitution of self-identity” (p. 86). In the same light, Mathews (2000) argues that identities are not entities into which one is raised; rather, one assumes an identity and then works on it. However, other scholars have shown their concern about the limits of individual agency. Layder (1997), for example, defends the notion that social constructs such as ethnic affiliation, while not fixed for life, do nevertheless provide a grounding for much of one’s day-to-day activity. Block (2006) echoes Layder’s (1997) view, arguing that it is probably wrong to take concepts such as hybridity, third place and choice to the extreme of arguing that social phenomena such as ethnic affiliation cease to have any meaning.

I agree with Block’s (2006) suggestion of reconciling structure and agency: identity is an emerging process, “taking place at the crossroads of structure and agency” (p. 38). In other words, while identity is conditioned by social interaction and social structure, it, at the same time, conditions social interaction and social structure. Individuals “do not develop their sense of self, working exclusively from the inside out or from the outside in; rather, their environments provide conditions and impose constraints while they act on the same environment, continuously altering and recreating it” (Block 2006, p. 36).

In conclusion, a poststructuralist approach to identity views identity as socially constructed, a self-conscious, ongoing narrative an individual performs. Identity is about negotiating new subject positions at the crossroads of the past, present and future. The entire process is “conflictive” and the individual often feels “ambivalence” and there are “unequal power relations to deal with” (Block 2006, p. 40).

2.2 NS Versus NNS

In order to explore the NEST/NNEST issue in China, it is very important to first clarify the different discourses of the NS versus NNS identity concept. I will now discuss the issue of (non-)native speakerhood in ENL/ESL/EFL framework and in the World Englishes (WE) and EIL/ELF framework.

2.2.1 *(Non-)Native Speakerhood in the ENL/ESL/EFL Framework*

Braine (2010), in simplest terms, defines a NS of a language as one who speaks the language as his/her first language and, accordingly, a NNS is one who speaks that language as a second or foreign language. He further argues that such a definition is in nature biased since “the term ‘native speaker’ undoubtedly has positive connotations: it donates a birthright, fluency, cultural affinity, and sociolinguistic competence ... the term ‘non-native speaker’ carries the burden of the minority, of marginalization and stigmatization ...” (p. 9).

The concept of NS is, by many, attributed to Chomsky. His notion of the terms “native speaker” and “competence” has bolstered the authority of the NS. Chomsky defines NS as an “ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community, who knows its language perfectly” (Chomsky 1965, as cited in Braine 1999c, p. 15) and competence, according to him, has to do with intuitive knowledge of grammatical and ungrammatical utterances in a language. Kramsch (1995), however, explains that “it is not enough to have intuitions about grammaticality and linguistics acceptability and to be able to communicate fluently and with full competence; one must also be recognized as a native speaker by the relevant speech community” (p. 363). Similarly, Davies (2006) emphasizes the fact that mother tongue is not like gender. It is, “classically, social, just as culture is” (p. 438).

Phillipson (1992) views the NS notion from an ideological perspective and tries to pull down the barriers between NS and NNS teachers. He calls the popular view in ELT that the ideal teacher of English is a NS as “native speaker fallacy” (p. 195). He argues that features attributed to NSs, such as “the greater facility in demonstrating fluent, idiomatically appropriate language, in appreciating the cultural connotation of the language, and in being the final arbiter of the acceptability of any given samples of language” (Ibid., p. 194), can all be instilled through teacher training. He concludes that the NS fallacy is to serve the interest of the core English-speaking countries (e.g., the USA, the UK) and the effect of this fallacy has been to maintain relations of dominance by those countries over the periphery English-speaking countries. Canagarajah (1999a) supports this opinion and points out that the NS fallacy creates a global demand for NESTs from core English-speaking countries and thus helps NSs of English to dominate in the ELT profession. Pennycook (1994) also endorses this view by stating that ELT helps to “legitimate the contemporary capitalist order” (p. 24).

Therefore, a growing trend today is to deconstruct the notion of NS in ELT. For example, Liu (1999) proposes to view NS/NNS on a “multidimensional and multilayered continuum,” which can be explored in terms of the dimension of

- sequence (Is English learned first before other languages?)
- competence (Is English our most competent language as compared to other languages, including our L1?)
- culture (What culture are we most affiliated with?)

- identity (Who do we prefer to be recognized as under different circumstances?)
- environment (Do we grow up bilingually or trilingually?)
- politics (Why should we label NNSs and NSs in a dichotomy instead of viewing it on a continuum?) (pp. 163–164).

Other linguists are more adamant on this issue. For example, Rampton (1990), in his articles entitled “Discrediting the ‘Native Speaker’,” suggests using *expert speaker* instead to include all successful users of a language.

Different from the above-mentioned scholars, Medgyes (1992, 1994) discusses the NS construct specifically in its application to the ELT profession and holds the view that the native/non-native contrast is a clear categorical distinction. He argues that, in ELT, NESTs and NNESTs have revealed considerable differences in their pedagogical practice and that most of the discrepancies are language-related. He points out the NNSs’ English language deficiency and calls this disadvantage a “linguistic handicap” (Medgyes 1994, p. 178) in comparison to NSs’ innate linguistic competence. Medgyes (1992) further states that NSs have an advantage so substantial that “it cannot be outweighed by other factors prevalent in the learning situation, whether it be motivation, aptitude, perseverance, experience, education or anything else” (p. 342). However, he does not conclude from this that NSs are necessarily more effective teachers and recommends that NNSs do their utmost to attain near-native English proficiency in order to become self-confident teachers.

In conclusion, even though it has been established for some time that the NS/NNS categories are not based on easy, objective criteria (Davies 2006), and are indeed underpinned with political ideology (Phillipson 1992), the term continues to be used easily and unthinkingly by English language educators and their students throughout the profession (Holliday 2009) and the NS construct is still the ghost in ELT (Cook 2016).

2.2.2 *(Non-)Native Speakerhood in the WE and EIL/ELF Framework*

Varying uses of English worldwide have been discussed under different nomenclatures, such as World English(es) (WE) (e.g., Jenkins 2003; Kirkpatrick 2007; Rubdy and Saraceni 2006a), English as an international language (EIL) (e.g., Jenkins 2000; Llorca 2004), and English as a lingua franca (ELF) (e.g., Chew 2009; House 2003; Seidlhofer 2001). Many scholars use EIL and ELF interchangeably (e.g., Llorca 2004; Murata and Jenkins 2009). The WE researchers mainly aim to promote “the establishment of the legitimacy of world Englishes, their users and accompanying identities connected to respective Englishes, in both local contexts and international and intercultural settings, where people use their own varieties of English as an international lingua franca,” and thus, in this sense, the notion of WE is “closely connected to that of ELF” (Murata and Jenkins 2009, p. 3).

The proponents of WE are most notably represented by Kachru and the most influential model analyzing the spread of English has been his (1982, 1985, 1988, 1992). He divides WE into three concentric circles: the Inner Circle where English is used as a native language; the Outer Circle where English is a second language; and the Expanding Circle where English is a foreign language. The Inner Circle (e.g., the USA, the UK, etc.) represents the traditional cultural and linguistic base of English and thus norm-providing. The Outer Circle, mainly including countries that were formerly British or American colonies and where English continues to be a dominant language after their independence for the majority of their people is norm-developing. The Expanding Circle, where English is not acquired since early childhood but rather learned in schools by its people, is norm-dependent. The great advantage of this model over the ENL/ESL/EFL one is that it has broken new ground in “raising awareness of the very existence of dynamic varieties of English with growing populations of speakers” (Bruthiaux 2003, p. 160) and has made it obvious that “English is now a plural phenomenon with multicultural identities” (Chew 2009, p. 26). Meanwhile, the model does not suggest that one variety is any better, linguistically speaking, than any other. The spread of English has “resulted in the development of many Englishes and not the transplanting of one model to other countries” (Kirkpatrick 2007, p. 28).

In this model, English as it is used in the individual countries of the Outer Circle, and arguably in Expanding Circle, has become Englishes—nativized varieties of English “each with its own flavor and characteristics appropriate to its speakers’ local and professional use and to local institutionalized functions” (Jenkins 2009, p. 40). The spread of English in its sociohistorical context has created different varieties of English and highly proficient speakers of these varieties. With indigenized varieties of English developed, many there would consider themselves NSs of these Englishes (Canagarajah 1999a). To view the English speakers all over the world through the lens of NS/NNS dichotomy is to accept a linguistic caste system (Samimy and Brutt-Griffler 1999).

Unlike the WE model, which seeks to show how English becomes localized in different regions in the world, the EIL/ELF model, focusing more on communication in English between NNSs, seeks to show “how English is always under negotiation” (Pennycook 2009, p. 195). It is argued that the EIL/ELF model “liberates the L2 speakers from the imposition of native speaker norms as well as the cultural baggages of World Englishes models” (Rubdy and Saraceni 2006b, p. 8). EIL/ELF is thought to be a more neutral term since it no longer “connotes English-language contact involving native speakers as natural and acceptable and those involving non-native speakers as in some way ‘unauthentic’” (Chew 2009, p. 26).

EIL/ELF is not the English language as it is spoken in English-speaking households, but rather a language spoken across the world. The transformation of English from being the language of a few powerful countries to becoming the international language has brought with it many changes (Llurda 2004). In the context of EIL/ELF, NSs are only a part of the much larger group of speakers of the

language. As Modiano (1999) explains, proficiency in English is no longer determined by birth but by the capacity to use the language appropriately, a capacity that is shared by some speakers, be they native or non-native. In other words, in its emerging role as a world language, English has no NSs (Rajagopalan 2004) and the whole idea of NS has been considered blurred if not hopelessly meaningless (Rajagopalan 1997).

Chew (2009) sees new Englishes and EIL/ELF from a liminal perceptive. She presents a new model of world order, a “discontinuous nonlinear mode of historical development,” in which the universe is seen as “a series of stages of progression from one order level to another in which everything is connecting at higher orders or levels” (p. 39). First used in psychology referring to the “ambiguous phase where the initiate is outside of society but preparing to reenter society” (Van Gennep 1960, as cited in Chew 2009, p. 62), liminality, in world orders, refers to the interval between the world orders, the time when one order has ended and the next one is about to begin. Chew further divides the liminal period into three phrases: forming, norming and integrating. Based on the evidence we see around us in the world today, Chew argues that we are now in a stage of liminality, “a dramatic and difficult transition from the national to the global” (p. 209). Chew further states that each liminal period always sees new lingua franca(s) rising to the fore in relation to others since lingua franca(s) are instruments of world orders and people are almost always automatically driven to the lingua franca(s) with the most economic, cultural and symbolic rewards as a means of alignment with the new world order. When lingua francas spread, prodigious varieties will be spawned. The change in attitudes toward the prodigious varieties, in today’s situation, the New Englishes, bears striking resemblance to the three phrases of liminality: the indigenous variety is at first considered inferior to the imported NS variety (the forming stage) but gradually it becomes accepted and institutionalized (the norming stage) and finally it is recognized as the norm and becomes the model for language learning in schools (the integrating stage).

Be it WE paradigm or EIL/ELF paradigm, the centrality of Inner Circle communities to the life of English is increasingly questioned. The oft-cited statistics of Graddol (1999) has shown us that the number of English speakers outside the Inner Circle is now far greater than those within. In addition, an increasing number of English speakers all over the world are using this language for communication between NNSs than for communication involving at least one NS (Rajagopalan 2004). We are moving toward “an understanding of American English and Sri Lankan English as local varieties for intranational purposes, with possible lingua franca core” (Canagarajah 2006, p. 24).

It is recognized that the terms of NS and NNS are highly controversial; however, considering the current situation in China, the local Chinese teachers of English are still customarily termed NNESTs for the time being. It must be noted that no derogatory judgment is intended by using this term.

2.3 Language, Ideology and Power

Ideology is rich in interpretation with both positive and negative meanings. A common interpretation is that ideology represents social interests and provides individuals with a partial view of the world (Filippakou 2011). Not limited to a partial understanding of the reality, ideology also reveals how power differences are reflected in its presence (McLellan 1986). It is better to see ideology as exercising on discourse a particular set of effects (Eagleton 1991), which are related to power, and more precisely, social struggles of power (Filippakou 2011). Implicated in “an asymmetrical distribution of power and resources” (McLellan 1986, p. 83), ideology is present when there are power conflicts between social interests. Reinforced by power, ideology comes from a struggle between parties representing different social interests.

Though language is not necessarily ideology, language and ideology are intimately connected (Modiano 2001). Bakhtin (1986), for instance, states that language is not a neutral medium shaped by individual desire, intent, or bordered by objective meanings, but it is the symbolic terrain where hegemony is asserted and revisited. Hegemony could do its work with the support of ideology. Parallels should be drawn between the market of English as an export product, linguistic imperialism, and the ontological impact which foreign language learning has on learners (Pennycook 1989, 1994). According to Modiano (2001), while foreign language learners may not necessarily become dominated by the acquired tongue, they are most certainly influenced to a considerable extent: one does not learn a language “solely as a system of lexical usage, grammar, and pronunciation utilized to express meaning,” but also “as a vehicle for the conveying of ideologies which seek to define the individual, the world, and the social realities which frame human experience” (p. 162). In the process of learning a language, one is “ontologically colonized by the ideologies which flourish in the acquired tongue” (Ibid., p. 162).

Language ideologies provide possible frameworks for linguistic practices, devaluing alternate forms, and reaffirming others. Holliday (2005, 2006) has pointed out that the ideology of native-speakerism is a deeply pervasive ideology within the ELT profession. He defines native-speakerism as “an established belief that ‘native-speaker’ teachers represent a ‘Western culture’ from which spring the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology” (Holliday 2005, p. 6). He further differentiates between native-speakerism in a surface sense, where the subscribers project the beliefs of the ideology as matters of fact, and in a hidden sense, which is usually revealed as prejudicial. According to Holliday (2006), in the surface sense, there is a popular discourse within which NS and NNS take on the appearance of neutral categories. They are used by everyone, even though these terms are not based on easy and objective criteria. The established impression that speakerhood relates to birth within a particular country is maintained and therefore associated with ideological neutrality. However, the hidden results of native-speakerism reveal, first, discrimination against NNESTs. In many scenarios, NNESTs need to compete with less well-qualified NESTs.

Second, native-speakerism is connected with ethnicity and race: NNS can be a label for the non-White Other. Braine (1999a, b, c) argues similarly that native speakerhood is neither a privilege of birth nor of education, but of “acceptance by the group that created the distinction” (p. 15). ELT has constructed the NS/NNS distinction as being largely instrumentally linguistic and thus technically neutral categories, which conveniently ignores the politics of inequality.

According to Holliday (2009), there are significant parallels between the dominant ideologies of speakerhood and culture. ELT has traditionally connected learning English, “L2,” with a British or American culture, “C2.” This correlation is underpinned by the view that national cultures are the basic units we need to work with. Similarly, this thinking is convenient within professional and academic circles because it represents a world within which different but equal national cultures can be described, taught, and theorized about without getting into the uncomfortable politics of global inequalities.

“English-only” ideology is another dominant ideology in ELT derived from native-speakerism ideology. A manifestation of power relation in ELT, it is considered to have its origins in the ELT institutions of the center that influence language education policy making around the world (Canagarajah 1999b). The sociocultural settings of English language and English medium classrooms are intrinsically bi/multilingual as both learners and teachers bring their multiple identities and home community practices into the classroom (Saxena 2009). However, in many countries, policy-makers and other stakeholders have not realized nor accepted this fact, which has led to the L1 being categorized as the non-legitimate language in English classes and therefore positioned as problems rather than resources.

The wide spread of CLT, an ideology itself, has helped to deepen the “English-only” ideology. Howatt (1984) has distinguished between a “strong” and a “weak” version of CLT:

There is, in a sense, a “strong” version of communicative approach and a “weak” version. The weak version...stresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use their English for communicative purposes and, characteristically, attempts to integrate such activities into a wider program of language teaching ... The strong version of communicative teaching ... advances the claim that language is acquired through communication, so that it is not merely a question of activating an existing but inert knowledge of the language, but of stimulating the development of the language system itself. If the former could be described as “learning to use” English, the latter entails “using English to learn” it (p. 279).

Either way, CLT requires the maximum use of the target language in the classroom. In Appadurai’s (1990) terms, CLT is an example of a pedagogical *ideoscape*, a global flow of ideas about teaching. However, this flow of teaching method ideology has not been unproblematic, as pointed out by many applied linguists. For example, Ellis (1996), in his book discussing the gap between imported pedagogical principles and local teaching contexts, writes specifically about CLT in East Asian countries such as China and Vietnam, making the point that the focus on process inherent in this approach does not sit well in societies in which content is considered important. According to Pennycook (1989), the

concept of method reflects “a particular view of the world and is articulated in the interests of unequal power relationships” (p. 590), and it has “diminished rather than enhanced our understanding of language teaching” (p. 597).

In conclusion, as ideas about social and linguistic relationships, language ideologies are heavily loaded with political interests. Although many critical scholars are working hard to unpack the political and ideological nature of ELT (e.g., Canagarajah 1999b; Pennycook 1989, 1994; Phillipson 1988, 1992), certain dominant language ideologies such as native-speakerism remain deeply rooted in the ELT practices.

2.4 Features of and Differences Between NESTs and NNESTs

2.4.1 *Research Based on NNESTs’ Self-perceptions*

Peter Medgyes, himself a NNEST with first language as Hungarian, is the name no mention of research into the NEST/NNEST issue could begin without. Combining research with his own experience as a NNEST and teacher educator, and his observations of other NNESTs, he discusses many aspects of being a NNEST, some of which would be considered controversial even today, such as “natives and non-natives in opposite trenches,” “the dark side of being a non-native,” and “who’s worth more: the native or the non-native?.” Based on his belief that NESTs and NNETS are two different species, he advances four hypotheses:

- They differ in terms of their language proficiency.
- They differ in terms of their teaching behavior.
- The discrepancy in language proficiency accounts for most of the differences found in their teaching behavior.
- They can be equally good teachers in their own terms (Medgyes 1994, p. 27).

In order to empower NNESTs, Medgyes (1994) lists out six hidden advantages of NNESTs:

- provide a good learner model for imitation;
- teach language learning strategies more effectively;
- supply learners with more information about the English language;
- anticipate and prevent language difficulties better;
- be more empathetic to the needs and problems of learners; and
- make use of the learners’ mother tongue (p. 51).

In the same light, Cook (2005) states that NNESTs:

- provide models of proficiency for L2 users in action in classroom;
- present examples of people who have become successful L2 users; and
- often have more appropriate training and background (p. 57).

Modiano (2005) views the advantages of NNESTs from another perspective. He argues that with globalization increasing every day, it is important to learn an international variety of English, a lingua franca, and not one specific variety, such as British English or American English. Since NNESTs do not belong to one variety of English, they have less loyalty to one variety over another and are in better position to promote diversity.

Perhaps the first empirical study in this area, Reves and Medgyes' (1994) study has established as the benchmark of similar research (Braine 2005). A survey questionnaire was circulated among 216 native and non-native teachers working in 10 countries (Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Israel, Mexico, Nigeria, Russia, Sweden, Yugoslavia, and Zimbabwe). Among the respondents, 92% of them self-reported as NNESTs and 35% of them claimed they rarely or never interacted with NS of English. The survey revealed that 68% of the respondents perceived differences between NESTs and NNESTs whereas only 15% saw no differences. In addition, as high as 84% of the respondents admitted to having various language difficulties, with vocabulary and fluency being the most common areas. Nearly 70% of the respondents stated that their language difficulties had hampered their teaching effectiveness. The survey also showed some differences between NESTs and NNESTs as perceived by NNESTs themselves: NESTs were good at vocabulary, speaking, and pronunciation while NNESTs excelled in handling grammar and reading. The differences identified are summarized in Table 2.1 (Medgyes 1994, pp. 58–59).

The results of this study also showed that the perpetual fear of their students' judgment made NNESTs constantly self-conscious about their mistakes and this self-discrimination often led to a poorer self-image, which might have further deteriorated their language performance, and, in turn, could lead to an even stronger feeling of inferiority. Interestingly, as Amin (2004) argues, it seems acceptable for NESTs to make some occasional mistakes while teaching, or not to know all the details about the English language.

Unlike the international nature of Reves and Medgyes' (1994) study, more studies on NNESTs' self-perceptions were conducted in specific ESL settings. Employing a similar questionnaire and research questions to those of Reves and Medgyes' (1994) study, Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) investigated 17 NNS TESOL graduates in a large Midwestern university in the US, aiming to document their perceptions regarding the native versus non-native issues in teaching English. The differences identified largely supported the findings reported in Medgyes' (1994) book. To specify, they identified NESTs as being informal, fluent, accurate, using a variety of methods, being flexible, using conversational English, knowing subtleties of the language, providing positive feedback to students and having communication but not exam preparation as the goal of their teaching. On the other hand, NNESTs were thought of as relying on textbooks, applying differences between the first and second language, using the first language as a medium of instruction, being aware of negative transfer and psychological

Table 2.1 Differences in teaching behavior between NESTs and NNESTs

NESTs	NNESTs
Own use of English	
Speak better English	Speak poorer English
Use English more confidently	Use English less confidently
Use real language	Use bookish language
General attitude	
Adopt a more flexible approach	Adopt a more guided approach
Are more innovative	Are more cautious
Are less empathetic	Are more empathetic
Attend to perceived need	Attend to real needs
Have far-fetched expectations	Have realistic expectations
Are more casual	Are more strict
Are less committed	Are more committed
Attitude to teaching the language	
Are less insightful	Are more insightful
Focus on:	Focus on:
Fluency	Accuracy
Meaning	Form
Language in use	Grammar rules
Oral skills	Printed word
Colloquial registers	Formal register
Teach items in context	Teach items in isolation
Prefer free activities	Prefer controlled activities
Favor group work/pair work	Favor frontal work
Use a variety of materials	Use a single textbook
Tolerate errors	Correct/punish for errors
Set fewer tests	Set more tests
Resort to no/less translation	Resort to more translation
Assign less homework	Assign more homework
Attitude to teaching culture	
Supply more cultural information	Supply less cultural information

aspects of learning, being sensitive to the needs of students, being more efficient, knowing the students' background, and having exam preparation as the goal of their teaching. However, the participants did not necessarily think that NESTs were superior to them. Instead, they argued that successful teaching depends on numerous factors such as "the goals and objectives of a program, age, and level of students as well as individual teachers' personality and skills" (Samimy and Griffler 1999, p. 136).

Also in the US, in a major Southwestern university, Liu (2005) conducted an ethnographic case study. Focusing on four Chinese graduate teaching assistants teaching freshman composition to NSs, he examined the major issues concerning NNS teaching assistants. The results showed that one of the biggest challenges to the participants was the linguistic difficulties and uncertainties.

Early studies on the NEST/NNEST issue were mostly conducted in ESL settings and only a few recent studies were conducted in EFL settings. In Japan,

Butler (2007) investigated Japanese elementary school teachers' attitude toward the privileged status of NESTs and their self-evaluation of the language proficiency. She found that approximately 60% of her 122 respondents supported the ideology of native-speakerism—the notion that NSs of English are the best English teachers—and only 13% did not. These teachers also believed that Standard English (British or American English) only should be taught to EFL students. The teachers self-evaluated as having stronger reading skills than writing and oral skills.

Arva and Medgyes' (2000) study is among the few studies employing classroom observation to triangulate with interviews with teachers. Aiming to examine the teaching behavior of the two groups of teachers, the researchers invited 10 teachers teaching 9–11th graders to participate in the study, five NESTs and five NNESTs. As for the five NESTs, their experience in teaching English as a foreign language was very limited, while the five NNESTs were all qualified teachers. Their classes were recorded and they were interviewed afterwards. The results showed that the NESTs were perfect language models. Though they were all inexperienced, they were able to express the desired content economically and clearly and their linguistic advantage over their non-native counterparts became especially palpable when giving instructions. In addition, they functioned as cross-cultural bridges: they were rich sources of cultural information and meanwhile they kept inquiring about Hungarian traditions. Humor being in great abundance, they proved to be good facilitators. In summary, though NEST's lessons were “far from being perfect” and indeed were “rife with professional errors, big or small,” those inexperienced NESTs were capable of “performing the task for which they were employed: they succeeded in getting their students to talk in English” (Ibid., p. 366). In the case of NNESTs, it turned out that four out of five teachers used English almost exclusively during their lessons, which was in sharp contrast to what the teachers claimed in the interview, namely, that mother tongue was a great advantage to them over their native counterparts. In other aspects, such as relying more on course book, resorting to more error correction, checking students' work more consistently, and assigning more homework, classroom observation confirmed the results obtained from the interviews. Taking all the results into consideration, the researchers concluded that even untrained NESTs could be used effectively for certain purposes—they could “do a decent job as long as they are commissioned to do what they can do best: converse” (Ibid., p. 369).

Most research on NNESTs' self-perceptions on the features of and differences between NESTs and NNESTs has heavily relied on teachers' self-accounts, by means of narratives, surveys, or interviews. Therefore, it is mostly through their perspective that a research corpus has been established (Moussu and Llurda 2008). With self-report questionnaire or interview as the main research method, the studies reviewed have provided powerful insights into NNESTs' minds. The results of these studies have revealed the differences, strengths, and weaknesses of both groups. An examination of these studies has shown that the dominant ideologies such as the NS/NNS dichotomy and the native-speakerism are deeply rooted in NNESTs' mind.

One problem worth exploring is whether the NNEST participants in the studies in EFL settings have had the experience of working together with NESTs and whether the exposure to NESTs is long enough for them to form a critical perception of the issues related to NESTs/NNESTs. In Reves and Medgyes' study (1994), it was reported that 35% of the participants rarely or never interacted with NSs of English and 77% had never been in an English-speaking country or had been there less than 3 months. In Llurda and Huguet' (2003) study, the 101 participants worked in regular primary and secondary schools in Lleida, a Catalan city; however, as the authors stated, it must be noted that there were no NSs who had worked as primary or secondary teachers in Lleida.

Another problem is NESTs' qualification. Arva and Medgyes' (2000) study has specific strengths in that it combined interviews with classroom observation. With the participants noticeably unequal in terms of teaching experience and qualification—the NESTs were “poorly qualified as EFL teachers” and their EFL experience was limited while the NNESTs were “all qualified teachers of English” with “the length of teaching experience ranging between 2.5 and 10 years” (p. 359)—their analysis paid special attention to the relationship between language competence and professional expertise. However, as Samimy (1997) argues, it is unwise to overemphasize the linguistic deficit of non-native professionals while neglecting other equally significant factors related to professionalism: EFL qualifications and length of teaching experience also play a significant role. The excuse Arva and Medgyes (2000) gave was that “well-qualified and experienced NESTs were not to be found in Hungarian state secondary grammar schools” (p. 368). Thus, it seems that in their study, what they compared is not NESTs and NNESTs, but NSs of English and NNESTs. Indeed, this is a common problem because many NESTs in EFL situations are barely qualified to be teachers (e.g., Barratt and Kontra 2000; Benke and Medgyes 2005).

Thus, in most studies carried out in EFL contexts, the self-perceptions of the NNESTs seem to be based on a comparison with the imaginary or under-qualified NESTs. I will show in the next chapter how I tried to solve these two problems.

2.4.2 Research Based on Students' Perceptions

While the NS/NNS issue has been extensively studied from the teachers' point of view, less has been written about learners' perceptions toward this issue.

Conducted in the US, Mahboob's (2003) doctoral research applied a novel way to elicit students' perceptions of NNESTs. Instead of using a survey, he used a discourse-analytic technique. The participants, 32 students enrolled in an intensive English program, were asked to provide written responses to a cue that elicited their opinions on their NESTs and NNESTs. The analysis of those comments showed that both groups received positive and negative comments. Not surprisingly, NESTs were praised for their oral skills, large vocabulary, and cultural knowledge. Negative comments on NESTs related to grammar, experience as an ESL learner,

ability to answer questions, and teaching methodology. On the contrary, NNESTs were valued for their experience as ESL learners, knowledge of grammar, hard work, ability to answer questions, and their teaching methodology. As always, poorer oral ability and lack of cultural knowledge were NNESTs' Achilles' heel.

Kelch and Santana-Williamson's (2002) study was more focused. They aimed to determine if ESL students could identify native accents from non-native ones and if they held a more positive perception toward teachers with native accents. They invited 56 students to listen to the prerecorded tape of the same script read by three NSs of different varieties of English and three NNSs and then to identify each reader as NSs or NNSs and to rate them on a questionnaire. The results showed that only in 45% of the instances were students able to correctly identify the accents, and their perceptions of the teacher's nativeness strongly influenced their overall perceptions toward them. Teachers who were perceived as NSs were seen as more likeable, educated, experienced, and overall better teachers. There are in fact no intrinsic links between prevalent images of intelligence, aesthetic value or culture with the underlying sounds (Hudson 1986), and thus it is clear the affiliation is totally ideological.

Butler (2007) conducted a similar study among young EFL Korean students. The participants, 312 Grade Six students in Korea were asked to evaluate different accented tape recordings of the same person. The aim of the study was to investigate whether a foreign-accented teacher was perceived more negatively than an American-accented teacher and which qualities or weaknesses were associated with the foreign-accented teacher. The study did find significant differences in the students' perceptions toward the teachers (guises) with different accents in "their goodness of pronunciation, confidence in their use of English, focus on fluency versus accuracy, and use of Korean in the classroom" (Ibid., p. 749). The study also found that regardless of the teachers' (guises') accents, the students' desire to have them as their teachers was highly related to aspects such as "pronunciation, confidence, empathy, and ability to explain the differences between English and Korean" (Ibid., p. 749).

Cheung and Braine's (2007) study was carried out in Hong Kong and the aim was twofold: the perceptions of university students in Hong Kong toward NNESTs, and the specific strengths and shortcomings of NNESTs in Hong Kong. The study was conducted in two phases, a questionnaire survey involving 420 students from seven universities and interviews with 10 students from three universities. With some modification, they used Plakans' (1997) questionnaire, which had been designed to measure American students' attitudes toward international teaching assistants. In addition to the questionnaire, semi-structured interviews were conducted in English with 10 students who had expressed willingness during the survey to be interviewed for this study. The results showed what Hong Kong students valued about their NNESTs were: ability to use students' mother tongue in teaching, effective pedagogical skills, knowledge in English language, and positive personality traits. On the other hand, the most agreed-on shortcomings were examination-oriented teaching approach, over-correcting students' work and

limited use of English. The survey generally showed a favorable perception toward NNESTs: most students reported that they did not encounter problems with NNESTs because of their non-nativeness and they stated that NNESTs taught as effectively as NESTs.

Also carried out in Hong Kong, Ma's (2012) study yielded similar findings to that of Cheung and Braine's (2007) study. By means of semi-structured group interviews with 30 secondary school students, Ma (2012) found that the perceived advantages of the non-native local English included their proficiency in students' L1, their knowledge of students' learning difficulties, the ease the students experienced in understanding their teaching. The perceived advantages of NESTs were their good English proficiency and ability to facilitate student learning. The results also showed that the disadvantages of one category of teachers appeared to be the reverse of the advantages of another.

Also in an EFL setting, Benke and Medgyes' (2005) study presented a comparative analysis of students' opinions about NESTs and NNESTs based on a Likert-scale questionnaire with open-ended items as the last section. A total of 422 Hungarian learners participated in the study. The results showed that the advantage most frequently ascribed to the NNESTs was related to teaching and explaining grammar. NNESTs were also valued for providing more thorough exam preparation and promoting language learning more effectively. In addition, the shared mother tongue made NNESTs especially helpful in that they could supply the exact Hungarian equivalent of certain English word. On the other hand, respondents spoke highly of NESTs' ability to teach conversation classes and to serve as perfect models of imitation. The NESTs were also said to be more friendly and more capable of getting their learners to speak.

Barratt and Kontra's (2000) study was carried out in two countries, Hungary (116 students involved) and China (100 students involved). The aim of this study was to get a consumer's view of what worked and what did not for a visiting teacher in a foreign land. In both surveys, students were first asked to specify the number of NESTs they had interacted with. Many Hungarian and Chinese respondents had been taught by large numbers of NESTs (4.3 for Hungarian students and 2.85 for Chinese students on average). Participants were asked to free-write in English about their positive and/or negative experiences with NESTs. The results of the two surveys were similar: the most valuable characteristics of NESTs were authentic pronunciation, large vocabulary, and information about Inner Circle culture while the main complaints were that most of NESTs were not language teachers and lacked experience.

While self-perceptions of the NNESTs are important, what could be more critical are the perceptions of the students. The findings of these studies showed that the students, both in ESL and EFL settings, did not seem to have a negative perception toward NNESTs and recognized that teaching experience and professionalism were more important than teachers' linguistic backgrounds. Cheung and Braine's (2007) study was carried out in Hong Kong, which was regarded as an ESL setting since Hong Kong meets the description of the Outer Circle regions in Kachru's WE

model (1982, 1992): ex-colonies of the UK or US where English remains an important and usually official language after their independence. However, with Cantonese as the first language for the majority of its residences, this substantial monolingualism makes a lingua franca, English in this case, unnecessary (Li 2009). Indeed, Cheung and Braine (2007) considered Hong Kong, the venue of their study, an EFL setting. In this sense, their study is more relevant to the current project. However, they applied Plakans' (1997) International Teaching Assistants Questionnaire with only minor modification, which has made their study less EFL oriented. Comparatively, Benke and Medgyes' (2005) study is EFL-oriented in that their instrument—the questionnaire adapted from Reves and Medgyes' study (1994) and Arva and Medgyes' study (2000), is more EFL specific. Therefore, the questionnaire used in Benke and Medgyes' (2005) study was used as the starting point when the researcher was developing the questionnaire for the current research, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

2.4.3 Summary of the Features of and Differences Between NESTs and NNESTs in the Existing Literature

As discussed above, a number of features of and differences between NESTs and NNESTs have been elicited by NNESTs' self-accounts as well as the students' accounts. NNESTs' limited language competence is mentioned in almost all comparison studies. Almost all studies concluded that NESTs enjoyed a superior position to NNESTs as far as language competence was concerned. These findings are consistent with Holliday's (2005, 2006) view that the ideology of native-speakerism, an established belief that NSs represent the ideals of the English language, is a deeply pervasive ideology within the ELT profession.

Also, NESTs and NNESTs were reported to be different in their classroom practices: NNESTs seemed to provide more thorough exam preparation, to be more able to teach grammar and to be more efficient in identifying learners' problems and helping them overcome difficulties due to their language learning experience while NESTs' classes were associated with a more cheerful and humorous atmosphere and the teaching of cultural information. As discussed above, ELT has traditionally connected learning English, the "L2," with a British or American culture, the "C2" (Holliday 2009). Most studies have shown that both NNESTs and students perceive NESTs as more capable in handling the cultural elements in the classroom (e.g., Barratt and Kontra 2000; Mahboob 2003; Medgyes 1994; Reves and Medgyes 1994) and cultural knowledge has been identified as one of the main areas of difficulty by NNESTs (e.g., Liu 1999; Samimy and Brutt-Griffler 1999; Tang 1997).

2.5 NNESTs' Professional Identity

2.5.1 *Existing Literature*

Besides the research on the features of and differences between NESTs and NNESTs, some other studies examined NNESTs' self-perceptions regarding their professional identity. Given that one's appearance and accent influence how one is perceived by students (Amin 1997), and that speakers of outer circle varieties are perceived as "non-standard" and possibly "inferior" to NSs (Reis 2010), many qualified NNESTs struggle to assert and negotiate an identity as legitimate TESOL professionals in the contexts where they teach (Canagarajah 1999a).

In an ESL setting, Amin (1997) interviewed five visible-minority female teachers who were at that time teaching or had taught adult ESL students in Toronto, Canada. The teachers reported that some ESL students made assumptions that only Caucasians can be NSs of English, and that only NSs know real, proper, Canadian English, which led to visible-minority teachers' often being compared unfavorably to Caucasian teachers. Gender was reported to exacerbate the difficulties that women teachers faced when attempting to establish their authority. The participants felt disempowered by their students' decided preference for white male. The perception that NS identity is viewed as analogous to "whiteness" was also obvious in Liu's (1999) study and Golombek and Jordan's (2005) study.

Liu (1999) investigated NNESTs' views on the NS/NNS issue at a major midwestern university in the US. Responding to both face-to-face and email interview, seven professionals participated in the study, who represented a wide variety of cultural and linguistic experiences—Cantonese, Danish, Korean, Italian, Tagalog, Dutch, and Kimbala. The seven participants had diverse views: some found it hard to accept the simplistic way of categorizing a rather complex phenomenon within a NS/NNS dichotomy and expressed difficulty in affiliating themselves with either category while others did not experience problems in defining the term and felt relatively comfortable to be or not to be associated with the category each chose. However, they all agreed that because the term NNS was so complex, it was better viewed "on a multidimensional and multilayered continuum" (Ibid., p. 163). The ideology of NS/NNS dichotomy was challenged and J. Liu (Ibid.) concluded that a continuum was "a more objective and realistic configuration than a sharp NS/NNS dichotomy because it also implies a process in moving toward one side or the other" (p. 174).

There are also several Ph.D. dissertations focusing on how NNESTs struggled against the dominant ideologies such as native-speakerism in ELT and negotiated their professional identity in ESL/EFL contexts. Choi's (2007) research focused on the experiences of three non-native English-speaking university teaching assistants and their professional identity constructions as English teachers in an ESL context. Guided by the poststructuralist conceptualization of identity, the qualitative study explored the ways the three NNESTs understood themselves as English teachers, and negotiated the interplay between multiple, intersecting, and sometimes

contradictory discourses and their professional identity construction. The findings illustrated that, despite the shared NNEST identity, the three teachers' understanding of themselves as English teachers was different depending on their unique life histories, linguistic and cultural backgrounds, personality, and classroom contexts. Also, the findings indicated that while the discourse of NS supremacy did not function as a universal force in defining the lives and professional identities of the three participants, its power was still exerted subtly and silently, affecting the teachers' thoughts and belief systems.

Lu's (2005) study was about the NNS ESL teachers' construction, conceptualization, and interrogation of their own identities. Using narrative as a form of reflection, the author detailed his own professional journey and listened to the stories of the three participants' professional journeys. Through their language learning experiences, teaching experiences and life stories, the author tried to capture the experience of becoming and being an NNS ESL teacher in the United States from each individual teacher's perspective. The stories the author collected suggested that the process of becoming and being ESL teachers as NNSs in the US was a struggle because the issue of teacher identity for NNSs was both complex and challenging. Lu's inquiry offered a nuanced understanding of the struggles and challenges NNS ESL teachers might encounter in the US, and presented an in-depth look at how these teachers used their own cultures and language learning experiences to develop instructional and classroom management strategies that promoted success for ESL students in their classrooms, and how they used unique ways of teaching to establish their voices and transform their professional identities. Lu (Ibid.) concluded that becoming an ESL teacher with an NNS identity in the United States required more commitment, perseverance, and courage than what might be imagined.

Reis' (2010) dissertation examined the influences of the NS myth and how professional development could support NNESTs. The study focused on how second language teacher education could "empower NNESTs to strive for professional legitimacy while potentially reshaping their instruction in response to a more empowering conceptualization of self" (p. 4). The findings showed that a focus on NNEST-related issues provided useful resources to participants, who were teaching assistants in the ESL program of a large American university, as they challenged the NS myth. And the data analysis reflected evidence of the participants' emerging understanding of: (1) the NS/NNS dichotomy; (2) the NS myth; (3) their self-perceived identities; (4) their self-confidence as ESL teachers; (5) their perceived English skills/expertise; and (6) their perceptions of critical pedagogy.

Reis (2011) conducted another study, aiming to trace the development of an ESL writing teacher's professional identity and to explore how his beliefs and attitudes in regard to the ideology of native-speakerism were connected with his professional identity and instructional practices. The results showed that the participant went from being a blind believer in the NS myth to challenging it, and thereon to attempting to empower his students as expert speakers and users of the language. His beliefs and feelings toward the NS myth seemed ambiguous and incongruous:

at times he seemed to think of himself as an effective teacher; however, he also seemed to believe that he must make up for what he presumably lacked. In sum, his instructional practices reflected “a deep understanding of the NS myth and of its broader implications, as well as desire to empower his students to resist it” (Ibid., p. 154). These findings are consistent with those of Golombek and Jordan’s (2005) study, which also showed that though deeply influenced by the NS myth, the NNESTs were able to “appropriate and imagine new identities as legitimate speakers and teachers of English” (p. 523).

There are relatively few studies regarding NNESTs’ professional identity carried out in EFL contexts. One such study is Dogancay-Aktuna’s (2008) study carried out in Turkey, in which he asked 21 NNESTs about their professional identities and self-perceived skills. Nearly half of the participants rated their language competence in English as high (native or near-native) although some noted a need to improve their knowledge of idiomatic expressions and conversational English. In evaluating their status as NNESTs, half of the participants claimed to perceive prejudice against NESTs. However, 43% of the participants did not consider their NNS identity disadvantageous and their considerable professional training and familiarity with the local teaching context were seen as their advantages.

Choe (2005) explored four Korean EFL teachers’ beliefs about themselves, their strategies to position themselves, and their roles in ELT in Korea. The results showed that the ideology of NS model was deeply embedded in Korean ELT, and it had played a crucial role for the participants to negotiate their status as NNESTs. Their perceptions were dominated by the notion of English as a composite world language, which was accompanied by controversial issues such as cultural baggage, including instructional balance between the target culture and Korean culture; choice of educational target variety; and power relation between English and Korean. Their professional identity was also found within the notion of English as a composite world language. Since the NS model was the only yardstick of evaluation for teachers, they constructed negative self-images. On the other hand, TESOL training, target cultural experience, and experience as EFL learners helped them reconstruct their positive images as NNESTs. English as an international language (EIL), which is not related to any specific culture and nation, was suggested as an ideal solution to the problems that the NS model posed.

In conclusion, with narratives, surveys, or interviews as the main research methods, the studies reviewed have provided powerful insights into NNESTs’ minds. Most NNESTs suffered from the native-speakerism ideology and reported self-perceived prejudice based on ethnicity or NNS status, especially in a time when the trends in ELT methodology had changed from GT/ALM to CLT. In GT/ALM, NNESTs may find themselves in a more useful position since they are considered to be good at error suppression and correction and at preparing the students for examinations. In CLT, however, there is skepticism about the ability of NNESTs to be group process managers in leading the debriefing of activities and assisting groups in self-correction (Tang 1997). However, they identified some strengths of their own such as their considerable professional training, their familiarity with the

local teaching context and their experience as EFL learners (e.g., Choe 2005; Dogancay-Aktuna 2008). Their professional agencies and subjectivities helped them to (re)construct relatively positive images of themselves as English teachers.

2.5.2 A Poststructuralist View on NNESTs' Professional Identity

I understand that social identity is a cover term for “a range of social personae, including social statuses, roles, positions, relationships, and institutional and other relevant community identities one may attempt to claim or assign in the course of social life” (Ochs 1993, as cited in Menard-Warwick 2005, p. 254) and is constructed at the intersection of multiple identity markers such as race, gender, nationality, cultural background, age, linguistic ability, and social status (Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004). In this project, I will focus on CETs' professional identity: how they perceive and construct their English teacher identity within the dominant ideology and disempowering discourses of native-speakerism. To examine CETs' professional identity, I have incorporated the poststructuralist conceptualization of identity, specifically, Weedon's (1987, 1997) theorization of discursively constructed subjectivity, Norton/Norton Peirce's (1995, 1997, 2016) understanding of identity as multiple, a site of struggle and changing over time and Omoniyi's (2006) Hierarchy of Identities theory.

Weedon (1987, 1997) links language, individual experience and social power in a theory of subjectivity. She defines subjectivity as “the conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself, her ways of understanding her relation to the world” (Weedon 1987, p. 32). Furthermore, she places language in the central role in her analysis of the relationship between the individual and the society: “language is the place where actual and possible forms of social organization and their likely social and political consequences are defined and contested. Yet it is also the place where our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity, is constructed” (p. 21). Arguing that we should recognize the discursively constructed nature of subjectivity, she draws attention to the intricate relation between discourses and subjectivities. Borrowed from Foucault (1982), Pennycook (1994) defines discourses as “organizations of knowledge” which are always linked to “power, embedded in social institutions, and produce ways of understanding” (p. 127). Weedon (1997) argues that, in order for discourses to produce socially powerful effects, they need to govern “the emotional as well as the mental and psychic capacities of the individual” (p. 94), in other words, the modes of subjectivities. She further points out that individuals can intervene and resist the implications of dominant discourses that assign particular subject positions and limit the possibilities of other subjectivities. She claims that the lack of unity and consistency provides the discursive means for individual agents to resist and refuse to identify with the constraining subject positions offered and to create subjectivity

that better meets their interests. Working within a feminist poststructuralist tradition, Weedon's theory accords great human agency to the individual and gives prominence to the importance of language in constructing the relationship between the individual and the social (Norton 1997).

Consistent with Weedon (1987, 1997), Norton Peirce (1995) holds a post-structuralist view on identity. She foregrounds the role of language as "constitutive of and constituted by a language learner's social identity" (p. 13). It is through language that a person gains access to, or is denied access to, powerful social networks that give learners the opportunity to speak (Heller 1987). Criticizing SLA theorists for not having "developed a comprehensive theory of social identity that integrates the language learner and the language learning context" and not questioning "how relations of power in the social world affect social interaction between L2 learners and target language speakers" (p. 12), Norton Peirce (1995) constructed a theory of social identity from a poststructuralist perspective based on data she collected in her longitudinal case study of the language learning experiences of immigrant women in Canada. This theory assumes that "power relation plays a crucial role in social interactions between language learners and target language users" (p. 12). Using Weedon's (1987) conception of subjectivity, Norton Peirce (1995, pp. 15–16) equates social identity with subjectivity. Central to her theory are three defining characteristics of subjectivity: "the multiple nature of the subject; subjectivity as a site of struggle; and subjectivity as changing over time" (p. 15). First, different from the traditional conception of the individual, which presupposes that every person has an essential, unique, fixed and coherent core, poststructuralism depicts the individual as "diverse, contradictory, and dynamic; multiple rather than unitary, decentered rather than centered" (p. 15). Second, the conception of social identity as a site of struggle is an extension of the position that social identity is multiple and contradictory. Subjectivity is produced in a variety of social sites, all of which are structured by relations of power in which the person takes up different subject positions, such as teacher, mother, etc., some of which may be in conflict with others. In addition, the subject is not conceived of as passive but as "both subject of and subject to power within a particular site, community, and society: The subject has human agency" (p. 15). Put differently, although a person may be positioned in a particular way within a given discourse, the person might "resist the subject position or even set up a counterdiscourse which positions the person in a powerful rather than marginalized subject position" (p. 16). Third, poststructuralism highlights the changing quality of a person's social identity, which opens up "possibilities for educational intervention" (p. 16).

Also taking a poststructuralist stance on viewing identity, Omoniyi (2006) regarded identity as "dynamic, contested, and complex" (p. 11). In his theory of identity—Hierarchy of Identity (HoI), identity negotiation is construed not as an end in itself but as a tool in the service of hierarchization. An individual's various identity options are "co-present at all times but each of those options is allocated in a position on a hierarchy based on the degree of salience it claims in a moment of identification" (p. 19). His theory is supported by empirical evidence. In his

investigation of identity among inhabitants of Idiroko/Igolo (the borderland community between Nigeria and Benin) and Woodlands/Johor Bahru (the borderland community between Singapore and Malaysia), he has found that among the Yoruba and Malay who straddle these international boundaries, participants in interactions constantly hierarchized nationality, ethnicity, and other identities depending on their assessment of the context and the goals they sought to achieve (Omoniyi 2004). Van Dijk (1998) similarly notes that social members may share identities that are “more or less stable across personal contexts, and thus defining a personal self, but in concrete situations some of these identities may become more salient than others” (p. 30).

Omoniyi (2006) points out that one identity is not simply chosen from an array of possibilities over the others which are discarded; there is on the contrary a cluster of co-present identities but with varying degrees of salience. He further claims that in any identification context, all of the participants' co-present identity options are “hierarchized with great dynamism based on decisions of appropriateness in the moments of choosing between identity options in relation to evaluations of the state of affairs in terms of relationships and dispositions” (p. 20).

In conclusion, the three poststructuralists, Weedon (1987, 1997), Norton Peirce (1995), Norton (1997), and Omoniyi (2006), all agree that identity and identification are more complex conceptually than has been reflected in traditional sociolinguistic literature: Identity is multiple and multilayered. These theories, namely, Weedon (1987, 1997) theorization of discursively constructed subjectivity, Norton/Norton Peirce's (1995, 1997) understanding of identity as multiple, a site of struggle and changing over time and Omoniyi's (2006) HoI theory, serve as the theoretical underpinnings for my conceptualization of CETs' professional identity in this project.

2.6 Summary

In this chapter, I first presented the conceptual framework of this project with the discussion of the different theories of identity and the difficult definition of “(non-) native speakerhood.” Then I reviewed the relationship between language, ideology and power and pointed out that language was never purely neutral or merely linguistic, but political and ideological, indicating unequal power relations. Then studies on the features of and differences between NESTs and NNESTs were reviewed under two categories: NNESTs' self-perceptions and students' perceptions. The existing literature on NNESTs' professional identity was then reviewed to examine how NS norms influenced NNESTs' professional identity (re)construction and a poststructuralist view on NNESTs' professional identity was proposed.

References

- Amin, N. (1997). Race and identity of the nonnative ESL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 580–583.
- Amin, N. (2004). Nativism, the native speaker construct, and minority immigrant women teachers of English as a second language. In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals* (pp. 61–90). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Arva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System*, 28, 355–372.
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. In M. Featherstone (Ed.), *Global culture: Nationalism, globalization and modernity*. London: SAGE.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Barratt, L., & Kontra, E. H. (2000). Native-English-speaking teachers in cultures other than their own. *TESOL Journal*, 9(3), 19–23.
- Benke, E., & Medgyes, P. (2005). Differences in teaching behavior between native and non-native speaker teachers: As seen by the learners. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 195–215). New York: Springer.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Block, D. (2006). Identity in applied linguistics. In T. Omoniyi & G. White (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics of identity* (pp. 34–49). London: Continuum.
- Braine, G. (Ed.). (1999a). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Braine, G. (1999b). From the periphery to the center: One teacher's journal. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 15–27). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Braine, G. (1999c). Introduction. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 13–21). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Braine, G. (2005). A history of research on non-native speaker English teachers. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 13–24). New York: Springer.
- Braine, G. (2010). *Nonnative speaker English teachers: Research, pedagogy, and professional growth*. New York: Routledge.
- Bruthiaux, P. (2003). Squaring the circles: Issues in modeling English worldwide. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 159–178.
- Butler, Y. (2007). How are nonnative English teachers perceived by young learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 731–755.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999a). Interrogating the “native speaker fallacy”: Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77–92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999b). *Resisting linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). TESOL at forty: What are the issues? *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 9–32.
- Cheung, Y. L., & Braine, G. (2007). The attitudes of university students towards non-native speakers English teachers in Hong Kong. *RELC Journal*, 38, 258–277.
- Chew, G. P. (2009). *Emergent lingua franca and world orders: The politics and place of English as a world language*. New York: Routledge.
- Choe, H. (2005). *Negotiation of status of Korean nonnative-English-speaking teachers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Indiana.
- Choi, S. J. (2007). *The experiences of non-native English speaking teachers and their professional identity constructions in an ESL context*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Cook, V. (2005). Basing teaching on the L2 user. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 47–62). New York: Springer.
- Cook, V. (2016). Where is the native speaker now? *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(1), 186–189.
- Davies, A. (2006). The native speaker in applied linguistics. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 431–450). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (2008). Non-native English speaking TESOL teacher educators: A profile from Turkey. In S. Dogancay-Aktuna & J. Hardman (Eds.), *Global English teaching and teacher education: Praxis and possibility* (pp. 52–74). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Duff, P. A., & Uchida, Y. (1997). The negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities and practices in postsecondary EFL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 451–486.
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction*. London: Verso.
- Elliot, A. (1996). *Subject to ourselves: Social theory, psychoanalysis and postmodernity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Ellis, G. (1996). How culturally appropriate is the communicative approach? *ELT Journal*, 50, 213–218.
- Filippakou, O. (2011). The idea of quality in higher education: A conceptual approach. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 32, 15–28.
- Foucault, M. (1982). *The archaeology of knowledge, and the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Giles, H., & Johnson, P. (1981). The role of language in ethnic group formation. In J. C. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behavior* (pp. 199–243). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Giles, H., & Johnson, P. (1987). Ethnolinguistic identity theory: A social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 68, 69–99.
- Golombek, P., & Jordan, S. R. (2005). Becoming “black lamb” not “parrots”: A poststructuralist orientation to intelligibility and identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 513–533.
- Graddol, D. (1999). The decline of the native speaker. *AILA Review*, 13, 57–68.
- Heller, M. (1987). The role of language in the formation of ethnic identity. In J. E. Phinney & M. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization* (pp. 180–200). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holliday, A. (2006). Key concepts in ELT: Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, 60, 385–387.
- Holliday, A. (2009). The role of culture in English language teaching: Key challenges. *Language and International Communication*, 9, 144–155.
- House, J. (2003). English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7, 556–578.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hudson, R. A. (1986). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes*. London: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). Exploring attitudes towards English as a lingua franca in the East Asian context. In K. Murata & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Global Englishes in Asian contexts* (pp. 40–58). UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Johnson, D. M. (1992). *Approaches to research in second language learning*. New York: Longman.
- Kachru, B. B. (Ed.). (1982). *The other tongue*. Chicago: Illinois University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literature* (pp. 217–242). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1988). The sacred cows of English. *English Today*, 16(1), 3–8.

- Kachru, B. B. (1992). Teaching World Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed., pp. 355–366). Chicago: Illinois University Press.
- Kelch, K., & Santana-Williamson, E. (2002). ESL students' attitudes toward native- and nonnative-speaking instructors' accent. *The CATESOL Journal*, 14, 57–72.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kramsch, C. (1995). *The privilege of the non-native speaker*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Long Beach, CA.
- Layder, D. (1997). *Modern social theory: Key debates and new directions*. London: Routledge.
- Li, D. C. S. (2009). Towards “biliteracy and trilingualism” in Hong Kong (SAR): Problems, dilemmas, and stakeholders' view. *AILA Review*, 22, 72–84.
- Liu, J. (1999). From their own perspective: The impact of non-native ESL professionals on their students. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 159–176). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Liu, J. (2005). Chinese graduate teaching assistants teaching freshmen composition to native English-speaking students. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 155–177). New York: Springer.
- Llurda, E. (2004). Non-native-speaker teachers and English as an international language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14, 314–323.
- Llurda, E., & Huguet, A. (2003). Self-awareness in NNS EFL primary and secondary school teachers. *Language Awareness*, 12, 220–233.
- Lu, Y. H. (2005). *Stories of teacher identity: A narrative inquiry into East Asian ESL teachers' lives*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Maryland, Maryland.
- Ma, L. P. F. (2012). Advantages and disadvantages of native- and non-native-English-speaking teachers: Student perceptions in Hong Kong. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46, 280–300.
- Mahboob, A. (2003). Status of nonnative English-speaking teachers in the United States. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.
- Mathews, G. (2000). *Global culture/individual identity: Searching for a home in the cultural supermarket*. London: Routledge.
- McLellan, D. (1986). *Ideology*. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, 46, 340–349.
- Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. London: MacMillan.
- Menard-Warwick, J. (2005). Both a fiction and existential fact: Theorizing identity in second language acquisition and literacy studies. *Linguistics and Education*, 16, 253–274.
- Modiano, M. (1999). International English in the global village. *English Today*, 15(2), 22–34.
- Modiano, M. (2001). Ideology and the ELT practitioner. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 159–173.
- Modiano, M. (2005). Cultural studies, foreign language teaching and learning practices, and the NNS practitioner. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 25–43). New York: Springer.
- Moussu, L., & Llurda, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching*, 4, 315–340.
- Murata, K., & Jenkins, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Global Englishes in Asian contexts*. UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 409–429.
- Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 9–31.
- Norton, B. (2016). Identity and language learning: Back to the future. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50, 475–479.
- Ochs, E. (1993). Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26, 287–306.
- Omoniyi, T. (2004). *The sociolinguistics of borderlands: Two Nations, one Community*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

- Omoniyi, T. (2006). Hierarchy of identities. In T. Omoniyi & G. White (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics of identity* (pp. 11–33). London: Continuum.
- Papastergiadis, N. (2000). *The turbulence of migration*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Negotiation of identities in multilingual settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 589–617.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pennycook, A. (2009). Plurilithic Englishes: Towards a 3D model. In K. Murata & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Global Englishes in Asian contexts* (pp. 194–207). UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Phillipson, R. (1988). Linguicism: Structures and ideologies in linguistics imperialism. In J. Cummins & T. Skuttnab-Kangas (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 339–358). Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Plakan, B. (1997). Undergraduates' experiences with and attitudes toward international teaching assistants. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 95–119.
- Rajagopalan, K. (1997). Linguistics and the myth of nativity: Comments on the controversy over "new/non-native" Englishes. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 27, 225–231.
- Rajagopalan, K. (2004). The concept of "world English" and its implication for ELT. *ELT Journal*, 58, 111–117.
- Rampton, M. B. H. (1990). Displacing the 'native speaker': Expertise, affiliation and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, 44, 97–101.
- Reis, D. S. (2010). *Non-native English-speaking teacher and professional legitimacy: A sociocultural theoretical perspective in identity realization*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Pennsylvania state University, Pennsylvania.
- Reis, D. S. (2011). Non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) and professional legitimacy: A sociocultural theoretical perspective on identity transformation. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 208, 139–160.
- Reves, T., & Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teachers' self-image: An international survey. *System*, 22, 353–367.
- Rubdy, R., & Saraceni, M. (2006a). Introduction. In R. Rubdy, & M. Saracani (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 5–16). London: Continuum.
- Rubdy, R., & Saraceni, M. (Eds.). (2006b). *English in the world: Global rules, global roles*. London: Continuum F.
- Samimy, M. (1997). A review on "The non-native teacher". *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 815–817.
- Samimy, M., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). To be a native or non-native speaker: Perception of 'non-native' students in a graduate TESOL program. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 127–144). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Saxena, M. (2009). Construction & deconstruction of linguistic otherness: Conflicts & cooperative code-switching in (English/) bilingual classrooms. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 8, 167–187.
- Seidhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 133–158.
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information*, 13, 65–93.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). Social stereotypes and social groups. In J. C. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behavior* (pp. 144–167). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Tang, C. (1997). On the power and status of non-native ESL teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 577–580.
- Van Dijk, T. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London: SAGE.
- Van Gennep, A. (1960). *The rites of passage*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Joshson, B., & Jonhson, K. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 4, 21–44.
- Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory* (2nd ed.). New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Native and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers in
China

Perceptions and Practices

Huang, Z.

2018, XV, 192 p. 1 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-981-10-5283-5