

5-2021

## TEACHER-TEACHER? OR NATIVE SPEAKER?

Sixta Payan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd>



Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Payan, Sixta, "TEACHER-TEACHER? OR NATIVE SPEAKER?" (2021). *Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations*. 1181.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd/1181>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of Graduate Studies at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@csusb.edu](mailto:scholarworks@csusb.edu).

TEACHER-TEACHER? OR NATIVE SPEAKER?

---

A Thesis  
Presented to the  
Faculty of  
California State University,  
San Bernardino

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts  
in  
English Composition

---

by  
Sixta Tulia Payan  
May 2021

TEACHER-TEACHER? OR NATIVE SPEAKER?

---

A Thesis  
Presented to the  
Faculty of  
California State University,  
San Bernardino

---

by  
Sixta Tulia Payan

May 2021

Approved by:

Caroline Vickers, Committee Chair, English

Parastou Feizzaringhalam, Committee Member

© 2021 Sixta Tulia Payan

## ABSTRACT

Despite research on the native speakerism ideology aiming to resolve/dissolve ideological issues within the ELT community, the NEST/NNEST dichotomy continues to favor some groups above others and so the effects of the ideology continue to persist (Holliday, 2014; Selvi, 2016; Lowe and Kiczkowiak, 2016; Mahboob and Golden, 2013). The issue is that, while awareness of the native speakerism ideology exists at the research level, the subtle nuances and effects of the ideology are not as noticed at the local level (teacher to teacher), particularly among NNESTs. Therefore, this research seeks to expose how the ideology has permeated the local NNEST community of practice, by looking at how it is enacted in a NNEST community in Colombia via qualitative, semi-structured interviews with teachers regarding the NEST/NNEST dichotomy. The interviews were examined through Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Andrews' (2003) definition of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) in order to highlight the subtle linguistic choices used to navigate this conversation. Findings revealed that NNESTs qualify each other according to varied levels of both pedagogical knowledge and the academic status of language expertise, years of experience, time and/or schooling abroad, accent reduction, and cultural assimilation in native English speaking countries (Gonzalez and Llurda, 2016). This points to a Sub-Native-Speakerism Ideology developed by NNESTs to obtain higher statuses in their local/non-local ELT communities. This focus on local NNEST communities, where this status-based gatekeeping is most

apparent, has been missing in previous research, but has significant implications for the direction the Native Speakerism Ideology is taking.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would not have been able to finish this thesis without my Colombian family cheering me up from the distance, the Payan family supporting me through the decade that took me to get here, my friend Chere Smith accompanying me throughout the process, and Belen Rodriguez giving me the final push to complete this work. Dr. Vickers, your faith and support was a great resource as well. To my dear daughter Emma, whose life started as I joined the master program and whose unconditional love and beautiful smile was an inspiration and motivation to reach for my dream. Thank you for sharing mommy's journey

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
CHAPTER ONE: TEACHER-TEACHER? OR NATIVE SPEAKER?.....	1
Methodology .....	14
Setting.....	15
Participants .....	16
Data Analysis .....	17
Findings .....	21
Analysis .....	23
Section 1: NEST/NNESTs' Identity Construction.....	24
Section 2: NEST/ NNEST Status in Novice/Expert English Language User .....	43
Conclusion and Implications.....	50
APPENDIX A: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER, SPRING 2019.....	54
APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT FORMS .....	56
APPENDIX C: DU BOIS (2006) TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTION .....	59
REFERENCES.....	61

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Semi-Structured Interviews Log .....	16
Table 2. Academia-Micro Analysis .....	23
Table 3. Professional Status – Macro Analysis .....	23

## CHAPTER ONE TEACHER-TEACHER? OR NATIVE SPEAKER?

Although we, both “Native English Speaker Teachers” (NESTs) and “Non-Native English Speaker Teachers” (NNESTs), are aware of the native speakerism ideology and the dichotomy that it places between the two groups, and although much research has been done in order to resolve the issues such an ideology causes, because we still have so much to talk about, it is clear that the effects of the ideology continue to persist. At the research level, we understand what the native speakerism ideology is and the impact it can have on the English Language Teaching (ELT) community (Holliday, 2014; Philipson as cited in Garton et al, 2016); however, at the local level of our education systems (teacher to teacher), the ideology can be and often still is enacted imperceptibly because of the invisibility of our own ingrained expectations for how an ELT should sound and look (Appleby, 2016; Copland et al, 2019; Garcia-Ponce et al., 2017). As a result, ELTs in a “non-native,” local educational community have the potential to perpetuate the ideology among themselves because of the tendency to compare each other’s language proficiency to an ideal native speaker, whether there is a native speaker present or not. As a NNEST member of the ELT community, myself, I am weary of the dichotomy – the ideology within which the NNEST and NEST groups are seen as competing against each other, whether in terms of status, knowledge, and hiring opportunities, while feeling this pressure more from fellow NNESTs than from NESTs.

Therefore, my research is focused on the local NNEST ELT community in Colombia for two reasons: 1) In the last decade, Colombia (specifically the capital, Bogotá) has experienced a boom in ESL instruction with the goal of being bilingual by 2020 (Gonzalez and Llurda, 2016). 2) Much of the research done on native speakerism ideology and its effects has been centered on Asian and Middle Eastern countries with little attention on Latin American countries. This last reason is important because although Latin America is experiencing the same issues as Asia and the Middle East, the global institution of education does not seem to be as politically and financially invested in Latin American countries. As a result, the research does not seem to grapple with the effect the ideology is having on those local Latin American ELT communities or what those effects mean to the ELT community as a whole.

My goal for this project, therefore, is to question how we in our local NNEST communities are or are not perpetuating the ideology by asking how do NNESTs discuss the notion of 'native' and 'non-native' speakers? And does the awareness of the native-speakerism ideology behind this topic influence how NNESTs perceive each other in terms of teaching/language status in the ELT community? Like many ELT researchers in the field have said (Holliday, 2014, Kamhi-Stein, 2016, Moussu and Llurda, 2008, Cook, 1999, 2013, Aneja, 2016), while I do not like the labels we place on each other, I am aware that I must use them to discuss the following research. With that in mind, let me begin by briefly setting up the terminology and background of this topic.

Debate surrounding first and second language users as language teachers has been part of many discussions in the field of TESOL (Reyes & Medgyes, 1994, Samimy, & Brutt-Griffler, 1999, Pavlenko, 2003, Brain, 2005, Appleby, 2016, Holliday, 2014, Selvi 2010, Mahboob and Golden 2013, Aneja 2016, Lowe and Kiczkowiak 2016). In this dichotomy, L1 users are sometimes favored because they know the ins and outs of the language and culture, while L2 users may struggle to be recognized as equally competent to their L1 counterparts. The preference for L1 users has been coined as the “native speakerism” ideology (Holliday, 2005), where the assumption regarding “native speakers” is that they are “the best model and teachers of English because they represent a ‘Western culture’ from which springs the ideals both of English and of the methodology for teaching it” (Holliday, 2014, p. 1). Holliday (2014) has advocated that this ideology, however, others and stigmatizes L2s as their abilities to teach English is marked deficiently because of the disbelief they can teach the language within a western perspective.

Part of the issue with the negative association attached to L2 users comes from labeling them as non-native speakers. Under the native-speakerism ideology, second language English teachers are described as Non-Native English Speaker Teachers (NNEST), and are, as such, marked as “different” professionally from Native English Speaker Teachers (NEST). Such difference is marked by a so-called “lack of target language linguistic competence” (Medgyes, 2001) when compared to the idealized Native Speaker (NS) as a first language

English teacher or not. This differentiation is in part what contributes to many second language ELTs' belief that they are not as fully competent in the language as a first language English user or teacher because they are relegated to being non-native speakers (NNS) first and language teachers second (Reis, 2010; Selvi, 2016; Holliday, 2014; Lowe and Kiczkowiak, 2016)). The native-speakerism ideology, and the native speaker fallacy (Philipson, 1992) lowers second language ELTs' self-esteem and leads them to be conflicted between their multiple "non-native language" identities as L2 users, L2 learners and L2 teachers (Ortaçtepe, 2015). NNESTs' multiple identities have led to an issue of legitimacy in their professional field. The NS ideology has disempowered NNESTs to the extent that their qualifications are usually questioned by the community ranging from the institution they work for, or intend to work for, to their colleagues and students (Reis, 2010). Therefore, NNESTs' marked differentiation and somewhat illegitimate professional position can be problematic as NNESTs constitute the larger group of English Language Teaching positions (Braine, 2010; Reis, 2010; Selvi, 2016).

This stigmatization towards the NNEST group and the surpassing number of NNESTs in the ELT field has given way to the NNESTs movement (Kamhi-Stein, 2016; Selvi, 2016). The NNEST movement has its beginnings in the 1996 TESOL international convention (in Chicago, Illinois, United States), and it was designed to increase their professional status (Kamhi-Stein, 2016). However, Kamhi-Stein states that while many efforts have been made to accommodate the

initiatives set up in the 1996 TESOL convention, the NNEST movement has not succeeded in dismantling the “non-discriminatory professional environment for all TESOL members regardless of native language and place of birth” (p.186), which is the first goal. In fact, Nigar and Kostogriz (2019) assert that discriminatory hiring and workplace practices for NNESTs remain present even in a much more globalized teaching environment.

Even though the term “native speaker” has been a prohibited criterion to be used upon hiring by TESOL and BAAL, the native-speakerism ideology is still embedded in the practice (Holliday, 2014). Since the NNEST movement started, TESOL has released several anti-discriminatory statements and initiatives such as the 1992 “Statement of nonnative speakers of English and hiring practices,” the 2006 and the 2016 “Position statement against discrimination of nonnative speakers of English in the field of TESOL” (Selvi, 2010, Garcia-Ponce, 2017). Nevertheless, despite the well-intended statements and initiatives across the different academic communities such as TESOL, BAAL, CATESOL among others, Kamhi-Stein (2016) states that publications “opposing discriminatory hiring practices” to educate employers, have had a minimal impact (p.187). The variety of statements confirms that discriminatory practice is in effect especially in areas where the research discussion around the NNEST movement is a distant one (Selvi, 2010, Garcia-Ponce et al., 2017).

The discriminatory practice in the ELT field has been documented through the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Mahboob et al. (2004)’s research in the US

showed that the NEST criterion played an important factor in the hiring decision. Clark and Paran (2007), a replication of Mahboob et al. (2004)'s research in the U.K., found a similar impact. Clark and Paran (2007) state that the NEST was a such a significant criterion for employers in the U.K. that they "make hiring decisions based on it" (p.422). The results also showed that NNESTs would have less probability to be hired by the same employers. Additionally, two other studies looked at job advertisements and how, in their context, "nativeness" plays a role in hiring practices. Selvi (2010) investigated the extent of the native speaker fallacy in job advertisements and found that the discrimination does not only exist, but it is multifaceted in nature. In other words, the language proficiency in comparison to "nativeness" is just one type of discriminatory practice. There were more layers to the discriminatory qualifications that had to do with country of origin or residence and country of academic/professional training, and English variety. Yet, Selvi's analysis "showed that discriminatory qualifications were mostly found in EFL settings" (p.166). Similarly, Mahboob and Golden (2013) investigated how job advertisement for ELT positions discriminate against applicants according to their backgrounds. In their study of ELT job advertisements from East Asia and the Middle East, Mahboob and Golden found that there were seven factors to be key requirements for applicants. Some of the seven factors describe "biographical" features such as age, gender, nationality, race, and "nativeness." This last one was found to be "the single most frequent criterion mentioned in the advertisements across the two regions" (p.73).

Mahboob and Golden conclude that the issue with discriminatory practices in the ELT field occurs at the actual employment level in East Asia and the Middle East. They suggest that part of the issue has to do with the definition of NNEST, and the distinction given to the ‘native and non-native speakers,’ which has been repeatedly emphasized by research on NS ideology (Holliday, 2014; Aneja, 2016, Copland et al. 2019). Therefore, Mahboob and Golden recommend thinking about the value of ELTs in terms of not “nativeness,” or origin of country and race, but rather qualifications and experience (Reis, 2010).

Nevertheless, the notion of NS and NEST as “better teachers” has permeated the minds of the entire ELT field under the essentialism stereotypes of the native-speakerism ideology (Lowe and Kiczkowiak, 2016). For instance, Wang (2012) has discussed how despite the great efforts to see the teaching and learning of English, not from the norm of the ‘native speaker,’ but from the concept of world Englishes (WE), NNESTs in Asian countries still regard NESTs as the ones capable of teaching “authentic” and “beautiful” English, at least, phonologically (p. 57) (Gonzalez and Llurda, 2016). This type of thinking and preference reinforces the native-speakerism ideology where the “native speaker” becomes the model to teach the language and the target for language learners’ imitation. Furthermore, because this notion is so embedded in the collective minds of the ELT field, it has also become embedded in the practice of the ELT community, wherein all members recognize the NS as the ideal. Whether they

agree or not, the community of practice implements the standard as the benchmark for status.

The community of practice, here, refers to the theoretical framework that our learning is social, and it is a product of our interaction within a community (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 2015). Lave and Wenger (1991) uses the term legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) to refer to the social practice between newcomers and old-timers and their engagement in learning. LPP is often seen as the entrance for newcomers to observe and understand the practice. It is through LPP that a newcomer can “gradually works his/her way towards full **participation** in the community” (Wang, 2011). Respectively, Lave and Wenger (1997) claim that “to become a full member of a community of practice requires access to a wide range of ongoing activity, old-timers, and other members of the community; and to information, resources, and opportunities of participation” (p. 101). Nevertheless, they point out that no one really gets to be part of a community of practice until the members of that community give the newcomers full participation.

Parting from Lave and Wenger (1991)’s concept of community of practice, then, the ideological concern with native speakerism partly emerges through social interaction and hiring practices within the community of practice. In other words, newcomers (NNESTs) cannot simply learn to place themselves beneath others (NS and NESTs) if old-timers (experienced teachers and administrators) of the established community do not accept and reinforce the movement from

periphery to center, but rather maintain the native speakerism ideology that prevents movement. As a result, NNESTs feel a constant need and even requirement to prove themselves to the old-timers instead of taking opportunities to progress in the practice. In the ELT CoP globally, NS and NEST are granted access and more participation because their language knowledge, language experience and/or country of origin guarantee that they represent the ideal teacher of English, thus they come with better instructions and less concern over whether language knowledge will equal language use. This is the fallacy of the CoP because it simultaneously lessens NNESTs' participation as legitimate participators and forces them into a somewhat peripheral position keeping them marked as perpetual apprentices of the language (Braine, 2010; Selvi, 2016).

Because this peripheral position has increased the effects of the NS/NNS dichotomy in the classroom, and in an effort to create a somewhat equal value between the NEST and NNEST participants in the ELT CoP, Asian communities in recent years have used programs like the JET (Japan exchange and Teaching Program), EPIK (English Program in Korea), NET Scheme (Native-speaking English Teacher Scheme) in Hong Kong, and FETRP (Foreign English Teacher Recruitment Program) in Taiwan, to integrate the two often separate teacher groups, to collaborate in ELT settings. The belief is that NESTs' and NNESTs' collaboration might contribute to the education system significantly (Wang, 2103; Gardner, 2006). However, team teaching has not fully been successful as NESTs are considered a "threat" by NNESTs partly because NNESTs feel uneasy about

their English competence, a thought embedded in the NNESTs' practice through many years of the NS- ideology (Holliday, 2014; Wang, 2013). Yet, Wang (2013)'s research on pre-service NNESTs' attitudes towards team teaching in Taiwan shows NNESTs' "uneasiness" has to do also with the NEST- hiring policy which NNEST participants describe as "unfair" because qualifications and prerequisites for NESTs are not equal to the NNESTs (Kirkprattick as cited in Garton et al., 2016, Copland et al., 2019; Gonzalez and Llurda, 2016)). Additionally, team teaching can signal to the NNEST that a NEST is still necessary for quality instruction in the classroom.

Therefore, the community of practice itself seems to continue to share the view of the idealized NS as the norm for any newcomer to begin and continue their participation within the field. However, while the idealized NS is the standard and goal of the community when hiring both NESTs and NNESTs, as newcomers NNESTs are still viewed as less than their NS counterparts, or the ones that are able to simulate and imitate such ideal (Wang, 2013). Braine (2010) actually argues that the tension and dichotomy of NS/NNS, unfortunately, will always exist because NNS is simply seen as replicating the language as an approximation to their counterparts, the NS.

Consequently, the discriminatory hiring practices spread worldwide have shown to NNESTs that they are more likely to remain in the position of legitimate peripheral participation as they enter the ELT field. The fact that they have a degree and experience as both speaker and teacher seems not to equate to

“mastery” of the language compared to the NS or NEST, suggesting that it takes more than having a degree to prove that NNESTs should have full and equal access to a membership in the ELT CoP (Gonzalez and Llurda, 2016; Selvi, 2016). This can be seen with the regulation practices that are implemented by hiring agencies such as equivalency exams, verification of degrees, and sometimes re-education in the field. In fact, Nigar and Kostogriz (2019) explain that in order to be eligible for hire, NNEST “qualifications need to be obtained in the countries where English is spoken as the first language because these countries alone are the providers of equivalent courses” (p. 5). Nigar and Kostogriz (2019) argue that these requirements to pass standardized exams and complete education courses in native speaking countries act as gatekeepers for the ELT institution and thereby the CoP. Because NNESTs are constantly being tested and re-educated (Gonzalez and Llurda, 2016), their status as apprentice in the profession remains firm as their knowledge and experience is placed second to that of a NEST.

Typically, then, NNESTs continue to be apprentices in the ELT CoP because of the belief of lack of language proficiency compared to NSs or NESTs, an ideology that reinforces ‘nativeness,’ and the perception of the NS as the ideal teacher of English. NNESTs become, as a result, legitimate peripheral members who participate to a lesser degree, and thus struggle to move into the status of expertise because NESTs hold a higher knowledge status based on their ‘nativeness’ or country of origin (Selvi, 2106). Pavlenko (2003) argues that this

NS/NNS dichotomy carries a problem for newcomers to the profession because it implies a type of marginalization to those in the periphery who struggle to sound more like a NS.

However, while struggling at the periphery against this marginalization (Reis, 2010; Selvi, 2016), local ELT communities of predominantly NNESTs have created a system of status obtained whereby they can assess various levels of NNESTness amongst each other. This in itself perpetuates the marginalization as they gatekeep each other. Many researchers have missed these particular gatekeeping strategies in their quest to solve the NS/NNS dichotomy issue, perhaps because this practice among NNESTs is subtle and often not discussed openly because while they “may be acutely aware of conditions they find problematic or oppressive in professional and personal domains, they may not so easily perceive the ways in which they may benefit from broader structural patterns that organise individuals into professional and institutional hierarchies and favour particular groups or identities of teachers” (Appleby, 2016, p. 764). What we get, then, is a type of sub native speakerism ideology where, since NNESTs know that they cannot overcome the NS/NNS dichotomy (the specific condition they find problematic), they create categories of speakers that come as close as possible to the NS ideal. These categories are based on years of experience, time abroad, schooling abroad, accent reduction, and cultural assimilation in countries where English is the national language (Gonzalez and Llurda, 2016). However, these categories are obtained through a certain privilege

that some NNESTs have while others lack. The privilege obtained through the NNESTs' categories among themselves are often ignored in the research of the NS/NNS dichotomy, which could explain the different levels of peripheral participation of NNESTs worldwide. When it comes to research and being able to see this trend among NNESTs, Appleby (2016) gives a clue as to why these privileges remain largely undiscussed by stating that privilege can be invisible for participants and researchers, so that the participants, then, may not notice the ways in which their privilege and access to those created categories (as mentioned above) may benefit them and place them into positions that are favored by professional and institutional organizations, although they do notice when they lack those privileges (Appleby, 2016; Selvi, 2106). Furthermore, because of the invisibility of these categories to the participants when discussing the dichotomy, researchers tend to miss the hierarchal strata of the NNEST community when responding to the NS/NNS dichotomy. However, such hierarchies carry a powerful movement for NNESTs in their degree of peripheral participation. Depending on a NNEST's accumulation of years' experience in these categories, some NNESTs can approach the line between apprenticeship and mastery while others cannot. But this can only be assessed by NNESTs.

Therefore, with this research I was interested in understanding how the native-speakerism ideology permeates the construction of expert-novice relations in a local NNEST ELT community of practice in Colombia, and how the native-speakerism ideology is enacted during ELT's semi-structured interviews about

their views regarding NEST versus NNEST, and their role in the assessment of ELTs' competency within the English teaching community, whether NEST or NNEST.

### Methodology

The data was gathered through one-on-one semi-structured 20 to 30-minute interviews (thirteen questions) via recordings between April 29<sup>th</sup> and May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2019 at the centers' library or the teachers' lounge. The questions were structured into three parts: 1) questions about the participants' background, ELT training, career, and experience; 2) questions about the native-speakerism ideology where the words "native" and "non-native" speakers and teachers NEST/NNEST dichotomy were included; and 3) questions about changes for the ELT community. This structure allowed me to first set up a comfortable conversation for participants, second ask directly about the native speakerism ideology and any influences in their practice, and lastly to see if participants, after discussing the NEST/NNEST dichotomy, would bring the dichotomy back into the discussion on their own as something they would like to change. I chose to use semi-structured interviews over observation because as the interviewer, I could have access to crucial information about a specific topic that could not have been extracted by direct observation (Litosseliti, 2010). Through semi-structured interviews, I was able to unhide participants' opinions about the native-speakerism ideology. Since ideologies are "primarily located in the 'unsaid'"

(Fairclough, 2013 p. 27), I wanted to extract how the native-speakerism ideology emerged even when the participants were directly discussing the ideology.

### Setting

The International English Language Center (IELC) is one of the largest institutions of English Language teaching established in Colombia since 1942. IELC calls itself a binational center and has established cultural and academic relationships between Colombia and the United States. IELC is well recognized among the ELT community in Colombia and South America, and it is praised as a community school. IELC values teaching over language usage experience and emphasizes teachers' professional development institutionally and individually (Richards and Farrels, 2005). At the institutional level, IELC provides academic and formative conditions for all new hire and old-timer teachers, who are trained with the center's methodologies and are kept current in ELT pedagogies. At the individual level, precisely because of the emphasis from the institution, teachers are current with the ELT practice, knowledge and teaching awareness (students, pedagogical, curriculum knowledge). ELTs are required to be active researchers that take place during the Teacher Development and Training Sessions (TDTS) that occur three to four times a year. It is not easy to become an ELT for IELC compared to other institutions primarily because IELC requires a C1/C2 proficiency level, which marks NNESTs at mastery level proficiency. This is in addition to common university level requirements for teaching language.

## Participants

There were ten teachers who were interviewed, five women, whose pseudonyms are Gigi, DC, Thy, Fanny, and Mac, and five men, Tomas, MV, Dougie, BD, and Sensei. Nine of the participants were between the ages of 26 to 33 years old, except for Sensei who was 59 years old at the time of the interview and had six more years of work before retiring. Half of the participants had been to an English-speaking country in past years, and three of them had had experience teaching English or Spanish as a second language abroad. One of the participants, Sensei, lived his childhood in Southern California and graduated from high school there before moving back to Colombia. More than 70 % of the participants had 5 to 10 years of experience teaching, except for BD who was the newest, with 3 years of experience, and Sensei, who had 40 years. More than 50 % of the teachers' experience had come from teaching at IELC, and some of the teachers had only worked at IELC. This is the case of Sensei, DC, Dougie and BD.

Table 1. Semi-Structured Interviews Log

<b>Location</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Participant</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Years of experience as an ELF teacher</b>	<b>Years working at Colombo</b>	<b>Travel abroad</b>	<b>Degrees</b>	<b>Job position</b>
1. Library	4/30/19	2:15 pm	Tomas		Not logged on recording	Not logged on recording	No	*B.A. ELT	Library manager
2. Library	4/30/19	2:41 pm	Gigi	26	6	3 ktp	Didn't specify	*B.A. ELT Graduated 04/19	Didn't specify ATP?

3. Teacher lounge	4/30/19	3 15 pm	DC	33	10	10	Yes	*B.A. ELT M.A.?	ATP? Teacher trainer
4. Teacher lounge	5/1/19	5 :40 pm	MV	39	10	8	Yes?		
5. Teacher lounge	5/1/19	4:47 pm	Thy	32	9	3 1/5	No	Journalist *B.A. ELT	ATP
6. Teacher lounge	5/2/19	12:10 pm	Dougie	28	5	4 3ktp 1 and 5 moths aep	Yes		
7. Teacher lounge	5/2/19	4:10 pm	Sensei		40	40	Yes		
8. Teacher Lounge	5/6/19	2 :10 pm	Fanny	31	8	7	Yes, Chicago. 2 ½. Taught Spanish	BA MA (EDU :cognition & Emotion )	ATP
9. Teacher Lounge	5/6/19	4:09 pm	Mac	31	10	7			
10. Teacher lounge	5/6/19	2:45	BD	28	Almost 3 years	3 1. 3 months	No	*B.A. ELT	ATP

### Data Analysis

All semi-structured interview recordings were transcribed following Du Bois's (2005) "Discourse Transcription" (DT) conventions and examined through the lens of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). This theoretical framework sees language as a "social practice," that together with discourse shapes our social structures while simultaneously shaping language and discourse. Additionally,

language is seen as ideological, thus it plays a role in normalizing and reproducing social inequalities (Lin, 2014). Hence, CDA specifically aims to examine language and discourse to tackle social problems regarding power abuse (Strauss and Feiz, 2014; Lin, 2014). Therefore, CDA's analytical framework conveys the purpose of this research as it aims to examine the language used when discussing the native speakerism ideology and dismantle how the ideology has created a social power hierarchy among the NNEST ELT CoP.

In order to carry out the analytical framework of CDA, researchers examine both micro and macro levels of discourse (Straus and Feiz, 2014). At the micro-level analysis, language is scrutinized for any "patterned linguistic features" such as lexical choices (adverbs, verbs, adjectives etc.), rhetorical choices, figurative language, and any linguistic elements that display stance-taking (Straus and Feiz, 2014; Lin, 2014). At the macro level analysis, CDA examines the interdiscursive nature of such linguistic choices and the social structures surrounding the discourse (van Dijk, 1993). Thus, CDA's interest is in understanding "how language works within institutional and political discourses (e.g. in education, organisations, [*sic*] media, government)" (Baxter 2010, p.11). van Dijk explains that researchers examine the lexical choices and rhetorical strategies at the micro level, and at the macro level the structures of society, and categories such as gender, ethnicity, political orientation etc. Additionally, Fairclough (2013) explains that there are three properties of CDA: relational,

dialectal, and transdisciplinary. Fairclough states that "we cannot answer the question 'what is discourse' except in terms of both its 'internal' relations and its 'external' relations with such other 'objects'.... we can only arrive at an understanding of it by analyzing sets of relations. Having said that, we can say what it is in particular that discourse brings into the complex relations which constitute social life: meaning, and making meaning" (p. 3). What Fairclough is saying is important within the context of this study because ELTs may know about the native-speakerism ideology, understand it, and even speak about it, but the way they interact during the semi-structured interviews, overtly speaking about the ideology, continues to socially reconstruct and perpetuate the ideology (Holliday, 2014). This is because at the micro-level expression, our language choices are less "automatized, less consciously controlled, or not variable at all" (van Dijk, 1993, p. 261), which in turn allows for the analysis of such language choices that display how an ideology, the native-speakerism ideology, has become a dominant and normalized foundation among the ELT community of practice.

Therefore, using Fairclough's perspective of CDA to approach this study allows for the analysis of how NNESTs, perhaps without even knowing it, dialectally and relationally create this discourse within their own discipline (Holliday, 2014). Fairclough mentions that "we cannot transform the world in any old way we happen to construe it; the world is such that some transformations are possible, and others are not. So CDA is a 'moderate' or 'contingent' form of

social constructivism" (p. 5). Since this research is looking to understand how NNESTs work within discursive models of native-speakerism ideology in practice, CDA and specifically Fairclough's take on CDA has helped shed light on the findings of this study.

In order to do the macro level analysis, I began by using CDA as a means of defining language and context through a micro level analysis. In order to do the micro level analysis, I looked at specific linguistic patterns that occurred during the interviews and the use of lexical and rhetorical choices surrounding the NS/NNS dichotomy. After completing the micro level analysis, I began to distinguish, through a macro level analysis, the social structures generated by said choices regarding terminology.

The first step resulted in the identification of four categories of definition.

1. De-construction of the "native" speaker
2. Conceptualization of "native" speaker
3. Societal construct of "native" speaker
4. Stigmatization and/or discrimination towards "non-native" speakers

Each category was read again in order to find the micro level word choices which "[reveal] much about who we are, how we feel about things, what we think about things, how strongly things matter to us" (Strauss & Feiz, 2013, p. 17). The second part of the analysis consisted of noting the language used around the terms NEST and NNEST under each category, which served to pattern social structures within the dichotomy within the local NNEST community.

Simultaneously, the words were codified using ATLAS.ti software. The codes were based on Andrews' (2003) definition of Teacher Language Awareness (TLA), a concept where he emphasizes the intrinsic link between "knowledge about language (subject-matter knowledge) and knowledge of language (language proficiency)" (p. 81). TLA categories allowed me to classify the way teacher participants spoke about their identity in the ELT community and that of native speakers.

### Findings

One of the main issues when NNESTs encounter NS teachers is that many receive the title of qualified teachers just because they are English experienced as it is their first language (Kamhi-Stein, 2016; Mahboob and Golden, 2013, Selvi, 2010, Ali, 2009; Wang, 2013). Karimi (2011) conceptualized the type of NS teachers, in this paper, as non-licensed-in-English language teachers (NLELTs). These teachers may have entered the ELT field unconventionally without majoring in any English-related disciplines, and they "rely principally on their subject matter knowledge" (Aguirre-Garzón and Catañeda-Peña, 2017 p. 79; Karimi, 2011). This is of course a big issue for the NNEST community because not only have they felt marginalized because they would never reach the proficiency of the 'ideal native speaker' (Kamhi-Stein, 2016), but now the only thing that NNESTs can justify and prove that they are capable of, teaching English as a foreign language because they have acquired

a degree, is undermined when nonteachers (NLELTs), but first language users, get preferences in jobs (Mahboob and Golden, 2013; Holliday, 2014).

Based on this trend, when I formulated the questions and even when I started to do the entire research, I was expecting NNEST participants to speak more about their language proficiency, and this to be a key factor in determining their status as ELTs (Lowe and Kiczkowiak, 2016). I expected NNESTs would hesitantly describe their language ability as *not as “good” as NESTs* as this is part of the essentialist stereotypes of the native-speakerism ideology (Holliday, 2014; Lowe and Kiczkowiak, 2016). I had imagined that the overt discussion on the dichotomy would bring up NNESTs’ self-perception of their own language proficiency negatively and a discussion of hiring NESTs over NNESTs would bring up an issue against NNESTs’ marginalization (Kamhi-Stein, 2016; Holliday, 2014). Additionally, I had expected NNESTs would mention their pedagogical training as an important factor in the dichotomy comparison where NNESTs’ pedagogical knowledge would be equal compared to any NEST.

Out of these expectations, while the participants shared their concerns about the hiring practices and the marginalization that occurs to some NNESTs, the language proficiency was not the focus of the dichotomy discussion; in fact, training and pedagogy were the participants’ major concerns (Wang, 2013). The pedagogical knowledge was held as the NNESTs’ top quality. The following charts represent the categories by which participants ranked ELT community

members as a result of the comparison discussion initiated by my direct questions.

Table 2. Academia-Micro Analysis

NS	Teacher
Anyone not trained to teach but speaks English “natively” and “teaches” (NLELT) ()	Anyone who is trained regardless of NS/NNS

Table 3. Professional Status – Macro Analysis

NS	Semi-NNS	NNS
Speakers who teach, have been trained to be teachers, and speaks English “natively”	Speakers who teach, have been trained to be teachers, and have social and cultural experience with the language through abroad traveling, abroad education etc.	Speakers who teach, have been trained to be teachers, and have never left home country.

The fact that pedagogical knowledge was held in high regard by the NNEST participants more than concern over proficiency was surprising to me as both NNEST and researcher. For this reason, I became an interesting, but unintended participant in the study, as will be seen in the semi-structured interviews below.

### Analysis

In this section, I present the analysis of my data, where I focus on participants’ discussion on the NEST/NNEST dichotomy, and how their language

choices and interactions with me, the researcher, an unintended participant, brings light to NNEST dialogue on an “unapparent” overcome ideology of marginalization. The analysis is divided into two main sections, the first part covers the participants’ excerpts in their definition and construction of teachers’ identity in the ELT field, which explains Table 2. The second part includes the analysis of my unintended participation in the construction and perpetuation of NS/NNS ideology, a pattern that arose as I was carrying out the analysis, which explains Table 3, the professional status among the ELT community of practice.

### Section 1: NEST/NNESTs’ Identity Construction

The first two excerpts define a NS-teacher who is different from teachers whether NEST or NNEST in that NS-teachers’ educational background includes multiple professions but not teaching, coined under Non Licensed English Language Teachers (NLELTs) by Karimi (2011) (Table 2) (Kirkpatrick as cited in Garton et al., 2016; Karimi, 2011). The following three excerpts show the abandonment of NS/NNS terms’ when it comes to teaching (Mahboob et al., 2013). These excerpts equalize teachers despite their “native/nonnative” status as long as they both have had teaching pedagogy training. The last excerpt portrays how the “native speaker” ideology resurfaces once the participants’ language experience status shifts among themselves.

NS-Teacher (NLELTs) vs Teachers. The following two examples centered around the participants’ response to the direct question regarding NESTs/NNESTs comparison. Within the responses, the participants used words

such as “teacher teachers?”, “a real teacher,” they are “not teachers,” “they are accountants, bankers,” to refer to NSs when they were asked to compare NESTs/NNESTs.

Example 1 comes from Thy, a teacher who had had 9 years of experience in ELT with 3 ½ teaching in IELC. Thy is originally a journalist and Spanish teacher for an adult school and decided to get a degree in the ELT field and “become a real teacher,” as she commented in the interview (Thy-recording 7, line 43).

Example 1 <Thy>

223. I; oh ok eh how would you compare a native speaking teacher to

224. nonnative speaking teachers? And why?

225. T; ..ok but are we talking about teachers teachers or native speaker

226. and..

227. I; so ok let's see how you understand the question right? So my

228. questions is how would you compare native speaking teachers to

229. nonnative speaking teachers and why?

230. T; ah teachers ok (Hx) um:: I would say.. both of them have their

231. strengths I think that to be a teacher..the most important thing that you

232. need to have is um..the background in your pedagogy practice

233. I; uhm

234. T; like..oh be a real teacher because...here in Colombia people tend to

235. confuse a native speaker with a teacher and it's not the same

236. I; uhm

237. T; you know so I think that if i is a real teacher who got education to be

238. a teacher (H) we are pretty similar but we are also different because

239. they had the experience of the culture like they can use the culture in

240. term:: of.. (TSK) connecting that.. to::the way they::: teach you know

In example 1, I wanted to know about the participant's opinion on the comparison between native and nonnative speaking teachers in lines 223-224. Thy responded with an alternative question requesting for clarification on the types of "teachers" I am referring to. Thy says in line 225, "teacher teachers? or native speakers?" Her response has two parts. First, Thy repeats the word "teacher" twice, placing the first "teacher" as an adjective to describe the "teachers" mentioned in the question. The second part of line 225, is "native speakers." Thy's additional description to clarify which teachers I am referring to juxtaposes to "teacher teachers." Such juxtaposition indicates that there are "teachers" who get the title without having been trained (Karimi, 2011; Kirkpatrick as cited in Garton et al., 2016), thus Thy's need for clarification. To her request, I repeated the question in lines 228-229. In line 230, Thy answers with an exclamation "ah," the word "teachers" and "ok" to signal she had understood what kind of teachers the question is asking about. In line 234, Thy adds the adjective "real," another adjective, to describe the teachers in the question. Additionally, Thy mentions that it is a common practice to confuse "native

speaker with teacher,” lines 234-235 (Kirkpatrick as cited in Garton et al., 2016). The pair “real teacher” appears once again in lines 237 next to the phrase “who got an education.”

Before she actually discusses any similarities or differences among NS and NNS teachers, Thy finds the need to clarify the type of NS teacher she is going to compare to not only herself, but any other NNEST. In line 237, Thy continues her response by adding “real teacher who got an education.” After demystifying “this NS- teacher,” she only says that both NS with pedagogical knowledge and NNS teachers are the same. When it comes to the difference, Thy indicates that NS- teachers have “the experience of the culture,” line 239, and they can use their cultural knowledge of the language when they teach as can be seen in line 240.

In addition to Thy’s response on the teachers’ identities (NS teacher vs NEST/NNEST), Example 2 depicts more in depth the multiple professions many NS teachers have (Karimi, 2011). Example 2 comes from Frank, a junior teacher who works at the institute’s library running various activities with kids and teens. Even though Frank earned a degree in ELT, he thinks of himself as a self-trained teacher. In Example 2, Frank, does not only discuss the hiring practice in Colombia, but actually names non-teaching professions for hired NS teachers (Gonzalez and Llurda, 2016).

Example 2: <Frank>

236. I; How would you compare native speaking teachers to nonnative  
237. speaking teacher?

238. **F**; ... I ##### ### ### ### Well it tends to happen he- in here in  
239. Colombia.
240. **I**; Mhm, what tends to happen?
241. **F**; yeah I- I'm- [I'm going to tell ya @@@]
242. **I**; [Okay, okay @@@ go ahead]
243. **F**; ... Some uh enterprises hire teachers and they are not really  
244. teachers they are just people that speak in English because they lived  
245. in the United States or they are born in the United States, but they are  
246. not teachers, they are accountants, bankers, whatever.
247. **I**; Mhm
248. **F**; And they needed a job so they hired them because their- they speak  
249. English, but they're not teachers.

In example 2, Frank initiates his response to the comparison of NESTs/NNESTs by saying “it tends to happen here in Colombia” in line 238. I asked for clarification, and Frank responded with “enterprises hire teachers and they are not really teachers.” He explains that the reason why “they” are hired is because of their status as “lived” or “born” in the United States (lines 244-245) (Kirkpatrick; Phillipson as cited in Garton et al., 2016). Then Frank adds, “they are accountants, bankers, whatever” in line 246.

Throughout his response, Frank never uses the label of NEST/NNEST to clarify that the “they” he is referring to is teachers. Frank only uses the pronoun

“they” to refer to teachers who are not teachers, but teachers who got into the teaching profession without the pedagogical training to do so (Table 2). Frank’s response is a direct critique to the hiring practice in Colombia where many NS-teachers get a position over actual teachers in the ELT field (Kirkpatrick as cited in Garton et al. 2016). However, the nonidentification of “they” as NS or NNS, and his description of what the “enterprises” hire teachers as, “lived” or “being born” in the United States, could include a percentage of nonnative teachers that also get better positions because of their cultural and travel experience when returning to Colombia. This could also indicate the professional status of Table 3 where semi NNS teachers have priority over regular NNESTs without the cultural and abroad experience (Gonzalez and Llurda, 2016).

Same Qualification? Yes, We Are the Same. The following three excerpts are taken from the interviews with Fanny, MV, and DC. In these examples, the participants’ response to the labels NS/NNS is dismissed in that the labels become irrelevant, and they are not equivalent to assess any teaching qualification.

Example 3 comes from Fanny, one of the teachers who had had experience teaching abroad. Fanny emphasizes that there is not an issue with being NS or NNS. These labels do not determine who the best teacher is (Medges; Mahboob and Golden, 2103). In fact, Fanny mentions that as long as both NS/NNS have teaching training, pedagogy knowledge and a passion for teaching, they are the same.

Example 3 <Fanny>

198. **FY**; I think it is difficult to first to generalize
199. **I**; why?
200. **FY**; because there are many native teachers with very very well
201. prepared
202. **I**; ok
203. **FY**; # but there are others that are not and they just used their
204. language and the native language as a joker to get a job which is
205. really sad and it's not really fair for teachers who are not native and
206. have been preparing their whole lives just to get a very good job
207. **I**; uhm
208. **FY**; so I think if.. it's not about being native or not native but its
209. more about getting the right teaching skills to teach if you are native
210. and you have the teaching skills then go ahead get the job but if
211. you are not (emphasis) that's the point that is when like many
212. teachers get like really disappointed with
213. **I**; you mean many teachers you mean [nonnative]
214. **FY**; [nonnative] teachers yeah
215. exactly

In example 3, Fanny starts by acknowledging the difficulty in comparing all NS to NNS. From lines 200 to 204, Fanny classifies NS into two types, the ones

“well prepared,” and the ones “that are not.” Fanny’s separation of NSs is reflected in Table 2. There are NSs who teach, but are not trained to do so (Karimi, 2011). To distinguish NS teachers from NEST/NNEST, Fanny uses the phrase “well prepared.” “The ones that are not (prepared)” are constructed as utilizing their language as a wild card or (“joker” in line 204) to teach (Mahboob, 2004; Clark and Paran, 2007; Mahboob and Golden, 2013; Selvi, 2016). In this definition, Fanny includes the word “native” to remark that it is the label that qualifies NS teachers to teach and not their teaching qualifications. To Fanny, such hiring practices are unfair for NNESTs as is mentioned in line 205 (Wang, 2013).

In her definition, to clarify who the teachers are in the comparison, Fanny uses the words “well prepared” in line 200-201. According to *Dictionary.com*, to be prepared means “make (something) ready for use” or “when (someone) [is] ready to do or able to deal with something.” However, Fanny is using the expression to approximate a literal translation from our colloquial Spanish language “estar preparado.” This expression is used to indicate that a person has studied, has been to university and obtained a degree and is now ready to work in the corresponding field. One can see the Spanish colloquial translation in lines 200-201 when Fanny defines the difference between NS teacher with NNEST as the latter “have been preparing their whole life.” This preparation is elucidated when Fanny explains, from lines 208 to 209, that the label is irrelevant, instead the qualifications are the substance, that is “getting the right teaching skills.”

Furthermore, in line 208, the “it” refers to the qualification of whoever is teaching. The second “it” is her contra-response to the identity of the teacher in question. The “it” is now switched not to the identity, but the qualifications of whoever is teaching a second language. Fanny’s description puts emphasis on the pedagogical knowledge any teacher in the ELT field should have. Once again, Fanny’s comment reveals the underlying ideological issue surrounding the hiring practice many NNESTs face when trying to get a job. This is having NS teachers, not qualified to teach, who are teaching and are given preference over those who have the qualifications, because of the way they speak (Mahboob and Golden, 2013). Even though this may not be the case of the institute the participants of this study are working for, the sentiment exists, and the participants are aware of it.

In Example 4, MV, one of the teachers who has been assessed greatly for his teaching and classroom management, states that NS teachers have a bigger advantage over NNS teachers when it comes to pronunciation (Wang, 2012), vocabulary and cultural expressions (Lowe and Kiczkowski, 2016).

#### Example 4 <MV>

273. **MV**; okay I think the only advantage the native speakers have is  
274. pronunciation ...maybe also vocabulary expressions that.. we cannot  
275. understand or we cannot internalize since our cultural differences our

276. background is different (sniff) so that's like the advantage but at the  
277. moment of being in front of the class? It doesn't matter where you're  
278. from it ju—it just matters what you want to do with your class the  
279. way... you love teaching... and the way you have I mean the rapport  
280. you have with your students that's what matters at the end so yeah as  
281. I said some advantages in terms of...vocabulary.

MV's initial comparison focuses on the teachers' proficiency or communicative competence (Wang, 2012; Lowe and Kiczkowiak, 2016). However, in line 276-277, MV asks a rhetorical question, "but at the moment of being in front of the class?," and then he answers "it doesn't matter," referring to the teacher's nationality, or origin, thus making reference to the teacher's identity brought upon with the label "native" or "nonnative." MV, then expands the NS/NNS teachers comparison to what either teacher can do when teaching. This refers to their capability of teaching the language in a way that students can comprehend, again reinforcing pedagogical knowledge over language use status.

Example 5 comes from DC, a teacher who has worked at IELC for 10 years prior to the interview and is now a teacher trainer. When asked to describe her ELT training, DC mentioned she is a "IELC product." Out of all participants in this study, DC was the one who spoke of "varieties of English," "English as a global language," "standard English," and the idea of bringing awareness, of the previous information, to not only the teaching community, but students as well. In

the following example, DC demystifies the use of NS/NNS to describe a “competent teacher” (Lowe and Kiczowski, 2016; Holliday, 2014).

Example 5 <DC>

134. **DC;** Well m- um I don't think there's- I mean I- I don't think part of  
135. the criteria- like that's why I didn't really mean ## @ when I was  
136. describing my criteria, I don't think that a competent teacher should  
137. be either a native or a  
138. **I;** [Nonnative]  
139. **DC;** [nonnative] speaker, I think that's- that #- doesn't really matter  
140. I- I honestly think that um you be a great teacher when you are a  
141. native if learn how to teach and like I said if you're open and- and  
142. [creative and resourceful]  
143. **I;** [creative and resourceful,] yeah  
144. **DC;** Um and the same thing happens when you're a nonnative  
145. speaker an- I- I don't th- maybe it can be a little bit more  
146. challenging in a way. Um for you to develop the communicative  
147. #competence let's say that's like the difference. Um but once  
148. you've done it, and again you keep reading, you keep learning uh I  
149. don't really think that's there- there is a difference between these  
150. kinds of teachers.

DC explains, that in her criteria to describe a competent teacher, she would exclude the labels NS/NNS (Holliday, 2014). From lines 134 to 137, DC mentions “I don’t think” “I didn’t really mean” “competent teachers should be... native or” with my interruption in line 138 “nonnative.” From lines 140 to 150, DC describes what it would entail for a “native” or “nonnative” teacher to be a competent teacher. In line 141, DC states that “native” teachers can be great only “if [they] learn how to teach.” This phrase emphasizes the pedagogical aspects any teacher should have, and that once again, many NS-teachers become one without the corresponding training, thus Table 2. In line 144, DC asserts that the need to be pedagogically trained is not only applicable to NESTs, as she explains that NNESTs should also be required to be pedagogically trained to teach, when she says “the same thing happens when you’re a nonnative speaker.” Although DC adds that NNESTs have a challenge (line 146) when it comes to the communicative competence, she ends the comparison remarking “I don’t think...there is a difference in these kinds of teachers,” referring to pedagogically trained ELTs, whether NEST or NNEST (Holliday, 2014). Yet, DC has established that “these” kinds of teachers are the teachers defined in Table 2, teachers trained to teach.

IELC’s Semi-Native Speaker. The last two excerpts from this section are taken from the interview with Sensei, who is Colombian born and a California high school graduate student who has worked for Colombo since 1982. In

Example 6, Sensei describes Colombo's hiring practices at the time that he was recruited.

Example 6 < Sensei>

290. **I;** terms of the training or [like the] selection of the teachers or lik what-  
291. what are the requirements?  
292. **S;** [Wow]  
293. **S;** Look, back then you didn't need a teaching certificate  
294. **I;** Mhm  
295. **S;** Or a teaching degree or any of the sort, you took uh the training at  
296. the Columbo.  
297. **I;** Uhu  
298. **S;** They [turned your-]  
299. **I;** [Whether you are a] teacher or not.  
300. **S;** Honey we- there were very few Engli- professional English  
301. teachers, we had a staff of doctors, lawyers, engineers uh a couple  
302. Vietnam veterans  
303. **I;** Mhm  
304. **S;** Uh etcetera just multi professions all over the place, but we all had  
305. a common- a commonality which was that we spoke English  
306. **I;** Mhm  
307. **S;** And we learned to teach English

308. I; Oh okay.

Sensei mentioned that at the time “you didn't need a teaching certificate or a degree” (Karimi, 2011). The center required applicants to sign up for a one-month training course and enroll in a team-teaching training course to be allowed to teach. Being able to teach was based on the applicants' successful completion of each course. In line 293 and 296, Sensei mentions a teaching certificate, degree or “any of the sort” was not necessary. In line 299, I overlap Sensei pointing out the professional identity of hired teachers discussed in the conversation by saying “whether you are a teacher or not.” By doing so, I directly point out the hiring practice of the ELT community to hire people who have had experience with the language and not necessarily with language teaching (Karimi, 2011; Karkpatrick as cited in Garton et al., 2016). To my overlap, Sensei replies with “very few professional English teachers” in line 300. Sensei, in this instance adds the word “professional” to distinguish English teachers who had obtained a degree in ELT from English teachers who had not (NS teachers: NLELTs of Table 2) (Karimi, 2011). Immediately after, he mentions that in the past, many of the hired teachers, or “staff,” were “doctors, lawyers, engineers...Vietnam veterans” (lines 301-302). In the following line, Sensei called those hired teachers “multi professionals.” He then adds that what kept all these professionals together as teachers (indirectly) was they all “spoke English” and “learned to teach English” at the center (305 and 307) (Karimi, 2011).

Sensei's extract about the history of the center in the 90's and beginning of the century comprises the hiring practice that has surrounded the ELT community in Colombia, Latin American, and Asian countries (Holliday, 2014; Appleby, 2016; Mahboob and Golden, 2013; Selvi 2010; Clark and Paran, 2007) When Sensei mentions that there was no need for a degree that certified any of the hired staff to teach the language, he traces a pattern of previous and continuing hiring practices that have followed many NNESTs in the ELT community (Selvi, 2016; Kirkpatrick as cited in Garton et al. 2016). Even though the center's requirement for applicants have changed since then, some of the participants in this study had expressed the sentiment towards this type of hiring practice, directly or indirectly, which prefer to employ "teachers," who have experience with the language, yet are less qualified to teach the language, compared to teachers with language teaching experience.

Sensei's comments about teachers in the past, such as their lack of degree, the fact that "teachers" were "multi-professional," and the one thing they all shared being their language ability (linguistic, sociolinguistic, and pragmatic competence (Andrews 2003; Karimi, 2011), shows the privilege given to other professionals (doctors, lawyers, bankers, etc.) because of their status of language experience, over professional language teachers (Appleby, 2016). Even Sensei's own hiring story shows the privilege given to those with perceived English language experience and ability since, as a California high school graduate student, he was hired a couple of years later to teach at IELC, without a

degree initially, although he obtained his teaching certificate from the University of Alabama through an overseas program both institutions had agreed upon, at a later time.

During this conversation, I notice that for Sensei to discuss the hiring practice for the center did not bring a negative sentiment compared to Thy, Frank, and Fanny, who displayed a discomfort with the topic of having “native teachers” who only have language experience and lack teaching experience. For Sensei, this past hiring practice did not affect and has not affected him. Sensei’s background with language experience with both languages has allowed him to be part of both circles, the NS teacher circle and the NNEST circle (Appleby, 2016). From lines 300 to 307, Sensei uses the pronoun “we” to show his affiliation to a group of teachers that were not professional language teachers just yet. Sensei initiated line 300 with a “we” that is truncated and reframed in the form of “there were.” The truncated “we” is a movement of hesitation to show at the time he was not part of the “professional English teachers.” Sensei then uses another “we” to describe the “center,” and at the same time to separate himself from the other hired professionals that he was not. Lastly, he uses “we” to include himself with a group of hired staff who spoke English and learned to teach the language. The pronoun, “we,” allows Sensei to navigate his experience in both circles, while acknowledging the differences.

To Sensei, the hiring practice that occurred in the past with the center was not a big issue as it might not be with many of the hired English language

experienced speakers who get ESL/EFL/ELT positions not only in Colombia but across the world. His “native” status has impeded his ability to see the marginalization effect this type of hiring has brought upon NNESTs (Appleby, 2016). In fact, in the following excerpt, Sensei states that “native vs nonnative” status is not an issue.

In Example 7, Sensei was asked to discuss how comparing NS/NNS influence him as a teacher. Sensei repeats the question, I emphasize “as a teacher?” Sensei repeats a second time. Then I add “if,” as giving Sensei options and clarification to the question asked. Then in line 711, Sensei says “really, it doesn’t influence me at all.” The “at all” is an absolute no. Yet, I reframe the question in disbelief of what I just heard. Sensei again reaffirms with “no” and “never” after I question his answer. In lines 716, I ask Sensei if he had noticed his colleagues had shared anything in relation to one’s affiliation to language status. Sensei pauses momentarily and qualifies the question as “interesting.” Then he states “no.” I keep reframing the question and not accepting Sensei’s answers. But in lines 719 to 720, I now add “instructors, supervisors” and ask Sensei if the dichotomy of NS/NNS “is ... a thing.” Finally, Sensei states that “native/nonnative” is not an issue; otherwise it would have been during “the selection process.” However, in the following line Sensei distances himself from being classified into either category of the dichotomy when he uses “they became teachers.” Sensei does not use the inclusive pronoun “we.”

Example 7 <Sensei>

704. **I;** yeah, anyway. Uh how does this comparison whatever you were just  
705. talking about native speaking teachers versus nonnative speaking  
706. teachers, how does this comparison influence you as a teacher?  
707. **S;** How does it influence me?  
708. **I;** As a teacher?  
709. **S;** As a teacher.  
710. **I;** If it does, maybe it doesn't.  
711. **S;** Really it doesn't influence me at all.  
712. **I;** You don't think about it  
713. **S;** No, really, I've never given thought about it.  
714. **I;** Okay  
715. **S;** To be honest no.  
716. **I;** Do you think your other colleagues think about it?  
717. **S;** ... .. Well interesting question I've never spoken to anybody about  
718. that.  
719. **I;** So, it's not something that people talk about? I mean I'm talking like  
720. by people I mean instructors, supervisors. Is- is this a thing?  
721. **S;** not native, nonnative [no] I don't -  
722. **I;** [No]  
723. **S;** You know if it were- if it were an issue, they would have seen it  
724. during the selection processes before they became teachers

725. **I**; Oh okay
726. **S**; You know if it were an issue, I imagine that would have been
727. observed before.
728. **I**; Okay
729. **S**; Really to me, hey
730. **I**; It's not
731. **S**; No
732. **I**; [It's ##]
733. **S**; [not at] all

The first part of this analysis has covered how the participants within this study have defined and constructed the teachers' identity in the ELT field. As seen in the analysis above, pedagogical knowledge became NNESTs' wild card to defend their academic status, to prove to others that they were capable to teach the English language. However, when the comparative question of NEST/NNEST came up, the participants' definition of NEST had a twist from my initial expectation. The question created discomfort among participants. Some of them answered it in terms of advantages and disadvantages where NESTs' advantage was their pronunciation, lexicon, and cultural knowledge, and NNESTs' advantage was their grammar and pedagogical knowledge. Yet, there were different reactions when participants were asked to compare NESTs to NNESTs. Some of the participants' first reaction was to resist the comparison. They

reframed the question or asked for clarification. NESTs and NNESTs were not compared based on language or pedagogy. Rather, NESTs were not comparable in the participants' minds. What happened instead was that participants separated NESTs from NS teachers in order to describe and focus on the marginalization happening in the ELT CoP, an issue they do not consider NESTs being a part of. They focused on the NS teacher as one who has had long term experience in English language teaching, but not much experience or training in terms of pedagogical creation/application; thus, NS teachers or NLELTs are not equivalent to NESTs or NNESTs.

NNEST participants were very aware of their knowledge of their students, and their pedagogical training. This, in a sense, has empowered the participants to assert their membership in the ELT community, pushing to the side the label NNEST to determine their peripheral membership, thus ending the feeling of marginalization based on their language status (Holliday, 2014). In addition to this, it was their focus on pedagogical knowledge and training received that determined how they spoke of NESTs/NNESTs in terms of academia and professional status (see Tables 2 and 3).

## Section 2: NEST/ NNEST Status in Novice/Expert English Language User

In the following three excerpts from previous examples, I will be discussing the way in which my own perceived status as a NNEST plays into my participation with the interviewees, specifically in the ways that I respond or do

not respond, given the “level” of the interviewee’s English from my perspective as a member in the NS/NNS dichotomy. The purpose of this section is to elucidate how language expertise and status in the ELT community influences each member to gatekeep other members based on the concept of being a NS or as Near NS as possible as a NNS (Holliday, 2014; Aneja, 2016). This dichotomy, although directly affecting NNESTs often negatively, as discussed above, can easily become a tool by which NNESTs measure each other’s status and viability within the ELT community, without them even being aware. The three excerpts are taken from interviews with Thy, Frank, and Sensei.

During my interview with the first two, Thy and Frank, it was made clear that they had never traveled abroad or used their English in a setting outside of Colombia. Although this did not directly influence their position on the dichotomy because they did not consider themselves less for having only used English in their native country, as I analyzed my data, it became apparent that this information did directly influence (without my knowledge) the way that I engaged with them (Aneja, 2016).

Excerpt from Example 1 <Thy>

223. **I**; oh ok eh how would you compare a native speaking teacher to

224. nonnative speaking teachers? And why?

225. **T**; ..ok but are we talking about teachers teachers or native speaker

226. and..

227. I; so ok let's see how you understand the question right? So my  
228. questions is how would you compare native speaking teachers to  
229. nonnative speaking teachers and why?  
230. T; ah teachers ok (Hx) um:::

In the excerpt with Thy, I ask a NS/NNS teachers' comparative question, to which she replies by giving options to what kind of teachers I am referring to. In my response to Thy's clarification, as it can be seen in line 227, I initiate by a combination of "so" and "ok." This is a move one makes to correct or modify what somebody else has said. Typically, "so" is a transition word, and "ok" is used as a statement of recognition, but together they are a way to shift into correction. My response continues with the expression "let's see," which is a teacher move when one is directly referencing something someone else has said without pointing fingers and creating distance. In other words, "let's see" is an invitation for a mutual correction without saying the other party (Thy) is "wrong." Then, I add "how you understand the question." This move implies that the other person has not understood the question I intended, and "right" is a way to get the other to conform to my assumption, thus I repeat the question signaled again with "so." The problem with my participation in this exchange is that, first I did not recognize Thy's question as a clarification question but as a misunderstanding even though there was no reason she had misunderstood. Thy was simply asking for clarification because she meant to refine what kind of teachers I was

referring to (NEST/NNEST vs. NS-teachers). ELT teachers' identity and construction were not something that I thought of as the interview was happening. So, I translated her question as her not understating my English spoken question. By this subtle movement, unintentionally I position her at a lower status in the ELT NS/NNS dichotomy that I was there to push against (Holliday, 2014; Aneja, 2016).

Furthermore, in Frank's interview I reinforce novice/expert status in our exchange about the ELT NS/NNS dichotomy.

Excerpt from Example 2 <Frank>

236. I; How would you compare native speaking teachers to nonnative  
237. speaking teacher?  
238. F; .... I ##### ### ### ### Well it tends to happen he- in here in  
239. Colombia.  
240. I; Mhm, what tends to happen?  
241. F; yeah I- I'm- [I'm going to tell ya @@@]  
242. I; [Okay, okay @@@ go ahead]  
243. F; ... Some uh enterprises hire teachers and they are not really  
244. teachers...

In the previous excerpt, in Frank's response to my question, he stutters briefly, which is a normal speaking move. However, my response to Frank's

stuttering is with “mhm, what tends to happen?” a move that suggests that his stutter is not normal and needs either support or modification. However, his response is “yeah I’m going to tell ya” and laughs, which indicates that his stutter is normal, and he is asking for the floor back. Then, I give him permission when I say “go ahead.” In this exchange, I assume an authoritative figure again, teacher like, where I am prompting “correct speech” when he does not need it. In both Thy and Frank’s cases, they knew exactly what they wanted to say and need it, either they needed time to process the information and respond in an interview setting, or they needed clarification about terminology.

In the final excerpt, taken from my interview with Sensei, the exact opposite seemed to occur. Rather than rhetorically placing myself as the gatekeeper of the ELT community, I was gatekept by Sensei (Aneja, 2016; Appleby, 2016). Leading up to this excerpt, I found that Sensei had received most of his primary education in Southern California, where I currently live. Furthermore, Sensei positioned himself in the beginning as considering himself a NS of both English and Spanish. At this point, regardless of my time and education abroad as an adult using English, my status as English user and expert seemed to be secondary, compared to Sensei’s expertise and status in the ELT community. Additionally, Sensei picked his own pseudonym for this project, because he is a “go to” for many of the other teachers at IELC. This, in and of itself is significant because of the title’s meaning, i.e. to be the master or

knower. In this same vein, Sensei establishes himself as senior to my own status by using the term “honey” in reference to me, in Example 6 above (line 300).

Excerpt from Example 7 <Sensei>

704. **I;** yeah, anyway. Uh how does this comparison whatever you were just  
705. talking about native speaking teachers versus nonnative speaking  
706. teachers, how does this comparison influence you as a teacher?  
707. **S;** How does it influence me?  
708. **I;** As a teacher?  
709. **S;** As a teacher.  
710. **I;** If it does, maybe it doesn't.  
711. **S;** Really it doesn't influence me at all.  
712. **I;** You don't think about it  
713. **S;** No, really, I've never given thought about it.  
714. **I;** Okay

In this excerpt, right away I start with “uh,” where in previous interviews I was very direct. Here I am hedging with filler words. I also keep adjusting the question as I repeat it twice (lines 704 to 706). With Sensei, I appeared less confident than in previous interviews where I only expected to ask the question directly and one time. In the pair exchange in lines 707 to 708, Sensei asks a clarification question, like Thy did, but in this case, I submit to the question and

respond. In the next set, Sensei repeats my answer and, rather than taking an authoritative position, I hedge by suggesting he might not fit in the dichotomy as if he has a choice, a choice not given to Thy or Frank. After he responds to my questions, I simply respond “okay.” Again, I place his status above mine by not interrogating “why” his response is what it is. This type of exchange repeats throughout the rest of the interview.

In the beginning of this research, I went looking for an answer on how the ELT community can be responsible for perpetuating the NS/NNS dichotomy in terms of linguistic competence as a status marker. However, my data showed me that this dichotomy among ELT professionals, specifically NNESTs, is not based on linguistic competence, but rather on the professional experience the user has with the language (Appleby, 2016). The dichotomy is then perpetuated, not by the academic status of the NNESTs (Table 2), but rather on the professional experience with the language that the NNESTs have garnered, which has given access to more privilege over other NNESTs (Table 3). Therefore, my shifting from authoritative to non-authoritative role as English speaking interviewer reflects my own perceived status, within the professional sphere of language, of both them and myself. Significantly, my interviewees’ status markers came from my own questions regarding their experience in the language at the beginning of each interviews (Table 1). Without having that prior knowledge at the beginning of their interviews, it is difficult to say whether I would have made the same authoritative oves with Thy and Frank, and this is what needs further research.

My own unintended participation in the dichotomy demonstrates how easy it is for NNESTs (under privilege acquired through travel and study abroad, years of experience in English speaking countries, etc.) to perpetuate a dichotomy they do not like, without even noticing. To this end, Holliday (2014) mentions that part of the issue with research comparing NS/NNS is that it keeps comparing the two groups against each other, thus making it about language competence and strength/weaknesses as teachers based on their status in language proficiency. However, my research suggests that the dichotomy, within the NNS community, is not about competence, but about judging each other by how much experience they have, which explains Table 3, the professional status among the ELT community of practice.

### Conclusion and Implications

There two important takeaways from this research. First, I want the ELT community (whether NEST or NNEST) to notice and understand that these categories by which NNESTs are given status are important in terms of job opportunities and teaching abilities. However, at the same time, I am uncomfortable with the idea that the ELT community penalizes both the NEST and NNEST for either the privilege of gaining experience and therefore status or the lack of privilege and therefore lack of status (Aneja, 2016; Appleby, 2016). The problem is that this seems to be attached to teaching capabilities. For example, perhaps a NNEST knows grammar inside and out, and has great lesson plans for teaching grammar, and even has strong reviews from students,

however the same NNEST could be overlooked for a job in teaching because of the lack of a broad language experience that a different NNEST has. Although this has to do with the NS/NNS dichotomy in the ELT community in general, as the literature suggests, at the local level it also has to do with whether the instructors are seeking to improve constantly and consistently in the language they are teaching. At IELC, instructors (NEST or NNEST) are required to stay current in the field and keep progressing in the language. Because instructors at this site are required to be current in the ELT field, there seems to be a consensus of equal academic status among them despite labels that classify them as “native,” “near-native,” or “non-native” when it comes to language. The question that arises, then, is how is status marked at sites where such requirements do not exist? For example, as an outsider to the IELC ELT local community, I assessed them via the language experience status, while they did not. The implication is that they mark status by pedagogical currency in the ELT community, while I marked status by experience in the language. My question is: is this a trend that is shared among NNESTs that are not required to be current?

The second takeaway, here, is how important it is to recognize how subtle the permeation of native speakerism is in our mindset as NNESTs. I did not even notice, until a close analysis of my data showed me, my own biases and how much I was perpetuating the native speakerism ideology by assessing NNEST colleagues' language experience and classifying them into statuses and thereby furthering the ideology among the NNEST local community (Gonzalez and

Llurda, 2016). This is because ideology (even directed against us) becomes so embedded in our own everyday language and performances that we have to be reflectively critical of our own participation in the dichotomy in order to see it (van Dijk, 1993). The implication of the language experience classification is that the ideology has transmuted into a new native speakerism ideology that is controlled by the NNEST local communities. While the native speakerism ideology began as a gatekeeping strategy instituted and perpetuated by English speaking countries' normative standardized tests of native equivalent English (Nigar and Kostogriz, 2019), at this point in time, it seems that the NNEST community, both globally and locally, has redefined the ideology and method of gatekeeping to assess, not proficiency of the language, but experience with the language in both hiring practices and teacher-on-teacher interaction (Gonzalez and Llurda, 2018).

We need to start exploring these NNEST local communities and see how they interact among each other in terms of experience and how this concept of language expertise is displayed. While this was my goal, to explore this within the context the NS/NNS dichotomy, what I ended up finding was that in many cases the NS and even the NEST do not play a role in how NNESTs assess each other in the ELT field. The ideal native speaker always plays a role as the center of comparison among NNESTs, hence the categories. But this comparison happens internally, via approximation to the model and not in direct comparison to the model. The problem left to us as researchers is being able to uncover these comparisons in professional interactions where marking status is done invisibly. If

we can do so, we can modulate better the permeation of native speakerism ideologies both inside the local ELT community and abroad, because we can practice seeing each member in terms of their teaching proficiency first and language performance second.

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER, SPRING 2019

☰ Menu

## Study Details



👤 Sixta Payan

[Studies](#) / Study Details

+ New Submission

Study Details	Submissions
---------------	-------------

Approved

### IRB-FY2018-91 EFL Teaching Practices and the Native-Speakerism Ideology

📄 PDF    🗑️ Delete

<b>Approval Date:</b> 04-08-2019	<b>Expiration Date:</b> N/A	<b>Organization:</b> CAL - English, Users loaded with unmatched Organization affiliation.	<b>Active Submissions:</b> N/A
<b>Sponsors:</b> N/A	<b>Closed Date:</b> N/A	<b>Current Policy:</b> Post-2018 Rule	

Key Contacts		Attachments	
Team Member	Role	Number	Email
Caroline Vickers	Principal Investigator	909/5375684	cvickers@csusb.edu
Sixta Payan	Co-Principal Investigator		Sixta.Payan@csusb.edu
Sixta Payan	Co-Principal Investigator		Sixta.Payan@csusb.edu
Caroline Vickers	Primary Contact	909/5375684	cvickers@csusb.edu

APPENDIX B  
INFORMED CONSENT FORMS

To [REDACTED]

I am asking [REDACTED] to participate in a study I am conducting about EFL Teaching Practices and the Native-Speakerism Ideology, so that I can complete my thesis at California State University, San Bernardino. This project looks at how members of the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teaching community view native-speakers and non-native-speakers English language teachers. I want to look at this because I want to understand how and why EFL teachers seem to compare their proficiency to an ideal native-speaker, even though the research says an ideal native-speaker does not exist.

If the center decides to participate, I will observe and audio or video record, whichever the teacher or coordinator participant prefers, formal or informal teacher meetings in the teacher's lounge (two hours), I will conduct an audio and/or video recorded interview with each teacher and coordinator participant (30 minutes). I will also ask for pre-assignments for professional development sessions and call for teachers, which includes a description of teachers' expected profile.

Benefits of the study include a better understanding of how EFL teachers see native and non-native speaking teachers.

Risks to [REDACTED] are minimal but may include teachers' discomfort being audio or video recorded while talking about their teaching practices and/or hiring process for the center, and possible disruption of regular formal and/or informal teacher meetings in the presence of the researcher.

The center's participation is completely voluntary. I will not use any data that [REDACTED] does not want me to use.

I will not use the center's name, and any association to [REDACTED] in either transcription of audio or video recording will be removed. However, I will show audio or video recordings of the center's teacher and coordinator participants at professional conferences and will transcribe the audio or video recordings to present in my thesis and in publications. The researcher commits to share the findings of this study with the [REDACTED] coordination upon thesis completion and submission to California State University, San Bernardino.

My thesis advisor is Dr. Caroline Vickers, Professor of English at California State University, San Bernardino. If the center has questions, please contact her at cvickers@csusb.edu or at (909) 537-5684. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, which reviews all research conducted with human participants, at California State University, San Bernardino.

Please sign and date if you agree to participate.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

I agree to be audio recorded: \_\_\_\_\_

I agree to be video recorded: \_\_\_\_\_

To Whom it May Concern,

I am asking you to participate in a study I am conducting about EFL Teaching Practices and the Native-Speakerism Ideology so that I can complete my thesis at California State University, San Bernardino. This project looks at how members of the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teaching community view native-speakers and non-native-speakers English language teachers. I want to look at this because I want to understand how and why EFL teachers seem to compare their proficiency to an ideal native-speaker, even though the research says an ideal native-speaker does not exist.

If you decide to participate, I will observe and audio or video record, whichever you prefer, your formal or informal teacher meetings in the teacher's lounge (two hours), I will conduct an audio recorded interview with you (30 minutes). I will also ask for pre-assignments for professional development sessions and call for teachers, which includes a description of teachers' expected profile.

Benefits of the study include a better understanding of how EFL teachers see native and non-native speaking teachers.

Risks to you are minimal but may include discomfort being audio or video recorded while talking about your teaching practices.

Your participation is completely voluntary. You do not have to participate, and you can decide not to participate at any time. I will not use any data that you do not want me to use.

I will not use your name, but I will show audio or video recordings of you at professional conferences and will transcribe the audio or video recordings to present in my thesis and in publications.

My thesis advisor is Dr. Caroline Vickers, Professor of English at California State University, San Bernardino. If you have questions, you can contact her at [cvickers@csusb.edu](mailto:cvickers@csusb.edu) or at (909) 537-5684. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, which reviews all research conducted with human participants, at California State University, San Bernardino.

Please sign and date if you agree to participate.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

I agree to be audio recorded: \_\_\_\_\_

I agree to be video recorded: \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX C

DU BOIS (2006) TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTION

Meaning	Symbol	Example
Speaker attribution, letter in all caps	A;	A;
Pause, timed	(3.8)	(3.8) So anyway
Hold/micropause	..	.. I don't know
Pause, untimed	...	... well
Prosodic lengthening/lag	:	U::m
Appeal	?	A; Do you know?
Overlap	[ ]	B; It was so [funny] M; [Hilarious]
Unintelligible	# one per syllable	###
Uncertain	#word	#you #could see
Quotation quality less than a true voice of another	<QUOTE>	B; He was like, <QUOTE> what are you doing in there? <QUOTE>
Truncated/cut-off word	Word-	Wha-
Inhale	(H)	(H) Well I told him
Exhale	(Hx)	(Hx) I know
Laugh	@	@@@
Laughing word	@word	@he @was @so @funny
Vocalism	(COUGH)	
Click	(TSK)	
Time in seconds in recording	<T=00:00:0.0>	And then she came over <T=0:03:15.8>
Creak/glottalization	%	%oh
Transcriber's comments	((COMMENT))	((WAVING ARMS))

Transcript Conventions (Du Bois, 2006).

## REFERENCES

- Ali, S. 2009. 'Teaching English as an International Language (EIL) in the Gulf Corporation Council (GCC) countries: the brown man's burden' in F. Sharifian (ed.). *English as an International Language: Perspectives and Pedagogical Issues*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Aguirre-Garzón, E. A. and Catañeda-Peña, H. A. (2017). Empowering Non-Licensed-in English Language Teachers to construct professional knowledge in their actual imagined communities of practice. *English Language Teaching*, 10(8), 78-92.
- Andrews, S. (2003). Teacher language awareness and the professional knowledge base on the L2 teacher. *Language Awareness*, 12(2), 81-95, doi: 10.1080/09658410308667068.
- Aneja, G.A. (2016) Rethinking nativeness: Toward a dynamic paradigm of (Non)Native speakering. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 13(4), 351-379, doi: 10.1080/15427587.2016.1185373
- Appleby, R. (2016). Researching privilege in language teacher identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(3), 755-768, doi: 10.1002/tesq.32.
- Baxter, J. A. (2010). Discourse-analytic approaches to text and talk. In L. Litosseliti (Ed.), *Research Methods in Linguistics* (pp. 117-137). London: Continuum.

- Braine, G. (2005). A history of research on non-native speaker English teachers. In G. Brain (Ed.), *Non-Native Language Teachers* (pp. 13-23). Springer US.
- Braine, G. (2010). *Nonnative speaker English teachers: Research, pedagogy, and professional growth*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Brutt-Griffler, J., & Samimy, K. K. (2001). Transcending the nativeness paradigm. *World Englishes*, 20(1), 99-106.
- Clark, E., & Paran, A. (2007). The employability of non-native-speaker teachers of EFL: A UK Survey. *System*, 35(4), 407-430.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209.
- Copland, F., Mann, S. and Garton, S. (2019). Native-English-Speaking Teachers: Disconnections between theory, research, and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 54(2), 348-374.
- Du Bois, J. (2005). Prosody in a delicacy hierarchy for discourse transcription. In: Paper Presented at Transcribing Now: Means and Meanings in the Transcription of Spoken Interaction, Santa Barbara, California.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York: Routledge.
- Garcia-Ponce, E. E., Lengeling, M. M., and Mora-Pablo, I. (2017). Discrimination in the TESOL profession in Mexico: Voices and perspectives of English as

- a Foreign Language Teachers. *i-manager's Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(4), 55-67.
- Gardner, S. (2006). Centre-stage in the instructional register: Partnership talk in primary EAL. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9, 476-494.
- Garton, S., Copland, F., and Mann, S. (2016). Opinions and positions on native-speakerism. In F. Copland, S. Garton, & S. Mann (Eds.), *LETS and NESTs: Voices, Views and Vignettes* (pp. 51-67). **British Council**.
- Gonzalez, A. and Llurda, E. (2016). Bilingualism and globalization in Latin America: fertile ground for native speakersim. In F. Copland, S. Garton, & S. Mann (Eds.), *LETS and NESTs:Voices, Views and Vignettes* (pp. 51-67). **British Council**.
- Holliday, A. R. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University
- Holliday, A.R. (2014). Native speakerism. *Canterbury Christ Church University*, 1-5.
- Jenkins, J. (2013). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. London, UK: Routledge
- Kachru, B. B. (1986). The power and politics of English. *World Englishes*, 2(3), 121-140.
- Kachru, B. (1997). World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 66-87.

- Karimi, M. N. (2011). Variations in EFL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 3(3), 84-114.
- Kamhi-Stein, L.D. (2016). The non-native English speaker teacher in TESOL movement. *ELT Journal*, 70(2) 180-189.
- Kharchencko, N. (2014). Imagined communities and Teaching English as a Second Language. *Journal of Foreign Languages, Culture and Civilizations*, 2(1), 21-39.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lin, A. (2014). Critical discourse analysis in Applied Linguistics: A methodological review. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34, 213-232.
- Litosseliti, L. (2010). *Research methods in linguistics*. London: Continuum.
- Lowe, R.J. and Kiczkowiak, M. (2016). Native-speakerism and the complexity of personal experience: A duoethnographic study. *Cogent Education*, 3, pp 1-16.
- Mahboob, A., Uhrig, K., Newman, K.L., and Hartford, B.S (2004). Children of a lesser English: status of nonnative English speakers as college-level English as a second language teachers in the United States LD. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and Teaching from Experience: Perspectives on Nonnative English-Speaking Professionals*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor (2004), pp. 100-120.

- Mahboob, A. and R. Golden. 2013. Looking for native speakers of English: discrimination in English language teaching job advertisements. *Voices in Asia Journal* 1/1: 72–81
- Medgyes, P. (2001). When the teacher is a non-native speaker. In Marianne Celce Murcia (ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. 3rd ed. (pp. 415–27). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Moussu, L. (2006). Native and non-native English-speaking English as a second language teachers: Student attitudes, teacher self-perceptions, and intensive English program administrator beliefs and practices. [Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University West Lafayette]. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED492599.pdf>
- Moussu, L. and E. Llurda. 2008. 'Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: history and research'. *Language Teaching*, 41(3), 315–48.
- Nigar, N. and Kostogriz, A. (2019). Deconstructing Non-native English-speaking teachers' professional identity: Looking through a hybrid lens. *English Language Teaching*, 12(12), 1-12.
- Ortaçtepe, D. (2015). EFL Teachers' Identity (Re)Construction as Teachers of Intercultural Competence: A Language Socialization Approach. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 14, 96-112.

- Pavlenko, A. (2003). I Never Knew I was a Bilingual: Reimagining Teacher Identities in TESOL. *Journal of Language, Identity, & Education*, 2(4), 251-268.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). Linguistic imperialism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reyes, T., & Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teacher's self-image: An international survey. *System*, 22(3), 353-367.
- Reis, D. S. (2010). *Non-native English-speaking teachers and professional legitimacy: A sociocultural theoretical perspective on identity realization*. (Publication No. 3436097) [Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University]. ProQuest Dissertation Publishing.
- Richards, J., & Farrell, T. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Samimy, K. & J. Brutt-Griffler (1999). To be a native or non-native speaker: Perceptions of 'non-native' students in a graduate TESOL program. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English Language Teaching* (pp127–144). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate.
- Selvi, A. F. (2010). All teachers are equal, but some teachers are more equal than others: trend analysis of job advertisements in English language teaching'. *WATESOL NNEST Caucus Annual Review 1*, 156–81.

- Selvi, A. F. (2016) Native or non-native English-speaking professionals in ELT: 'That is the question!' or "is that the question?' In F. Copland, S. Garton, & S. Mann (Eds.), *LETS and NESTs: Voices, Views and Vignettes* (pp. 51-67). **British Council**.
- Strauss, S. & Feiz, P. (2014). *Discourse Analysis: Putting our world into words*. New York: Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 249-283.
- Wang, L.-Y. (2012). Moving towards the transition: Non-native EFL teachers' perception of native-speaker norms and responses to varieties of English in the era of global spread of English. *Asian EFL Journal*, 14(2), 46-78.
- Wang, L. (2103). Non-native EFL teacher trainees' attitude toward the recruitment of NESTs and teacher collaboration in language classrooms. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(1), 12-20.
- Wenger-Trayner, E. and Wenger-Trayner, B. (2015). Communities of practice: A brief introduction. *Wegner-Trayner.com*.