

**“YOU DON’T LOOK LIKE A PROFESSOR”: AN AUTOETHNOGRAPHIC
STUDY OF HOW RACIAL IDENTITY, LEGITIMACY, AND LANGUAGE
INTERSECT AT A CANADIAN HIGHER EDUCATION WRITING CENTER**

XIANGYING HUO

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE
STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN EDUCATION

YORK UNIVERSITY

TORONTO, ONTARIO

March 2017

©Xiangying Huo, 2017

Abstract

With the rapid spread of English as a lingua franca, the number of non-native English teachers far exceeds that of native English-speaking teachers worldwide. In recent years, there has been considerable debate on what characteristics represent the ideal English speaker qua language teacher, mostly revolving around the notion of the “native speaker.” English, with a colonial history and as an imperial legacy, has created the native speaker-non-native speaker dichotomy, a hegemonic construct that assumes a monocultural and monolingual lens as a frame of reference. It has thus become challenging for non-native English-speaking teachers to teach English and questions of identity and legitimacy of non-native English-speaking teachers and their students have become central to these debates. This dissertation contributes to this broader discussion through an autobiographic ethnography of the challenges confronting a non-native English-speaking instructor at a Canadian higher education Writing Center. My experience, examined through the prism of a case study, highlighted the intersections of power, race, and ideology as they relate to issues of identity and legitimacy of non-native English-speaking teachers. To illuminate my research problem, I employed two conceptual frameworks -- Critical Race Theory and Bourdieu’s concepts of cultural capital and legitimate language. My methodology employs various approaches, including reflective journal entries on my teaching experience at the Writing Center, autobiographic interviews with my six native and non-native English-speaking students, and field notes of my six respondents about their perceptions of me as their non-native English instructor.

My findings reveal that questions of identity and legitimacy of non-native English-teachers are complex and dependent on the power, race, and ideology of both the students and the instructors. My students demonstrated initial resistance in accepting my identity as a non-native English-speaking teacher and also questioned my legitimacy and knowledge; however, their perceptions about me also evolved over time, eventually shifting to appreciation and acceptance. My findings also uncovered the limited exposure students have to non-native English-speaking instructors and to diverse teachers, thus raising fundamental questions about the role of universities in challenging racism and implementing ethical internationalization to tackle global hierarchy and hegemony.

Acknowledgements

I would not have been able to complete the arduous journey of my Ph.D. studies without the vigorous and tremendous support from all the people below.

I feel highly appreciative for my supervisor Dr. Sandra R. Schecter who has gone all out to guide me through this long journey. I am extremely grateful for her erudition, expertise, far-sightedness, excellent instruction, and unfailing devotion and help.

My big thanks also go to my co-supervisor Dr. Carl James for his broad knowledge and wisdom. Dr. James has contributed considerably to my dissertation process and has provided me with numerous valuable suggestions.

I feel deeply thankful to my committee members Dr. Roopa Desai-Trilokekar and Dr. Neita Israelite. I very much appreciate their great wisdom, high responsibility, wonderful feedback, and patient instruction.

I appreciate the support from many people at the Faculty of Education, such as Dr. Lyndon Martin, Dr. Rishma Dunlop (deceased), Dr. Esther Fine, Dr. Alison Griffith, and Dr. Stan Shapson. I would like to express my thanks to Loretta Fiorini, Laura Greco, Jane Larsson, and Kevin Gambin. As well, I express my big thanks to Dr. Norman H. Sheep outside the Faculty of Education for his kind help and generous support.

I greatly thank my mother who inspired me to pursue my Ph.D. studies in North America when I was only several years old. I have benefited a great deal from her in every aspect of my life. She must feel very proud of me in heaven. I feel indebted to

my grandparents who raised me and educated me to be an independent and strong person. I appreciate their endless love. May they rest in peace. I thank my father for his years of high expectations of me, rigorous education, and tough love. I particularly feel much obliged to my husband who has sacrificed everything and has spared no effort to accompany me to Canada to help me fulfill my Ph.D. dream. He has never ceased to support me despite numerous hardships in the past six years. I feel really fortunate and grateful for his companion, love, encouragement, and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents.....	vi
List of Tables	x
Chapter 1 Introduction and Rationale.....	1
Introduction	1
Colonization: English as a Language of Power.....	1
Globalization: English as a Commodity.....	4
Internationalization of Higher Education	5
International students.....	9
Internationalizing curriculum	13
International teachers.....	14
English as a Medium for Multiculturalism within the Canadian Context.....	16
Summary.....	19
Personal Rationale	19
Dissertation Outline.....	23
Chapter 2 Conceptual Frameworks	25
Bourdieu: “Cultural Capital”	25
Bourdieu: The Notion of “Legitimate Language”	28
Summary.....	31
Critical Race Theory.....	31
1. The centrality and intersectionality of race and racism.....	32
2. The challenge to dominant ideology	34
3. No space is neutral.....	37
4. The commitment to social justice.....	42
5. The centrality of experiential knowledge	44
6. The interdisciplinary perspective.....	45
Summary.....	46
Intersection of Two Theoretical Frameworks.....	48
Chapter 3 The Proliferation of English as a “World” Language	52
Overview of World Englishes.....	52
Responses to English as a World Language	55
Sociolinguistic Debates on Native Speakerism.....	61
Definitions of “native speaker.”	62
Native speaker and non-native speaker dichotomy	63
Linguistic norm	66
Native status	67
Native-Speakerism as Hegemony.....	68
Native speaker myths	70

Linguistic Imperialism.....	71
Native Speaker Fallacy.....	73
Standardization as ideology.....	75
Writing Norms: Monomodality versus Multimodality.....	77
Chapter 4 Review of Research on Teachers of English as an International Language	85
Advantages and Effectiveness of Non-Native Language Teachers.....	86
Students' Perceptions of Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers.....	89
Challenges Facing Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers.....	95
Linguistic challenges.....	95
Sociopolitical challenges.....	99
Hiring challenges.....	100
Summary.....	103
Chapter 5 Methodology.....	106
Research Questions.....	106
Research Site.....	106
Participants.....	107
Demographic background.....	107
Purposeful sampling.....	107
A Qualitative Research Approach.....	108
An Autoethnographic Study.....	111
Autoethnography.....	112
Data Collection Strategies.....	115
Reflective journal entries.....	115
Autobiographic interviews.....	117
Fieldnotes.....	119
Data Analysis.....	119
Researcher's Positionality.....	122
Summary.....	123
Chapter 6 Study Findings 1: Students' Perceptions of the Role of English and English language Instructors' Characteristics.....	124
Students' Socio-historical Locations.....	125
Family background.....	125
Sociocultural locations.....	130
Academic challenges.....	131
Academic writing.....	131
Class participation.....	132
Social challenges.....	134
Friends circles.....	134
The language chosen to speak.....	136
Sociopolitical identities and positions in the Canadian society.....	137

Students' Views on the Role of English	139
Students' Perceptions of Native and Non-Native English-Speaking Instructors	143
The default English language teacher: "a walking dictionary."	143
Students' perceptions of native vs. non-native English-speaking instructors	144
Students' Evolving Perceptions	153
Chapter 7 Study Findings 2: A Non-Native English Language Instructor's Experiences at a Higher Institution Writing Center	159
Site 1: At the Writing Center	159
Linguistic issues: "Have you tutored any student in my program?"	160
Frontal confrontations	160
Interrogations.....	162
Requests for reassurance	163
Promises and disappearances	164
Sociocultural issues: "I don't think you know it."	165
Suspicion of my legitimacy: "I don't know whether you can help me."	165
Double check of my cultural capital: "Are you sure?"	166
Open resistance and defiance: "I need you to tell me my problems."	167
Covert protest and rebellion	167
Racialized stereotypes: "You don't look like a professor maybe because of your nationality."	168
Routine background inspection: "Are you a student?"	168
Blatant attacks and challenges.....	169
Distain and contempt.....	169
Rage and fury	170
Suspicion and inspection	171
Perplexities and fear	172
Despair and disillusionment	174
Summary of Site 1 Findings	175
Site 2: The New Online Booking System.....	176
No Appointments: "It is so Weird to See a Chinese Name among All other Names."	178
Late Appointments: "Your Appointment was the Only one Vacant."	179
Early Appointments: "My Instructor is Unavailable Today."	180
Full Appointments: "I am not Sure whether I'll be Able to Book you Next Week."	182
Summary of Site 2 Findings	183
Site 3: The Drop-in Service in the Library	186
Summary of Site 3 Findings	189
Reflections on my Evolving Status as a Writing Instructor	190
From the Periphery to the Center	190
A Skillful Substitute	191

Trouble Shooter	192
Empowerment: A Legitimate English Instructor at the Center	193
Chapter 8 Discussion and Conclusion	195
Synthesis of Study Findings	196
Oral communication	198
Contrastive rhetoric	198
Curriculum.....	199
Personal attributes	199
The system.....	200
Implications of the Study.....	202
Theoretical implications	203
Applied Implications	206
Limitations of the Study	211
Concluding Remarks	212
References	214
Appendices	256
Appendix A.....	256
Interview Protocol	256
Appendix B.....	259
Informed Consent Form	259

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Social and Demographic Features of Student Participants.....	107
Table 2: Respondents' Rationale for the Importance of English.....	141
Table 3: Respondents' Perceived Advantages of Native English-Speaking Instructors	144
Table 4: Perceived Disadvantages of Native English-Speaking Instructors.....	148
Table 5: Perceived Advantages of Non-Native English-Speaking Instructors..	151
Table 6: Respondents' Perceived Disadvantages of Non-Native Instructors	153

Chapter 1

Introduction and Rationale

Introduction

Contemporary adult migration has introduced unique complexities and posed unique challenges for higher education, particularly in the North American context, where within institutions of higher learning both students and teachers who are non-native to the host culture interact, not only with those who are familiar with the host society but with one another as well. Because the stakes for the success of such displacements are high, and also because these interactions are at risk by virtue of students' distances from the linguistic and cultural norms that underlay the institution's academic expectations, sites of higher learning within North America have been obliged to introduce support mechanisms to mediate between students and course curricula within a variety of disciplinary areas, with idiosyncratic disciplinary norms (Casanave, 2002). One such support mechanism is the tutorial center, staffed largely by instructors who are students pursuing graduate study within the host institution. This dissertation will investigate the challenges and opportunities represented by these complex processes through the prism of a case study of the relations between one instructor in such a tutorial center and her students. However, before proceeding with this narrative, I would first provide some broader contextualization for the processes referenced in this introductory statement.

Colonization: English as a Language of Power

Braj Bihari Kachru (1986), pre-eminent scholar on the status of English as a world language, has qualified English as "a colonial language" (p. 5) and "a language

for oppression” (Ansre, 1979, as cited in Kachru, 1986, p. 13). Kachru (1986) and
Strevens (1992a) trace the historical effects of the colonial origin of English on
non-native speakers and non-native varieties, linking their analyses to two diasporas
concerning the expansion of English related to colonialism (B. B. Kachru & Nelson,
1996a; Y. Kachru & Nelson, 2006). From a historical perspective, the first “diaspora”
occurred as the British empire colonized North America, Australia, and New Zealand.
Consequently, English spread from a distant island to two large continents
(Pennycook, 2010). The second “diaspora” was the outcome of colonialism in Asia
and Africa (B. B. Kachru & Nelson, 1996a). Although English was “exported”
(Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 3) to the colonies by a small number of English speakers, it
flourished among a greater number of indigenous people and grew into an important
language (B. B. Kachru & Nelson, 1996a; Y. Kachru & Nelson, 2006). Various
Englishes came into being during the colonial age, manifesting local people’s unique
features and identities. The far-reaching influence of these multifarious
institutionalized Englishes persisted until the post-colonialism period (Seidlhofer,
2011) which will be explored in a later section of this chapter.

Colonization is explained by Canagarajah (1999) as follows: “in this form of
geopolitical relationship, communities related to each other in a hierarchical and
unilateral fashion. The dominant communities assumed the superiority of their
cultural and social systems, even that of their language, and attempted to spread their
influence at the cost of local traditions” (p. 230). Colonialism, viewed by Pennycook
(2001) as “global capitalism” (p. 66), is “about far more than just economic and

political exploitation; it was also a massive movement that both produced and in turn was produced by colonial cultures and ideologies” (p. 67). One of the major consequences of the expansion of English is that it has brought forth issues of power and ideology (B. B. Kachru & Nelson, 1996a; Y. Kachru & Nelson, 2006). English became a token of privilege of the dominant caste (Canagarajah, 1999; Kachru & Quirk, 1981). Kachru and Quirk (1981) note that the diffusion and utilization of English have demonstrated the political power and impact of English-speaking countries. Language has given way to power which is in the hands of the ruling elites (Mufwene, 2002). The predominant role of English was solidified when the United States became the leading economic and political power in the world (Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008; Pennycook, 2010; Seidlhofer, 2011).

Coupled with opportunities, English has also created economic, social, and political obstacles and perpetrated injustice and inequalities across the globe (Tollefson, as cited in Pennycook, 2010, p. 116). B. B. Kachru and Nelson (2006) document that English colonizers acted as “linguistic codifiers, and gatekeepers” (p. 18) in judging whether non-native English speakers were eligible to share their resources by becoming users of English. As a result, multiple dichotomies have been created between, for example, British and American English, codified English and non-codified Englishes, and native speakers and non-native speakers. Moreover, there has been considerable contention over issues such as “whose language is this?,” what is the norm? (p. 10), and how to assess English proficiency/ies (Canagarajah, 2006c). These issues will be explored in greater detail in Chapters 3 and 4.

Globalization: English as a Commodity

Giddens (1990, p. 64), as cited in Block (2008, p. 31), defines globalization as “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa.” The power and inequities established as a result of colonization have been further entrenched given recent trends in globalization. Globalization processes accumulate power and wealth for the countries that already have amassed resources. Although there is an increasing trend in the movement from the south to the south (e.g. between African and Asia countries), developed northern countries that possess advanced knowledge and technology still dictate “international academic mobility” and stand to gain the most profits (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 291). With the increasing trend toward globalization, it has been argued that the world has become a “global village” (McLuhan & Powers, 1989). Pennycook (2010) indicates that “Globalization is not only about economic processes, but political, technological and cultural processes as well.” Triggered by capitalism, globalization is tied to “international capital” (p. 113). As “a cause and consequence of globalization” (Seidlhofer, 2011), English has become a “world language” (Mair, 2003) and a commodity (Block, 2008; Rajagopalan, 2005). This means that English has gained value and currency to acquire linguistic capital and power (Kachru, 1986). The economic value of English is therefore allocated significant importance in the job market. Therefore, the learning of English on the part of non-native speakers is becoming more significant. Two outcomes of the commodification of language are:

the imposed monetary connotations of the language (Block, 2008, p. 35) and the interpretation of language “as measurable skill, as to a talent, or an inalienable characteristic of group members” (Heller, as cited in Block, 2008, p. 35).

Consequently, minority people’s languages are devalued and these people are financially disfranchised and excluded (Heller, as cited in Block, 2008, p. 35).

Knigh (2012) asserts that one significant dimension of globalization is international migration. The current scale of international mobility is at an unprecedented rate of increase. “Cross-border education” (p. 36), namely, addressed by Knigh (2007) as “transnational, offshore, and borderless education,” has gained in popularity. Migrants in this academically mobile market are diverse, ranging from international students to teachers, scholars, and researchers (Knigh, 2012).

Intensifying these global trends has been the push towards internationalization of higher education adopted by institutions of higher education, and qualified as a strategy in “the toolkit of responses available (primarily at institutional and national levels) to address the many and diverse opportunities and imperatives presented by the overwhelming forces of globalization” (Rumbley, Altbach, & Reisberg, 2012, p. 4).

Internationalization of Higher Education

Internationalization of education is defined by Knigh (2003) as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (p. 2). Knigh (1999) distinguishes between the dynamics of globalization and internationalization in this

manner: “Globalization can be thought of as the catalyst while internationalization is the response, albeit a response in a proactive way” (p. 14), and more specifically, “Internationalization is changing the world of higher education, and globalization is changing the world of internationalization” (Knight, 2004, p. 5).

If globalization is a “process” (Knight, 2012, p. 30) and an inevitable political, economic, and social tendency in the new era, internationalization is open to multiple options, by focusing on policies and strategies in face of the globalized higher education setting (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009). Internationalization embraces both “at home” and “abroad” dimensions (Knight, 2012, p. 27). It aims at curricula enrichment, educational quality and reputation, competitions, reforms, as well as financial profits (Rumbley, Altbach, & Reisberg, 2012). Internationalization is driven by political, social, academic, and economic forces among which the economic motivation ranks as the top triggering factor. Internationalization is believed to be a strategic goal of higher education “as a compelling agent of change in its own right” and also as “a potent catalyst for new models” (Rumbley, Altbach & Reisberg, 2012). Although original rationales and expected results are to provide access, address needs of a diverse population, and promote citizens’ awareness of obligations (Altbach & Knight, 2007), it is facing great risks of being privatized, commoditized, and commercialized (IAU, 2014; Knight, 2012; Rumbley et al., 2012). The escalating market-orientation of internationalization has raised ethical concerns for higher education, foremost amongst which is the fostering of elitism. Since the expenses of international

education are high, only those students from affluent families are able to be internationally mobile while the majority of students born into families with low socioeconomic status are deprived of opportunities of studying abroad. Therefore, international education is restricted to the privileged class. Second, with large resources flowing from developing countries into developed countries, poorer developing countries suffer from “brain drain” and therefore further disadvantage whereas richer developed countries enjoy “brain gain” and increased advantage. Therefore, internationalization has produced unevenly allocated resources and unequal opportunities between countries, regions, higher institutions, and individuals (Knight, 2012; Rumbley et al., 2012). Additionally, higher education is viewed as a private merchandise instead of a public accountability (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Rumbley et al., 2012). Finally, not surprisingly, there have been numerous claims linking internationalization to “westernization, Americanization, Europeanization, or modernization” (Knight, 2012, p. 29).

The International Association of Universities’ 4th global survey (IAU, 2014) reveals that the majority of universities worldwide have placed internationalization as an integral part of their goals and plans. Fifty-three percent of participating universities have set policies for internationalization; 61% have allotted funds to internationalization; and 66% have designed assessments to appraise the execution of their internationalized policies. What about Canada? Based on the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada’s (AUCC) survey (2014), over 95% of Canadian universities report that their “strategic or longer-term planning” gives 89%

attention to internationalization (p. 9). More than four fifths of Canadian higher institutions treat internationalization as their first concern in their education plans. Importantly, there has been an enormous increase in the number of full-time international undergraduates studying at Canadian campuses from 22,300 in 2000 to 89,000 in 2014; and the number of full-time international graduate students rose from 13,000 to 44,000.

Trilokekar (2009) contends that internationalization is a “strategic national policy on international education” (p.100). According to AUCC (2014), the main rationales for internationalization are producing “internationally knowledgeable and interculturally competent” global citizens with international lenses and capabilities, building collaboration with other foreign universities, reaping profits, enhancing international reputation, and improving internationalized education (p. 12). However, in terms of virtually linking “international competences” (p. 29) with students’ learning results as the institutions’ objective, there is a much smaller percentage, 10%, at Canadian universities in 2014, as compared with that at American universities, 55%, in 2011.

Given the preceding, I would argue that in Canada there has been a paucity of discussion over how to take up the implications of internationalization in the 21st century. Notwithstanding, internationalization has become an important theme in Canadian higher education circles, although universities’ efforts to address related concerns are mostly limited to the local level (Shubert, Jones & Trilokekar, 2009).

According to researchers, three core issues have arisen regarding internationalization of higher education institutions. These issues concern: international students, internationalizing curriculum, and international teachers.

International students. Since internationalization produces high mobility, there is an increasing number of international students studying globally, and many of them choose to pursue their studies at English-speaking countries. Almost 65% of international students have been attracted to North America and Western Europe (Albach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009). As one of the largest and most powerful providers, the United States plays the most active role in the international migration process (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 291). The Institute of International Education's (IIE) Open Doors data (2014) show that there were 886,052 international students studying in the United States in 2013/2014, increased by 8% as compared with the previous year. From a world perspective, it is estimated that there were 3.3 million "internationally mobile students" across the globe in 2008 (OECD, 2010, as cited in Rumbley et al., 2012). It is also predicted that the number of international students will grow from 1.8 million in 2000 to 7.2 million in 2025 (Bohm, Davis, Meares, & Pearce, 2002). According to the estimation of Australian scholars, the predicted figure is more staggering: around 15 million international students by 2025 (Albach & Knight, 2007).

Marginson and Sawir (2011) argue that although academic mobility and cross-border education provide international students with numerous opportunities and possibilities for their development and "self formation," these opportunities also

pose great challenges (p. 149). In Marginson's (2014) study, nearly two thirds of 290 interviewed international students studying at Australian and New Zealand universities reported isolation and loneliness in certain periods of their studies. In a similar vein, in Sawir et al.'s (2008) research, 130 out of 200 (or 65% of) international students from 30 countries studying at 9 universities in Australia reported alienation or loneliness, including social (caused by estrangement of domestic students and the absence of social circles), personal/emotional (generated by the lack of support from parents and relatives), and cultural (engendered by favored cultural and language norms to abide by) problems. Likewise, referring to the Canadian Bureau for International Education's (CBIE, 2014) investigation, a survey conducted by four major British educational organizations reports that two thirds of the international students in the United Kingdom do not have domestic fellow student friends, with 56% in Canada, and 40% in the United States (Gareis, 2012, as cited in CBIE, 2014). It is therefore not surprising to learn that in Leask's study (2010), native-born students passed the empty chair near the international students in the classroom and chose to sit with peers from their same cultural background.

Indeed, extant research suggests that despite the positive presence of international students on campuses and the contributions of increased diversity, these individuals appear invisible to their domestic classmates and teachers and their values are not respected or appreciated (Gopal, 2011b). As well, international students do not feel the connectedness to their host universities and are viewed as

cultural others (Beck, 2013; Marginson & Sawir, 2011; Trahar, 2010; Thom, 2010). Although domestic students are strongly encouraged to take the initiative to interact with international students, international students often find that the communication with the domestic students is not effective or successful (Sawir et al., 2008) due to both internal and external obstacles (CBIE, 2014). Based on Sawir et al.'s (2008) and Marginson's (2014) reports, the roots of such exclusion and loneliness are attributed to conflicting Western individualist and Asian collectivist values, obstacles in interaction, complex hybrid identities, and stereotypic "relational deficit" model manifested especially in language (Sawir et al., 2008, p. 152). Sawir et al. (2008) explicitly argue that linguistic proficiency is closely tied to the source of loneliness and that a top priority needs to be language support for international students. They further suggest that the combination of perceived individual, social, and cultural deficiencies leads to international students' feeling of isolation. As the curriculum and the pedagogy are mainly Eurocentric, these transposed individuals do not feel comfortable or secure in their new classrooms. Moreover, such discomfort exerts a harmful influence on their studies (Clifford, 2010), producing an erosion in their confidence and causing them to lose the desire to socialize or integrate with the host society and its associated culture (Beck, 2009). The isolation will also damage their self-respect and result in "academic attrition" (Sawir et al., 2008, p. 156).

Deficiency models of language proficiency are attributed as one of the key reasons accounting for international students' difficulties: "Within traditional EFL methodology there is an inbuilt ideological positioning of the students as outsider

and failure — however proficient they become” (Graddol, 2006, as cited in Mackenzie, 2014, p. 8). The English proficiency of ESL and EFL students is judged against the standardized native speaker norm (Cook, 2002, as cited in Mackenzie, 2014, p. 8) and any deviation from the standard is regarded as incorrect usage (Stevens, 1992b). This entrenched perception has deeply permeated into English language teaching (Seidlhofer, 2011) and standardized English testing (Lowenberg, 1992).

Marginson and Sawir (2011) contend that these deficit models fail to treat international education as a process of student-centered self-construction, rather, concentrating on the notion of “cultural fit” (p. 30) by stressing “adjustment” (p. 30), “acculturation” (p. 22), and “integration” (p. 34). It is further argued that the “cultural fit” premise coincides with the ethos of mainstream schools, teachers, and policy makers to “normalize” cultural “Others” (p. 35). These deficit models not only segregate international students, but also provide domestic students and faculty with immunity from accommodating to cultural diversity. Marginson (2014) argues that if international education can be viewed as self-construction rather than other-orientation, the preconceived deficient image of an international student will be changed to that of “a strong agent” (p. 12) capable of navigating their multiple identities in the host society. Further, newly acquired learner autonomy, aspiration, and constant “cultural negotiation” (p. 19) will motivate international students to acquire English, be successful in their academic performances, and may even

gradually alter their ways of thinking and living instead of moving toward unrealistic normative standards.

Internationalizing curriculum. An important process that impacts the speed of overall internationalization is to internationalize the curriculum (Altbach & Knight, 2007). Not only English-speaking countries have internationalized their curricula to attract international students, but also many non-native English-speaking countries across the globe (e.g. China, India, Philippines, and Malaysia) have started to establish English programs and courses in order to enroll international students (Altbach & Knight, 2007). However, following Caruana (2010), the internationalization of the curriculum cannot occur in Eurocentric and ethnocentric educational settings, that is, within institutions that endorse monolingual and monocultural norms for learning and teaching. Leask (2001) conducted a case study of the internationalization of the curriculum at the University of South Australia. Instead of implementing the traditional method of merely emphasizing content, the newly internationalized curriculum of this university stresses process as well. By striving for equity, diversity, and inclusivity, the university stipulates the norm of quality teaching as entailing student centeredness, cultural awareness, and empathic support. The university's internationalization of the curriculum concentrates its efforts on designing courses, modeling students' international lenses, and promoting teaching and learning techniques, particularly targeting the population of international students.

International teachers. Driven by the tremendous universal demand for English (Seidlhofer, 2011) and universities' commitments to multiculturalism, higher education institutions have begun to concentrate not only on enrolling a diversified student demographic, but also on the employment of international faculty (Leask, 2010, p.19) as a supplement to their full time, tenure stream faculty complement. The term "international teachers" has been used to refer to bilingual, non-native English-speaking teachers (with monolingual native English teachers as frame of reference), and/or teachers considered on the periphery of the teaching cohort as compared with their native-speaking counterparts considered at the center (Braine, 1999b; Thoms, 1999).

Although the number of international teachers has been listed by the Financial Times as one of the major factors in evaluating the quality of universities, there is still an underrepresentation of international faculty on campuses (Richardson, McBey & McKenna, 2009). Exacerbating the situation is the fact that Canada is facing challenges related to fiscal resources for higher education; and there are not sufficient qualified faculty members to meet the demands of campus diversification, including satisfying international students' needs (Richardson et al., 2009). Clifford (2010) asserts that many faculty members lack adequate training and experience in teaching culturally, linguistically, and ethnically diverse students (Gopal, 2011a). If teachers lack the expertise and perspectives needed for the display of "intercultural competence," considered an indispensable part of internationalization in higher education (CBIE, 2014, p. 38), how can they act as "primary facilitators" (Johnson,

2003, p. 22) and “border crossers” (Giroux, 1992) to prepare their students to succeed in a multicultural context?

Based on the definition provided by Deardorff (2009), “intercultural competence” denotes the capacity to exploit one’s intercultural perspectives, interpretations, and knowledge to communicate appropriately and successfully in culturally diverse environments. Intercultural competence in cross-cultural communication enables one to be culturally sensitive to different cultures and interact with cultural others effectively (Hiller & Wozniak, as cited in Gopal, 2011a, p. 374). Thom (2010) notes that intercultural competence has proven a necessary quality for students to achieve success and exert leadership in encountering international challenges. On the part of teachers, in Clifford’s (2010) research culturally responsive teachers were perceived as ones who could provide students with valuable international education perspectives. International faculty were considered by Rumbley et al. (2012) to be effective in integrating the curriculum with both learners’ academic experiences and global perspectives. Chimbanga (2014), as well, affirms the importance of recruiting international teachers to changing the scenario in higher education; and de Wit, Lauridsen, and Straight (2014) declare that the inclusion of diverse international faculty with culturally responsive teaching methods can substantially impact current curriculum, influence teaching methods and learning outcomes, and enable students to respond appropriately to the calls of internationalization and become global citizens in the new era.

English as a Medium for Multiculturalism within the Canadian Context

Multiculturalism is a key concept used in the determination of how to find an optimal approach of facilitating internationalization in higher education (de Wit et al., 2014). According to the American Council on Education (ACE, 2007), while internationalization is a “transformative change initiative” “into all aspects of the teaching, research, and services functions of an institution” (p. 19), multiculturalism is “more than just curriculum reform. It is both an educational and social reform movement that seeks to establish equity and equality, the elimination of social oppression, and the acceptance and valuing of human diversity” (p. 18). The commonalities and convergence of internationalization and multiculturalism are addressed in recent literature on multicultural education and international education. It is claimed that internationalization benefits from multicultural content in broadening its former “monolithic” lens (ACE, 2007, p. 5); in turn, multiculturalism “becomes enriched when it consciously incorporate[s] global perspectives” (Cortes, 1998, p. 116, as cited in ACE, 2007, p. 5). Moreover, the overlap of internationalization and multiculturalism enables the shift of focus from “Eurocentricism” to decolonization (ACE, 2007, p. 24), and from “ethnocentrism” to “ethnorelativism” (Bennett, 1993, p. 22, as cited in Otten, 2003, p. 15).

Cultural diversity in schooling settings is a phenomenon shown to be beneficial to both domestic and international students in broadening their horizons and enriching their perspectives (Jones & Caruana, 2010) and to teachers in responding to the needs of students and communities (Schechter & Sherri, 2009). Leask (2010)

points out that at an individual level, intercultural competence helps students to comprehend others' and their own cultures more perceptively. The university students (both local and international) who participated in Leask's (2010) research study depicted the exposure to other cultures as helping them to interpret the outside world, develop tolerance and appreciation of diversity, and interact appropriately across cultures. Similarly, in Schechter and colleagues' (Schechter & Ippolito, 2008; Schechter & Sherri, 2009) research, linguistic and cultural diversity is seen as a resource in fostering students' academic development and social integration as well as teachers' capacities to address the needs of students in settings characterized by super-diversity and flux.

In 2010, Equality Challenge Unit (ECU) launched a project involving six universities in the United Kingdom and Australia in the examination of the intersection of diversity and equality with internationalization. It was found that effective diversity does not lie in "normalizing" students, but rather relies on encouraging differences (p. 15) and developing a tolerant and friendly institutional climate, instead of forming "we-versus them" "hostile campuses" (p. 8). Beck (2013) maintains that the institution of the university, as a chief "agent" (p. 43) and "site" of education (p. 44), is supposed to be a place of inclusivity (Tan & Allan, 2010; Thom, 2010) where diversified values and different, including cosmopolitan, ways of thinking and living are fostered (Appiah, 2006; Beck, 2013; Brock, 2009; Brown & Held, 2010; Thom, 2010; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002), by instilling principles of

diversity and multiculturalism in higher education (Gopal, 2011a). In this way, students are expected to be genuinely “at home in the world” (ACE, 2007).

Notwithstanding the Canadian government’s adoption of multiculturalism as its official policy in 1971 (Tierney, 2007), as well as the emphasis on diversity within Canadian schooling circles, researchers (e.g., Gaskell, 2010; Thobani, 2007) have argued that equity and access are not achieved in the multicultural framework. Chimbanga (2014) highlights that departing from its original mission, multiculturalism in Canada fails to provide equal access and equity, but marginalizes and excludes poor, racialized students. Nuancing this argument, de Wit et al. (2014) contend that what perpetuates inequality is the pervasive use of English as the sole language of instruction language at school, a phenomenon that induces monolingualism, homogenization, and a native-speaker norm. Although within multicultural environments, English is clearly a useful tool with regard to the building of cultural consciousness, learning, and pedagogy (Kachru, 1996a), Rumbley et al. (2012) have argued that the escalating application of English as an instruction medium has brought about a transition in the language’s role from being a vehicle to becoming a national and international objective. That is, the ubiquity of English results in “Anglophonization,” with native-born English speakers charged with the oversight of heritage languages and cultures (de Wit et al., 2014). As a result, “multilingual classrooms” with “monolingual” English-speaking teachers is a commonly found phenomenon within Canadian schools (Thomas, 1999, p. 12).

Summary

In the preceding discussion, I have reviewed historical processes that have led to my presence as a doctoral student at a North American university and my position as a tutor in a higher education Writing Centre. Specifically, I examined how processes of colonization and contemporary trends of globalization, internationalization, and multiculturalism have resulted in both the increased concentration of international students and faculty within North American universities and the concomitant expansion of the role of English within these settings. In Chapter 3, I expand on the complex status of the English language within the current postcolonial era.

Personal Rationale

I am one of many non-native, English language speakers working as English language teachers throughout the world. While my situation might be considered unique were it to apply to a teacher of a language that does not enjoy pre-eminent status within a broad international sphere, it is not an isolated case in the context of English which enjoys the status of “global language” (Crystal, 1997), “international language” (Llurda, 2004; Modiano, 1999), and “Lingua Franca” (Canagarajah, 2006b; Canagarajah, 2007; Eoyang, 1999; Ferguson, 1992; Phillipson, 2000; Seidlhofer, 2001). In fact, at present there are more people speaking English as their second language (L2) throughout the world than native speakers of English (Llurda, 2004; Widdowson, 1994); and the use of English is not limited to native-speaking contexts (Widdowson, 1994).

As a result of English's expanding status as a "world" language, there is an increased demand for qualified English language teachers. Native English speakers are insufficient to satisfy the global demand for English language courses. It is estimated that over 80% of positions within the English language teaching (ELT) professions worldwide are taken up by non-native speakers (Braine, 1999a; Canagarajah, 2005), and that there are four non-native English-speaking teachers to one native speaker (Braine, 1999a; Kachru, 1996). Also noteworthy is that in most contexts, English is instructed by non-native teachers to non-native students, and that it is likely that members of neither category have communicated with a native speaker before in their lives (Kachru & Nelson, 1996a).

By way of background: I was born and raised in China. From the ages of 18 to 22, I attended Sichuan International Studies University (SISU) where I completed a B.A., with a major in English. From 1996 to 2011, I taught English at SISU in China. In 2006, I earned a Master's degree in Language Learning and Education from the University of York in the United Kingdom. I was then accepted as a Visiting Scholar at Michigan State University where I taught Chinese for one year (2007-2008).

In September 2011, I immigrated to Canada and began my doctoral studies as a Ph.D. student in a Faculty of Education at a major, cosmopolitan institution of higher learning. As part of the package of support for full time graduate students enrolled in Ontario universities, I was required to work as a Teaching Assistant within the university. I was pleased to learn that I was assigned to work as an instructor attached

to a Writing Center with a mandate to assist students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds with their academic writing for their degree.

Almost half of the students who visit the Writing Center are ESL or EFL students. The former chair of the Writing Department (affiliated with The Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Development) informed me that I was the only non-native English-speaking teacher to be employed at the Writing Centre in the last ten years. He expressed confidence that my cultural and linguistic background would prove a valuable resource for the Writing Center, and that my experiences, strategies, and perspectives would enrich those of native English-speaking teachers with whom students would also come in contact and, in this manner, help students to attain their academic goals.

I was thrilled at the prospect of this new placement! This was work with which I was familiar and felt comfortable. After many trials associated with my family's history and living conditions in China, and following a difficult and tortuous process of immigration to my New World home, I hoped that I had at long last found a niche where I belonged.

However, my doctoral dissertation does not constitute a narrative about belonging. Instead, my research odyssey has entailed a complex, intellectual pathway to understanding of how it is that I have now become disenfranchised with regard to the English language or, how I have acquired non-expertise in an area in which I had previously been recognized as an authority (Schechter et al., 2014). For it has indeed been my experience that during my employ as instructor at the Writing Center for the

last four academic years (2012-2016), my qualifications and consequently professional identity as an ESL teacher have repeatedly been brought into question. It is clear to me that my students' perceptions of me are significantly different than those of my former students in China, who never found cause to question my authority as an English professor. It is also clear that some students held/hold resistant, even antagonistic, attitudes towards me and have determined not to revisit me for writing assistance. Moreover – and this has been perhaps the most unsettling aspect of my voyage to dis-enfranchisement – my credentials have been challenged not only by White, native English-speaking North American students, but by non-White immigrant students as well, some of them from my own linguistic and ethnic background! Ironically, as a hybrid product of the Chinese, British, and Canadian education systems, I have become familiar with various cultures and different writing conventions. Being myself a commuter, I am able to assist my students to shuttle between the North American academic culture and their cultures of origin (Steinman, 2009a; Canagarajah, 2006a). Notwithstanding my rich and varied international teaching experience as well as acquired intercultural competence, my strengths are neither acknowledged nor valued, but instead regarded by some of my students as weaknesses and deficiencies. However, one light in this tunnel is that through the frameworks for conceptualization that I was able to access during the course of my dissertation research, I am able to problematize, and begin to understand, the collection of personal, academic, and professional experiences that have brought me to this peculiar place.

Dissertation Outline

My dissertation unfolds across eight chapters. In this first chapter I have engaged the issue of what it means to be a non-native English language speaker working as an English language instructor in a North American university through the passageway of a discussion of processes of globalization that have led to western institutions of higher education pursuing strategies of internationalization. I also summarized some of the research on the influence of these changes on international students and international faculty. Finally, I provided a personal rationale for my choice of dissertation topic.

In Chapter 2 I elucidate the two theoretical frameworks that undergird my dissertation research: Bourdieu-ian notions of “cultural capital” and “legitimate language” and Critical Race Theory (CRT). In the first, I concentrate on the relevance of Bourdieu’s notions of “cultural capital” and “legitimate language” to my dissertation study. The second of these discussions is devoted to the definitions, foci, and tenets of Critical Race Theory that places race and racism at the kernel of the analysis. I also examine the intersection of these two theoretical frameworks for my research purposes. Chapters 3 and 4 provide two comprehensive literature reviews of research relevant to my dissertation focus. Chapter 3 explores the proliferation of English as a “world” language, including the topics of overview of world Englishes, responses to English as a world language, sociolinguistic debates on native speakerism, native-speakerism as hegemony, and writing norms: monomodality versus multimodality. Chapter 4 reviews studies on teachers of English as an

international language and research on native versus non-native speaking language teachers. Chapter 5 outlines my study design, elucidating the research context, the study's research questions, data collection methodologies, and procedures for data analysis. In this chapter I also discuss the negotiation of human participants protocols.

In Chapters 6 and 7, I outline my study's findings. In Chapter 6 I provide the student perspective on the same subject matter through a discussion of native-speaking and non-native English-speaking students' perceptions of non-native English language teachers. Chapter 7 is written from the instructor's perspective, and details the problems and challenges encountered by a non-native English-speaking language teacher. In Chapter 8 I discuss my research results, speculate on anticipated theoretical and applied contributions, and make recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2

Conceptual Frameworks

In order to illuminate my research analysis, I will use two conceptual frameworks—Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986, p. 243), with particular reference to his notion of “legitimate language” (Bourdieu, 1977c, p. 648; 1991, p. 47; Schechter et al., 2014) and Critical Race Theory (e.g. Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; James, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1998, 1999; Solorzano, 1997; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001; Stovall, 2006), paying attention to the fact that space is not neutral (Cote-Meek, 2014; Razack, 2002; Schick, 2002). These two theoretical frameworks, while focusing on different aspects of societal inequality, share complementary features that will be useful for my study in that they are both concerned with issues related to power, difference, access, and identity. In this chapter, I elaborate on these two conceptual frameworks, discuss their relevance to my research, and the intersections of these two constructs.

Bourdieu: “Cultural Capital”

Central to Pierre Bourdieu’s (1986) theories is one important concept related to my research agenda, involving notions of symbolic capital—both “cultural” (p. 243) and “social” (p. 248).

Bourdieu (1986) expands the notion of capital to encompass all dimensions of power. People and groups utilize numerous resources (i.e., economic capital, cultural capital, social capital, and symbolic capital) to sustain and boost their social positions. Multiple capitals operate to solidify power relations and can compensate for and supplement one another such that they are interchangeable (Swartz, 1997). Economic

capital refers to financial and monetary resources. Social capital denotes social connections and networks. Bourdieu (1986) would argue that economic capital is at the center of all other forms of capital and that other categories are camouflaged types of economic capital. I take up the notion of cultural and symbolic capital in more depth below.

The notion “cultural capital” refers to accumulation of cultural knowledge and social capacities that are valued by mainstream society (Yosso, 2005, p.76). For Bourdieu (1986), unequal educational attainment amongst groups of school-aged children and youth results from differential experiences with cultural training, where the cultural nurturing provided in privileged families is more compatible with the norms of mainstream society and schools (Griffith & Smith, 2005; Lareau, 2003). Cultural capital, therefore, encompasses educational credentials, language capacity/dexterity, and other forms of cultural knowledge that are class-dependent (Dimitriadis & Kamberelis, 2006). For Bourdieu (1985), the differential distribution of cultural capital forms the foundation of social hierarchies and societal inequities in the contemporary world.

Leonardo and Broderick (2011) report that children from the dominant class, endowed with cultural capital and privilege, are viewed as intelligent. By contrast, children from the lower class are perceived to have capital that is intellectually inferior. Intelligence, constructed of capital, is a social formation, not “real (ontologically), objective (epistemologically), or useful (clinically)” (p. 2218).

Intelligence has become “cultural capital, commodity, or property (rather than some

objective cognitive or neurological state)” which is used to differentiate who has cultural capital and who does not (p. 2223). Yosso (2005) explains that Bourdieu’s cultural capital is embodied by the White, middle class. Leonardo and Broderick (2011) write that the manifestations of all other cultures have to be measured against the White, middle-class code and standard. As a result, similar to Whiteness, smartness is considered as cultural capital which people of color are less likely to possess. This means that intelligence cannot survive or sustain on its own, without the opposite side in the binary division.

Regarding Bourdieu’s notion of “symbolic capital”: the dominant power seeks justification for their status and the resulting social stratification that their class interests require (Bourdieu, 1986, as cited in Swartz, 1997, p. 74). However, at the same time the overt exposure of the interests of the dominant class will threaten their legitimacy and risk transforming the existent social order. Symbolic capital fulfills this need by legitimizing the oppression of the underclasses through rationalizations that camouflage the privileged classes’ true motives and interests through symbolic acknowledgements (Bourdieu, 1977b). Indeed, Bourdieu (1990) maintains that the major form of domination has switched from public oppression and force to symbolic violence and symbolic power. By “symbolic violence” Bourdieu is referring to claims that the subordinated class regards the domination of the privileged class as legitimate (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). “Symbolic power” refers to the justification of economic and political power as legitimate (Bourdieu, 1987) by gaining approval and acceptance from both the ruling and the ruled classes

(Swartz, 1997, p.89). Further, symbolic capital does not posture as power; instead, it is presented as a disinterested phenomenon (Swartz, 1997), a legitimate requirement for social consent, acceptance, and obedience (Bourdieu, 1986).

Bourdieu: The Notion of “Legitimate Language”

The second pivotal notion in Bourdieu’s theories is “legitimate language” (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 47). Language is regarded as cultural capital. Bourdieu (1977c) claims that language is not only a tool of interaction and knowledge, but also of power. For Bourdieu (1977a), power resides in “belief in the legitimacy of the words and of him who utters them” (p.117). The term “legitimate language” denotes “the authorized language which is also the language of authority” (Bourdieu, 1977c, p.648) and the variety that imposes itself as the norm for all groups and individuals (Bourdieu, 1991). Linguistic resources, therefore, play an essential role in assessing cultural capital and constructing the symbolic power relationship between individuals. For Bourdieu (1977c), linguistic “competence” (p. 653) refers to the capability to exert control over listeners and compel acceptance of the speaker’s message. In seeking to be acknowledged as competent, the speaker aims not only to be comprehended, but also trusted, obeyed, and respected. What matters is not so much the discourse itself, but the efficacy of the speaker as a “social person” (p. 653). “Legitimate language” is therefore a product of discourse being spoken by a “legitimate speaker” (as opposed to an “imposter”), under legitimate circumstances, to a legitimate listener, and articulated using legitimate forms (p.650).

Continuing on: “Linguistic domination” or “linguistic coercion” is in essence an outcome of political domination, a goal achieved by means of inculcating the acceptance of the dominant language as both legitimate and linguistically monopolizing (Bourdieu, 1977c, p.652). The stipulation and implementation of the legitimate language and its embedding into a “linguistic community” is viewed as an effective political strategy through which to create consensus and maintain power and profits (ibid). We see here how for Bourdieu (1991) language is at the center of the struggle to gain and maintain symbolic power within the social structure.

Linking to the educational infrastructure now: educational standards are established in order to assess linguistic competence (similar to cultural capital); and academic credentials are created in order to acknowledge linguistic capital. Moreover, linguistic capital may be transferred inter-generationally as part of one’s cultural capital legacy (Bourdieu, 1991, p.46). Given that there are two ways to acquire cultural capital, that is, through family socialization and schooling, the education system plays a significant role in legitimizing and imposing linguistic norms. Beyond sanctioning the credentialing of linguistic competence, educators implement normative notions of the “ideal speaker-listener,” based on native speaker competence in a monolingual society (Bourdieu, 1991, p.44; Chomsky, 1965). However, this concept of the ideal speaker-listener has aroused many queries, challenges, and debates, a subject I will explore in depth in my literature review.

Consistent with Bourdieu’s framework, Heller (1996) extends the notion of “legitimate language” (Bourdieu, 1977c) to issues of language choice and explores

how language use in social contexts illustrates practices associated with creating, instantiating, and enforcing linguistic norms. Heller tries to discover why certain language forms are deemed legitimate and others not. She observes that a “designated speaker” is not equivalent to a “legitimate speaker” (p. 155). Heller summarizes that legitimacy, rather than being attached to the command of standard French forms, is more linked with internalized knowledge related to how to employ the language and acknowledgement of one’s group membership. As well, in a comparative study, Schechter et al. (2014) examined educational policies and practices that target immigrant, bi-dialectal students in the Greater Toronto Area and la comunidad de Madrid. They found that because of discursive frameworks that shape educational policy in Ontario, including fiscal and career incentives provided school boards and schools to implement state-supported education policies, Toronto educators had a higher tolerance for transnational varieties of the societal language, English, than was evidenced by Madrid educators vis a vis varieties of Spanish. The explanation the researchers offer is that within Spanish society there is a belief that to preserve cultural unity, the integrity of the Spanish language, including the language forms that the educated classes (incorrectly) believe to represent the standard variety, must be preserved. Hence, Madrid educators consider the varieties of Spanish spoken by Latin American immigrants to be inauthentic, and are quick to correct, in the name of “legitimate language,” pronunciation or lexical anomalies produced by these bi-dialectal students (Schechter et al., 2014).

Summary. Bourdieu's concepts of cultural and symbolic capital provide a useful framework for understanding how it is that English has become "a personal and national commodity" through which many EIL students hope to acquire social capital to enable them to lead more affluent lives (Grant & Lee, 2009, p. 45). Specifically, Bourdieu's concepts help to contextualize ESL/EFL (and particularly, Chinese) students' views of my role as a university educator, in the context of their aspirations with regard to the acquisition of social status within a global economy.

Finally, Bourdieu's framework is instrumental for me in reflecting critically on whose capital, whose power, and whose language are deployed in educational settings that involve the instruction and codification of English. Within instructional contexts where the societal language is English, such as the one in which I teach, language varieties are evaluated against a nativized norm (Bourdieu, 1991). Although I am a "designated speaker" of the English language with imbued authority at the Writing Center, I am not regarded by my students as a "legitimate speaker" (Heller, 1996). Consequently, non-native speaking teachers such as myself often feel that they are considered "imposters" by their students and colleagues (Lin et al., 2005, p. 214, as cited in Bourdieu, 1991).

Critical Race Theory

Despite Bourdieu's significant contribution to the theories of "cultural capital" and "legitimate language," he does not explore race in depth. However, race is implicated in my dissertation topic as well. Critical Race Theory (CRT) is an intellectual and revolutionary approach which places race at the core of critical

examination. Critical Race Theory derives much from Critical Legal Studies (CLS), and challenges liberal legal ideals and current beliefs about civil rights. The framework is particularly concerned with race and racism (Roithmary, 1999), analyzing how legal principles and educational concepts and policies are employed to subordinate minorities (Solorzano & Yosso, 2001). Critical Race Theory is used as a significant tool for “deconstruction, reconstruction, and construction – deconstruction of oppressive structures and discourses, reconstruction of human agency, and construction of equitable and socially just relations of power” (Ladson-Billings, 1999, p.10). Researchers focus mainly on two aspects. First, they are interested in investigating the relationship between racism and the seeming race-neutral objectives such as “the rule of law,” “equal protection,” and “merit.” Second, CRT researchers seek solutions to the “vexed bond between law and racial power” (Crenshaw et al., 1995, p.xiii) in order to change the society for “racial empowerment” and “racial emancipation” (Roithmary, 1999, p.5).

There are several tenets ascribed to Critical Race Theory (Solorzano, 1997; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001):

1. The centrality and intersectionality of race and racism

In 1903, DuBois (1989) stated that “the problem of the 20th century is the problem of the color line” (p.29). Racism, based on and justified by “racial superiority and white privilege” (Solorzano & Yosso, 2001, p.4) is a “hegemonic ideology and discourse” which functions to maintain inequality and categorize racial groups (James, 2008, p.382). It is also a construct of “exploitation, and power used to

oppress ... other people on the basis of ethnicity, culture, mannerism, and color” (Lorde, 1992, p.5). Racism is a structure where racial dominance is generated and it is also a process where structures and ideologies are produced inside (Essed, 2002, p.185); therefore, racism is about “institutional power” (Solorzano & Yosso, 2001, p.4), practiced in multiple forms, on various levels, and manifested in different ways (James, 2010). Ibrahim (2009) brings forward the idea that the focal point of race is racialization, a phenomenon that is connected with racism. When race becomes a process of indication, the connotation does not refer to the color, but denotes how the color is indicated. Hence, the focus is not placed on race, but on the “process of its signification: racialization” (p.178).

Leonardo (2005) emphasizes that CRT researchers “privilege the concept of race as the point of departure for critique, not the end of it” (p. xi). According to Gillborn (2015), race, “as a social relationship” (p. 283), is “socially constructed” (p. 284). It implies that the society produces and strengthens difference. Hence, racism is covert, “complex, subtle, and flexible” (p. 278). Under the disguise of normalization, racism is not perceived as a problem by the majority of people.

Gillborn (2015) presents that intersectionality which has crucial importance to dissecting racial injustice is defined as “the question of how multiple forms of inequality and identity inter-relate in different contexts and over time” (p. 278). Intersectionality suggests that people have multiple memberships; nevertheless, their perceived identities influence their experience with the prejudice. Intersectionality is a useful instrument to better understand and analyze racism and the convergence of

race “with other axes of oppression” over time and across places (p. 279). For example, racism interrelates with sexism and classism (James, 2011; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001). The conjunction of race with gender and class largely impacts and predisposes opportunities for youth, their communities, education, and schooling resources available to them (James, 2012). Critical Race Theory scholars point out that racism has at least four facets: (1) it has macro and micro elements; (2) it has institutional and individual aspects; (3) it involves both conscious and unconscious components; (4) it has increasing effects on groups and individuals (Davis, 1989; Lawrence, 1987).

2. The challenge to dominant ideology

Leonardo and Broderick (2011) declare that “White ideology” (p. 2212), functioning as “social grouping” (p. 2211) and “stratification” (p. 2212), “turned white bodies into White people roughly 500 years ago” and enables both Whites and non-Whites to believe that only “certain bodies are White.” White ideology, “untied to certain bodies,” aims to construct “racial cosmology” to maintain White dominance and supremacy (p. 2209). Whiteness has become a universal truth and a self-evident axiom for Whites’ exclusive domination and absolute exclusion of bodies of color (p. 2213).

Critical Race Theory scholars point out that the concepts of objectivity and meritocracy are used to sustain discrimination and subordinate racial and ethnic groups (Charles, 2008; Matsuda et al., 1993; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001; Trevino, Harris & Wallace, 2008). In addition, Critical Race Theory indicates that the

notions of color-blindness, race neutrality, and fairness disguise power and supremacy of the main stream of the society (Calmore, 1992). The merit criteria which are claimed to manifest race-neutrality and objectivity are actually manipulated in a setting of racial subordination and marginalization by dominated groups who wield power. Contrary to being evaluated based on people's merits, minority individuals are judged and excluded by virtue of their race and stereotyping (Roithmary, 1999).

Gorham (1999) advances that ideology is a major notion in stereotypical manifestations as ideology has economic, social, and political roots (James, 2010). James (2010) notes that "stereotypes" were initially used in the print business as "a metal plate with a uniform matrix of type" by aiming at standardization and rigidity (p. 229). James observes that stereotypes are common beliefs and wrong evaluation of other people or groups, based on "over-categorization" and "over-generalization" rules, by upholding "correctness" and "truth" regardless of reality (p. 229). Paul (1998) borrows the psychologist John Bargh's words that kids learn the "socially constructed attributes" related to gender and race by the age of five without any option of agreeing or disagreeing to these properties (p. 55, as cited in James, 2010, p. 230-231). Paul (1998) reasons that "humans, like other species, need to feel that they are part of a group...And while we tend to see members of our own group as individuals, we view those in the out group as undifferentiated—stereotypes—mass." He concludes that "...it seems that stereotyping itself is bred in the bone" (p. 54).

Taylor (1981) explains that stereotypes are exploited as guidelines on “inter-group relations” and social positions, and that by stereotyping, the dominant group distinguish themselves as superior and “positive” (p. 55, as cited in James, 2010, p. 230). James (2010) demonstrates that “racial profiling” is an alternative word for “stereotype,” excluding racialized groups as “outsiders,” “unknown entities,” and “strangers” by linking race not only with visible color, but also with “religion, ethnicity, national origin, and/or birthplace” (p. 231). Dyer (1999) notices that stereotyping is exhibited in various formats where the stereotypes are “naturalized, [and] kept alive” (p. 460). Stereotyping, as “a symbolic frontier,” symbolizes power imbalance (p. 258) and excludes people of color. Hall (1997) treats stereotypes as the signification of racial diversity by stating that “stereotyping reduces, essentializes, naturalizes and fixes ‘difference’” (p. 258).

Under the guise of official multiculturalism policy in Canada, ostensibly colorblind and race-neutral perspectives and practices display and perpetuate “institutional racial power” and white superiority (Roithmary, 1999, p.2). In Canada, as in other countries, as researchers have shown, the camouflage of meritocracy and colorblindness marginalizes and excludes minorities in what might be considered a race-neutral society. However, Critical Race Theory researchers express strong skepticism about the claim of color-blindness, maintaining that this stance is an outcome of a “deeply politicized choice” in sustaining castes, racial subordination, and power (Crenshaw et al., 1995, p. xxviii). Taylor (2000) echoes the view that the assertion of color-blindness ignores social and historical settings and maintains the

privilege of Whites. For this reason, researchers such as Dixon and Rousseau (2005) have suggested that color blindness is “a form of microaggression” (p.16). A position of color-blindness also camouflages the social capital that students bring to school (Yosso, 2005, p.79) and does not encourage teachers to take individual students’ needs and interests into consideration (James, 2012). The critique of color-blindness is a main feature of Critical Race Theory (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005).

3. No space is neutral

Mohanram (1999) unravels the close ties and interchangeable relations between racial and spatial differences: “Racial difference is also spatial difference” (p. 3). Appadurai (1988) challenges the assertion that certain bodies belong to certain space (as cited in Mohanram, 1999, p. 11). Blackness is typified by being connected to “marking,” “static and immobilizing” whereas Whiteness is depicted as disembodiment, mobility, and “the unmarking of the body” (Mohanram, 1999, p. 4). Capitalism is addressed as “commodified and bureaucratized space arranged in the interests of capital and produced as a concerted attempt to define the appropriate meaning of public space and what citizens can do in it” (McCann, 1999, as cited in Razack, 2002, p. 8). Mohanram (1999) establishes that Black bodies in Western Capitalist contexts are envisioned as “out of place” (p. xii), from their natural settings or national borders, or the environment where “they ‘naturally’ belong” (p. xiii). Capitalism represents modernity and Blacks are envisaged as “pre-modern, pre-capitalist construction” (p. 22). In a similar fashion, Appadurai (1988) presents that an Aboriginal person—“one born in bondage,” is defined as “a person who is

born and thus belongs to a certain place...at a distance from the metropolitan West” (as cited in Mohanram, 1999, p. 11). Akin to Black bodies “fixed and frozen in time,” aboriginal peoples are also seen imprisoned in their natural setting as “intuitive, mythical, primitive and, most certainly, inferior” bodies (Cote-Meek, 2014, p. 70). In contrast, Mohanram (1999) expounds that Whites who can move freely physically and intellectually “to take anyone’s place, to occupy any place” are viewed as associated with capitalism, metropolis, and modernity (p. 15). In addition to the confinement to a peculiar space, Black and Aboriginal bodies also become “prisoners of a mode of thought... The science of concrete ultimately becomes the space of incarceration and, in extension, the place of blackness” (p. 11).

Lefebvre (1991) indicates that social space pertains to “the social relations of production and reproduction,” consisting of “perceived space,” “conceived space,” and “lived space,” or “representational space” (as cited in Razack, 2002, p. 9).

Lefebvre further illustrates that the perceived space functions to maintain the social order in that it legitimizes some behaviors and practices whereas forbidding some others by implementing daily regularities. This is echoed by Kress and Leeuwen (2006) with reference to the fact that subjects represent cultural normality. The conceived space shows how people visualize, conceptualize, and symbolize the space. The lived space is the interpretation of the space by “inhabitants” or “users” of the perceived and conceived space (Lefebvre, 1991). Evans and Hall (1999) sketch out that subjects are placed at the core of meaning. However, “meaning is constituted not in the visual sign itself as a self-sufficient entity, nor exclusively in the sociological

positions and identities of the audience, but in the articulation between viewer and viewed, between the power of the image to signify and the viewer's capacity to interpret meaning" (p. 4). Mohanram (1999) capsulates the signification of space in this way: "representation can only occur within relationships of power" (p. 22). Hall (1997) further explains that "how these practices (i.e. how other cultures are signified) are inscribed by relations of power (politics)—especially those which prevail between the people who are represented and the cultures and institutions doing the representing" (p. 225).

Schick (2002) articulates that the university space is "the purely white space" and male-dominated space (p. 111). In order to acquire "white entitlement" (p. 106) within this space, one has to realize who are dominant occupants and who possess power in the space and consequently corresponds himself/herself as "not-Other" (p. 104), as opposed to those non-White subordinate residents in the space. Dyer (1999) postulates that it is this feature of Whiteness—being "everything and nothing" that constitutes its symbolic power dominated by middle-class Anglo-speaking people; it is also this nature that makes it hard to study Whites since "the subject seems to fall apart in your hands as soon as you begin," as a contrast to "Black" ("not just people"), which is a much easier phenomenon to research (p. 459).

Mohanram (1999) contends that "...the inequitable power relationships between various spaces and places are rearticulated as the inequitable power relations between races" (p. 3). The university has become a political space based on race (Schick, 2002). Hall (1997) illustrates that polar dichotomies are set up between "insiders"

and “outsiders” (p. 258) in the university space. The “outside other” (Schick, 2002, p. 102), or “racial other,” residing in “racial space” (Razack, 2002, p. 12), is addressed as “expelled or excluded groups, ‘abjected’ (from the Latin meaning, literally, ‘thrown out’)” (Kristeva, 1982, as cited in Hall, 1997, p. 258). Razack (2002) proposes that identities and differences are shaped by space and that there are a series of binary divisions within the racial space: “the normal and the abnormal body, the former belonging to a homogenous social body, the latter exiled and spatially separated” (p. 11), the “respectable” (i. e. the middle class) and the “degenerate” bodies (i.e. disenfranchised class) (p. 10), the “acceptable and the “unacceptable” bodies (Hall, 1997, p. 258), the “rightful” (Schick, 2002, p. 101) and the erroneous bodies.

Space, being the arena of power, embraces “position, location, situation, center-margin, liminal space, and dominant-subordinate” (Mohanram, 1999, p. xv). Schick (2002) asserts that space, as a metaphor, is marked by the concepts of “fit in” and “out there” (p. 107). Aboriginal and racialized bodies in university classrooms are deemed as “out of place” (p. 113). Mohanram (1999) points out that at university, Aboriginal professors are marginalized and restricted to the space of the Department of Aboriginal Research and that it is a rather new phenomenon for Aboriginal faculty members to take up positions outside of their Aboriginal discipline. Monture-Angus (1995), a Mohawk professor, deploys her own experience in the academia to interpret the meaning of space. She used to work in a Law School where she was mistreated due to her aboriginal origin. Later, she switched to the Department of Native Studies

where she was not envisioned as foreign as before and she felt a more tolerant atmosphere.

The walls of the university's elite space separate privileged space from marginalized space, and in Schick's (2002) article "Keeping the ivory tower White," there exist "exclusive" space segregated from "excluded" space (p. 115), "rational" (p. 111) space from "illogical" (p. 107) space, and inner space from "outer" space (p. 113). Schick elucidates that elitism prevails and permeates at university in her research with 21 White teacher candidates, many of whom had neither European or Anglo background and were not of middle-class status. Schick notes how they were eager to represent themselves as legitimate and respectable residents in the elite space by identifying themselves with White normalcy. Naturally, these pre-service teachers were resistant to their indigenous professor who was thought by them as an "aboriginal body" in "outer spaces" (p. 113). They justified their hostile responses as "reasonable because it is in response to the professor's unreasonableness" (p. 114). In their opinions, the White elite space cannot be overturned, so the identities of the powerful and the powerless cannot be mixed up. Also, they considered that the space could not be polluted by cultural, racial, and non-dominant "Other" (p. 106). Razack (2002) notes that "white subjects are produced as innocent, entitled, rational, and legitimate" (p. 19) and that the university space is the site where the "rational subject" eschews the topic of racism and "bodies of color do not belong" to this White elite space (p. 16).

Whiteness, as embodiment in space, demarcates the boundary between what is a legitimate body and what is not, which is normative space and which is not (Schick, 2002), and who should be and who should not be in that space. Hegemony is existing in the university space, divorcing “in here” (e.g. White professors) from “out there” (e.g. teachers of color) (Schick, 2002, p. 101). In the political, racial, and hierarchical university space, students only “recognize certain bodies as White” (Leonardo & Broderick, 2011, p. 2226). As a result, Chinese bodies are excluded as “Other.” This has a historical precedent. Zong and Perry (2011) report that from the middle 19th century to the early 20th century, Asian people, especially Chinese, were racially discriminated against in Canada. From the enforcement of anti-Chinese laws depriving Chinese of social and political rights, to the physical attacks by the “Asiatic Exclusion League” on China Town, and further to the head tax imposed on Chinese (p. 107), Chinese were seen as second-class citizens and inferior bodies in the imperialistic and hegemonic space.

4. The commitment to social justice

Critical Race Theory is committed to achieving social justice and eradicating inequality (Trevino, Harris & Wallace, 2008) through combating multiple oppressions, including sexism and classism (Solorzano & Yosso, 2001). It adopts a view of equity that privileges outcomes-related goals over a restrictive perspective encapsulated in the reduction of goals to the principle of equal treatment (Crenshaw, 1988). Centering on justice, Critical Race Theory highlights the problems of

“dispossession, disenfranchisement, and discrimination across a range of social institutions” (Trevino, Harris & Wallace, 2008, p.8).

Interest convergence and Whiteness as a property are two useful theoretical tools in Critical Race Theory (Charles, 2008) in combating social injustice. Milner (2008) offers the following instructive example of interest convergence: in a northern city in the U.S., White students are trained to be bilinguals or trilinguals. In addition, much support is given to students who are non-native speakers of English since schools and the city realize that the cultural, linguistic and ethnic wealth those minority students bring to the classroom is valuable to mainstream White students (Yosso, 2005). Bell (2004) argues that there are two rules of interest convergence. First, minority individuals succeed only when their interests are consistent with those of White people. Second, even when the interest convergence works to redress racial problems, if policy makers think the remedy may threaten dominant Whites, it will be abolished. Milner (2008) points out that these principles reflect “a loss-gain binary” (p.334) which echoes Bell’s (1980) claim that Whites only support justice-related policies which will not weaken, change, or endanger their status. Since equity-directed practices may cause Whites to lose their supremacy and privileged positions, as Milner (2008) points out, interest convergence is a goal that is difficult to realize.

The conjunction of race and property rights is central to understanding CRT’s role in education (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). The key feature of whiteness as property is viewed as “the legal legitimization of expectations of power and control that enshrine the status quo as a neutral baseline,

while masking the maintenance of white privilege and domination” (Harris, 1993, p.1715). One of the advantages of such a property is to manipulate rights to deploy absolute exclusion. School funding is a good indicator of inequity and racism in education (Ladson-Billings, 1999), as an outcome of institutional, systemic, and structural racism. Some schools have additional resources, facilities, and activities since affluent parents can provide these schools with more funds.

5. The centrality of experiential knowledge

Critical Race Theory acknowledges that the experiential knowledge of minority groups is legitimate and appropriate for identifying, examining, and educating about racial subordination (Calmore, 1992; Matsuda et al., 1993). Such knowledge and “lived experiences” (James, 2011, p.193; Solorzano, 1997, p.7; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001, p.3) are viewed as wealth by CRT scholars. There are various elicitation approaches that CRT researchers utilize to elicit this experiential knowledge: family history, narratives, storytelling (Bell, 1987), and counter-storytelling (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Stovall, 2006). As the third important conceptual tool in CRT, storytelling/counter-storytelling relates to two core themes of CRT: the experiential knowledge of people of color and the empowerment of minorities (Charles, 2008). Two main goals of this approach are to apply storytelling and narratives to challenge racism (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Parker & Lynn, 2002), and to allow marginalized voices that are devalued by dominant groups to be heard (Charles, 2008; Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Trevino, Harris & Wallace, 2008). Voice scholarship utilizes “counter-stories” to challenge the dominant

discourse, values of mainstream society, and racial hegemony (Charles, 2008, p.64; Fernandez, 2002; Roithmary, 1999, p. 5). One application of voice in the CRT literature is seen in narratives by minority students of their experiences in/with education. These counter-stories reflect both a micro-level of racial discrimination demonstrated by teachers' low expectations and a macro-level of institutional racism where educational programs necessary for guaranteeing students' success in schooling are absent. Another utilization of voice in Critical Race Theory entails the investigation of experiences of minority scholars in higher education. As scholars of color tend to be concerned about race-related issues, their scholarship is often questioned and problematized as "illegitimate, biased, and overly subjective" (Delgado & Villalpando, 2002, p.171). Yosso (2005) sees the experiential knowledge of minority people to lie in the "community cultural wealth," or "accumulated assets and resources in the histories and lives of Communities of Color." The researcher asserts that the subordinate class has powerful and efficacious capitals—including "aspirational, navigational, social, linguistic, familiar, and resistant capital" (p.77).

6. The interdisciplinary perspective

Critical Race theorists are skeptical about a-historicism and ungrounded research into race and racism, and utilize interdisciplinary approaches to situate race and racism in contextual and contemporary settings (Matsuda et al., 1993; Solorzano, 1997; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001). An interdisciplinary perspective is considered essential to understanding subjects' lived experiences (Charles, 2008).

Interdisciplinary research has been used to highlight five societal aspects where inequities manifest along racialized lines: curriculum, instruction, assessment, funding, and desegregation.

In terms of the curriculum, Critical Race Theory has addressed not only sustained misinterpretation, erasure, and stereotyping, but also the lack of inclusivity and accessibility of curricular content. Regarding instruction, Critical Race Theory encourages teachers to make racism salient to their pedagogic approaches so that students are able to identify and fight against racial hegemony and oppression. Teachers are exhorted to take on assessment standards that subordinate people of color (e.g., standardized assessment tests), and school funding disparities that perpetuate inequitable access (Charles, 2008). Concerning the last issue, CRT researchers argue that desegregation measures have failed to redress social inequality; instead, they have redounded to the benefit of Whites (Bell, 1980).

Summary. Since schools are societal sites where the effects of social differentiation are visible, a considerable number of studies grounded in Critical Race Theory focus on conditions of inequity in educational settings (e.g., Henze, 2005). Critical Race educators combat entrenched inequality in schools by questioning the power and authority of dominant groups (Henze, 2005), and by engaging students in critical theorizing about the higher purposes of accountability protocols, such as mass standardized testing (Harris & Herrington, 2006).

Critical Race Theory is highly relevant to my research in helping me to understand and explain the problems and challenges that face non-native English

language teachers in English-speaking higher education institutions. The pervasive existence of racism, together with its intersection with sexism and classism, contributes to creating stereotypes about ideal English teachers in academia. Conversely, as a non-white, non-native-speaking immigrant woman, with unfamiliar and therefore questionable credentials, I am “at the bottom of the academic ranks” (Braine, 1999b, p. 17). Ng (1994) discusses how racism and sexism disempower non-native speaking women teachers. Students not only discriminate against racial minorities and women, but also challenge the knowledge and qualifications of minority teachers who have been imbued with power. She advocates an “anti-sexist/racist approach” which treats racism and sexism as “systemic” and “inter-personal (rather than individual)” and urges educators to fight these pernicious influences collectively (p.44).

Schechter and Cummins (2003) argue that minority cultures are an asset to the whole society, given the diverse linguistic and cultural resources they harness. While ESL students are believed to be valuable for their contributions to creating multicultural and multilingual societies in a global era, why are the benefits of NNS teachers downgraded or ignored? Referring to the interest convergence principle, it is not difficult to find that Whites are interested in protecting and securing their power and status. For this reason, teachers of color are underrepresented among faculty at American higher educational institutions (Laden & Hagedorn, 2000) and are racially discriminated against (Turner & Myers, 1999). If a NNS teacher is fortunate enough to be selected to teach at a university “center,” s/he is under the

constant scrutiny, or “White gaze,” of his/her students and White colleagues (Ibrahim, 2009, p.189). Given this situation, it is not surprising that faculty of color report low job satisfaction (Laden & Hagedorn, 2000).

Intersection of Two Theoretical Frameworks

Critical Race Theory and Bourdieu’s concepts intersect at four junctions.

First, the two frameworks examine the root of inequality in different dimensions and from varying perspectives. Both conceptual constructs assert that inequality originates from hegemony and domination of the privileged class. Since racism converges with classism (James, 2011; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001), the two frameworks have discussed that the dominant class monopolize power and authority and hence perpetuate inequality and injustice. In Critical Race Theory, minorities are marginalized and excluded based on their color. In Bourdieu’s theory, minority groups are powerless because of their unequal cultivation, varying educational experiences, different social and language habitus, and cultural capital caused by their inferior class. As a result, inequality results in oppression and differential treatment.

Second, both conceptual frameworks concern capital, especially cultural capital. Critical Race Theory deals with the visual dimensions of capital. “Raced bodies” (Mohanram, 1999, p. 4) are deemed not to have any (cultural) capital in the White elite space. Also in Critical Race Theory, Whiteness is generated by power which produces “institutionalized privilege,” and as a category, is imbued with social, political, and economic capital (Dei, 2000, p.29). Charles (2008) indicates that the

conjunction of race and property manifested via the concept of Whiteness as property demonstrates that privileged communities possess wealth and better access to resources which implies that Whites own more economic, social, and cultural capitals. For Bourdieu, capital is in the hands of the ruling class, displaying class hierarchies and sustaining inequality (Dimitriadis & Kamberelis, 2006). Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) tend to attribute minority students' poorer academic performances to the lack of those capitals.

However, Yosso (2005) argues that although such cultural knowledge and training are important to students, they are not indispensable to transmit any capital at schools. She shows the inextricable link between Bourdieu's theory and Critical Race Theory by pointing out that Critical Race Theory has switched the emphasis from the dominant class to the marginalized groups and that CRT "expands" Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital. Yosso's finding is in line with Schechter's (2015) conceptualization of the relation between language, culture, and identity. Schechter proposes that minority cultures with community cultural resources, multilingualism and multiculturalism should be viewed as a societal asset in light of the social capital they bring. Despite different forms and angles of the two frameworks, cultural capital and race interrelate, interact, and interplay with each other (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994).

Thirdly, both frameworks stress power, legitimacy, and social stratification. In terms of legitimacy, in the framework of Critical Race Theory, Whiteness as property makes the power of Whites legitimate, masked by White hegemony and domination.

In reality, their agenda is to completely exclude minorities (Harris, 1993). Whiteness as property is achieved via objectifying subjugated people. In Critical Race Theory, a series of appealing notions: e.g., color-blindness, race neutrality, objectivity (Roithmary, 1999), meritocracy, equity (Solorzano, 1997; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001), multiculturalism (James, 2011, 2012a) are highlighted to bring into focus how racial subordination and marginalization are experienced. Additionally, the concept of Interest Convergence indicates how interests converge in ways that minorities people's interests will not conflict with those of Whites and will not threaten their power and privilege (Bell, 1980). In Bourdieu's theory, all actions are interest-oriented. Nevertheless, the principle of legitimacy misleads people to recognize the interests of the dominant class as disinterested (Bourdieu, 1977b). Consequently, in Critical Race Theory, White supremacy creates difference (Dei, 2000) while for Bourdieu, the distribution and manipulation of capital exhibit class and race distinction (Dimitriadis & Kamberelis, 2006). As well, symbolic power is utilized to show social differentiation (Swartz, 1997).

Fourthly, these two frameworks deal with identity. Critical Race Theory explores racial identity, language identity, social identity, and cultural identity. In Bourdieu's works, he examines linguistic identity and social identity. A person's value is not only linked to what s/he says, but their social status (Bourdieu, 1977c). To sum up, the two frameworks have provided a conceptual construction of power relations and domination and have revealed that equity, equality, access, and justice are deceptive terms for the subordinate class. And so, unconscious and subtle discrimination

persists in postcolonial, postsecondary classrooms.

Chapter 3

The Proliferation of English as a “World” Language

The past 50 years have witnessed a flourishing academic discussion of the varied dimensions and varieties of “world Englishes” (Kachru, 1985, p. 2; 1992a, p. 1; 1997, p.67; Kachru & Nelson, 1996a, p. 72; 2006, p. 2), the nature and attributes of students benefitting from the roles, qualifications, and positionalities of professional educators associated with the teaching of these multiple and often complex dialects. These issues, as well as the cognitive, social, and political tensions that they invoke, are explored in more depth in my discussion of relevant research that follows.

Overview of World Englishes

With regard to the purview of world Englishes: there is no doubt that English is the most widely used language in the world (Kachru & Nelson, 1996a), considering its unparalleled influence in language spread, language communication, and language shift (Kachru, 1985). In the twentieth century, no other language has had such “international (i.e., external) and intranational (i.e., internal) purposes” (Fishman, 1992, p. 1; Kachru, 1992a, p. 1). George (1867) and de Quincey (1862) compare the inevitability of the expansion of English as “a mighty river flowing towards the sea” (as cited in Pennycook, 1998, p. 136). The explosive spread of English cannot be accounted for by native speakers whose mother tongue is English, but rather by the proliferation of speakers who use English as their “other tongue” (Strevens, 1992a, p. xi). Although the number of English users have increased rapidly to an estimated two billion (Crystal, 1985), native speakers of English make up no more than a fifth of

the whole demographic. In addition, the employment of English extends far beyond the restrictive boundaries of the original colonial domains and the functions of English are increasingly irrelevant to the nationality of its speakers (Stevens, 1992b). In sum, the advancement of English is attributable to a growth in the demographic of non-native speakers and less influenced by the uses of native speakers.

“World Englishes,” a term coined by Kachru (1992a, p. 1; 1997, p. 67), denotes local English varieties, emerging in geographic areas under the influence of the UK and the US. The concept of “World Englishes,” or “New Englishes” (Platt, Weber, & Ho, 1984, p. 6), focuses on heterogeneity by addressing “implications of pluricentricity” and stresses the acknowledgment of language functions in multiple settings (Kachru, 1997, p.66). The term “Englishes” is used because it embraces “sociolinguistic reality” which the concept “English” lacks (Kachru, 1992b, p. 357). Furthermore, the notion “Englishes” (ibid) expresses variations, diversified sociolinguistic settings, scopes, varieties, and different patterns of acculturation. Moreover, this term underscores the role of English as a useful linguistic instrument as opposed to the native speaker/non-native speaker (NS-NNS) dichotomy (Kachru, 1992a, p.2) and its role in “othering” (McKay, 2010, p.106).

According to Kachru (1985, p.12; 1992a, p.3; 1992b, p. 356-357), the spread of English is shown in three “concentric circles: the inner circle, the outer circle, and the expanding circle.” The inner circle refers to the conventional foundation of English, with speakers who use English as their native tongue. The outer circle involves countries where institutionalized varieties of English are used as “an

additional language” (Kachru, 1992a, p.3), “an alternative language” (Kachru, 1985, p.14), a lingua franca (Canagarajah, 2006b, p.197; Canagarajah, 2007; Mackenzie, 2014, p. 2; McKay, 2010; Pennycook, 2010), and/or a “contact language” (Canagarajah, 2006b, p.197; Canagarajah, 2007, p.924; Firth, 1996, p.240) in “un-English” settings (Kachru, 1985, p.13). The broad speech community created by the outer circle demonstrates diverse and distinctive features (Kachru, 1985). The population of this circle amounts to 1,303 million. If only one person out of ten utilizes English, the implication is that there are 130 million English speakers, by conservative estimation. The expanding circle comprises the countries that use English as their main foreign language (Kachru, 1992a), such as large-populated countries (e.g., China) that use “English as an international or universal language” (Kachru, 1985, p.13). These inner, outer, and expanding circles are ostensibly equivalent to native, ESL (English as a Second Language), and EFL¹ (English as a Foreign Language) denominations. Kachru points out that the three circles, using “norm-providing varieties,” “norm-dependent varieties,” and “norm makers” respectively (Kachru, 1985, p. 16-17), manifest the spread of English, and usher in unprecedentedly “cultural pluralism,” and “linguistic heterogeneity, and diversity” (Kachru, 1985, p.14).

With the fast spread of English, English is used increasingly in non-Western contexts, predominantly by non-native speakers (Ferguson, 1992; Kachru, 1985). In

¹ Marckwardt (1963) defines ESL as "a situation where English becomes a language of instruction in the schools, as in the Philippines, or a lingua franca between speakers of widely diverse languages as in India" and EFL as "English taught as a school subject or at an adult level solely for the purpose of giving the student a foreign-language competence which he may use in several ways – to read literature, to read technical works, to listen to the radio, to understand dialogue in the movies, to use the language for communication with transient English or Americans" (p. 25) which is consistent with Schecter's (1980) explanations of ESL and EFL.

this manner, English demonstrates its significant and powerful position in the contemporary world as a “utility language” (Kachru & Nelson, 1996a, p.77).

Additionally, Kachru and Quirk (1981) find that although there are multiple varieties of languages in the world, all writers utilize English to discuss issues pertaining to NS, NNS, and applications of English in settings around the world, practices which show the broad use and great importance of English in the contemporary world.

Responses to English as a World Language

There have been varying responses across the globe to the world-wide proliferation of English. In Europe, “Educated European English” is put into use when Europeans (e.g. French, German, and Netherlanders) interact with one another in commercial activities (Stevens, 1992b, p. 35). English is developing into a lingua franca in Europe (Modiano, 2005, as cited in Llurda, 2005), producing phenomena such as “Franglais” and “Spanglish” (Rajagopalan, 2005, p. 298). In Germany, English has enjoyed a long tradition for over four centuries while in Poland, Hungary, and Sweden English has recently become a lingua franca (Braine, 2005a; Modiano, 2005).

In Africa, there have emerged some “localized forms of English” (LFE), such as “East African English” (Stevens, 1992b, p. 34). In West Africa, Ghanaians are comfortable with “Ghanaianized” English (Kachru, 1992d, p. 56), or “educated Ghanaian English” (Kachru, 1992d, p. 61), yet they hold a negative view of the standardized norm represented by British English (Kachru, 1992d). In a similar fashion, in the West African country — Nigeria, there are four English varieties

(Bamgbose, 1992), and “the aim is not to produce speakers of British Received pronunciation (even if this were feasible!)...Many Nigerians will consider as affected and even snobbish any Nigerians who speak like a native speaker of English” (Bamgbose, 1971, as cited in Kachru, 1992d, p. 61).

Kachru (1981, as cited in Cheng, 1992, p. 163) summarizes the situation of the surging Englishes as follows: “The non-native Englishes are the legacy of the colonial period, and have mainly developed ‘unEnglish’ cultural and linguistic contexts in various parts of the world, wherever the arm of the Western colonizers reached.” There are diverse responses to the growth of world Englishes in former Western colonies. South American and Asian contexts will be analyzed.

For South America, consider the example of Brazil which was the former colony of Portugal. Braine (2005a) documents that in Brazil, there has been a tug of war between British English and American English norms. Although there is still a very limited number of Brazilians supporting the British English for its perceived cultural neutrality, the American English has taken control because of the economic power of the United States. The expansion and encroachment of English is on the way to replacing Portuguese. Although Brazil boasts the biggest number of speakers of the Portuguese language on the Earth, it is cautioned about the possibility of “Portuguese losing its identity through relentless Anglicization, massive borrowings and indiscriminate use of English” (Rajagopalan, 2002, p. 5, as cited in Braine, 2005a, p. xvii).

In the Philippines, a prior American colony, “Standard Filipino English” is regarded as the model of English in the Philippines (Kachru, 1992d, p. 61). Filipinos believe that as long as the variety is internationally comprehended, it can be put to good use (McKay, 1992). In many other Asian countries which were previous British colonies, localized varieties of English have emerged, namely, “Indian English” in India, “Singlish” in Singapore, and “Lankan English” in Sri Lanka, due to their over fifty years of independence from the control of Great Britain (Braine, 2005a, p. xiv).

Kachru highlights in his earlier works that in India, Indians still favor British English as their norm (1986); nevertheless, in his later studies he finds that in India, “the norm for English was unrealistic and (worse) unavailable — the British English variety” (Kachru, 1992d, p. 56). English has been indigenized in various linguistic aspects (Kachru, 1986), including the standard model of speaking and writing (Kachru, 1983). The “nativized” norm of Indian English has developed into a “grammar of culture” to demonstrate Indian distinctive culture (Kachru Yamuna, 1992, p. 343). Nearly half of educated Indians who use English consider the “nativized” (ibid) English as their internal model as well as the model of English pedagogy.

In Malaysia, at present, people are tolerant of deviations from normalized English as long as the deviations do not significantly hinder interactions. Malaysians question the authenticity of codified language, since they have found many “aberrations” in the standard English in Malaysia (Wong, 1981, p. 103). Wong (ibid) has reported finding a hybrid of the local dialect with standardized British English as

the indigenized and expanded “speech form” in Malaysians’ oral discourse (p. 103). This implies that English with native-speaker patterns is losing its power and seems a foreign language to the average educated individual in Malaysia. Consequently, the state language policy is to regard English as a “utilitarian language” (p. 104), an instrument to be utilized for its communicative potential, rather than an “object” to be worshiped (p. 104). Wong summarizes that the English-speaking context is not monolithic any more. With the emergence and spread of various English varieties, it is not realistic to expect everyone to employ normalized English forms; and students are encouraged to be exposed to non-native varieties in addition to Standard English in order to achieve “mutual intelligibility” with other non-native speakers (p. 107). Wong’s (1981) claims are supported by Lowenberg (1992) who found “morphosyntactic innovations in Malaysian English” and observed that the escalating use of Malay has shaken the status of normalized English (p. 111).

In another study on the proliferation of English, Shaw (1981) conducted a survey of 825 students from twelve higher institutions in three Asian counties: Singapore, India, and Thailand (of which only Thailand is a non-colonial nation). Shaw examined participants’ attitudes toward English and English varieties. Shaw found that in terms of the role of English around the globe, the majority of students considered English as an international language the value of which has been expanded via economic transactions and communication across national borders. With regard to which English variety should be taught, some students chose the non-native variety as the norm to follow. Shaw speculates that their answers indicate

their perceptions of the role of English as a world language. Although Thai students still treat the native-speaker model as their norm, over half of Indians and nearly half of Singaporean students view non-native varieties as the ultimate objective of English language learning. Shaw concludes that the future trend will be toward the “decolonization” and localization of English (p.121), and predicts that in future English will be less dominated by native speakers outside their domains and increasingly by non-native speakers who see English as their home language instead of “a tool borrowed from someone else” (p.122). Shaw’s (1981) finding is supported by Lowenberg (1992) that the “nativized” code of English is widely accepted by people with college education in Singapore (p. 109). It is further upheld by a Singaporean ambassador who, in his speech to the United Nation, stated: “I should hope that when I am speaking abroad my countrymen will have no problem recognizing that I am a Singaporean” (Stevens, 1992b, p. 39).

What are the responses of the non-English colonies to the proliferation of English? Kachru (1992c, p. 8; 1992d, p. 55) points out that in Japan, English, despite its status as a “performance variety,” as compared with “institutional varieties” (Kachru, 1992d, p. 55) used in India and Singapore, has “penetrated deep into the Japanese language and culture” (Kachru, 1992c, p. 5). Japan has had a long history of the recognition of the importance of English. There was voice over a hundred years ago urging replacing Japanese with English to contact the outside world. Hence, the nativized variety of English enjoys a solid position in communication in Japan (Kachru, 1992a).

In China, because of the so-called “new ELT (English Language Teaching) powerhouse,” there were 239 million Chinese learning English at different levels in 2003 (Ministry of Education, as cited in Braine 2005a, p. xvii). Cheng (1992) reports that there are several stages of the evolution of varieties of English in China and Chinese attitudes toward the flourishing Englishes. “Pidgin varieties,” substantially different from the codified English, came into being in the seventeenth century when British colonizers set up a “trading post” in China, followed by a couple of other ports occupied by Western countries (p. 163). With the diminishing effects of “Chinese Pidgin English” (p. 164), British English (Received Pronunciation) has become the norm in China since the 1950s. Following that, the politicized “Sinicized English” came into existence during the specific period in Chinese history — Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) (p. 172). This “political English,” shown in its largely deviant lexis, was not intelligible to Westerners (p. 167). With China’s modernization, China has been on the way to abandoning the outdated literary English translation of some politicized Chinese words and is determined to teach and learn authentic English that makes sense to the outside world. Cheng (1992) sketches out China’s reaction to the English varieties in this way: “When China is inward-looking, the English there acquires more Chinese elements; when China is outward searching, English there is more like the norm in the West” (p. 174). This resonates with Kachru’s (1981, 1992d) recommendation that it is advisable to distinguish the different utilization of the varieties of English locally, nationally, and internationally.

Stevens (1992b) contends that speakers from English-speaking countries also have different attitudes to the thriving of English. The “non-native varieties” have been “tacitly” recognized and accepted by some “native speakers” of English (p. 38). The early recognition dates back to the 1960s. British language teachers in Africa initially began to think it unrealistic to train “Ghanaian and Nigerian schoolchildren to speak English like the British” (p. 38). However, irrespective of these people’s subtle acknowledgement of English varieties and the far-reaching effects of world Englishes across the globe, most native users of English show contempt for Englishes that diverge from their “own language” (Stevens, 1992b, p. 29), or “my language” (Nelson, 1992, p. 327), or “my English” (Kachru & Nelson, 2006, p. 21). They are not tolerant of language variation, and group such varieties as “deficient models of language proficiency” (Kachru, 1992d, p. 59). Such “ignorance” is produced by “lack of awareness of the existence of flourishing, effective, functional, sometimes elegant and literary non-native varieties of English,” and their paucity of experiences of the linguistic contexts of these varieties (Stevens, 1992b, p. 37). Also exemplified by the case in the United States, American teachers still treat American English as the standard for all English learners in the US and overlook the existence and prosperity of plural varieties of English.

Sociolinguistic Debates on Native Speakerism

In recent years, the very construct of native speaker has become a subject of contention for two main reasons underscored by Kramsch (2009), Nunan and Choi (2010), and Schecter (2015). Firstly, the global teaching and learning of EIL have

resulted in the generation of authentic varieties of English that have permeated societal contexts where other languages enjoy national status, and produced home grown professionals in the field of English as a second and foreign language teaching. Secondly, Schecter (2015) points out that as English has become a medium of transnational interaction in global settings, individuals across cultures and national boundaries strive to manipulate the control of the English varieties from native speakers of English. In contention in these various discussions is the definition of “native speaker” (Davis, 1991, p. 146) native speaker and non-native speaker dichotomy, whether the “native speaker” should constitute the linguistic norm, and whether non-native speakers can acquire native status.

Definitions of “native speaker.” There has been considerable debate in applied linguistics circles on who or, more specifically, what characteristics represent the ideal English speaker qua language teacher (Llurda, 2009a). Perhaps the most heated issues engaged within these debates revolve around the definition of the “native speaker” (Medgyes, 1994, p. 10; Paikeday, 1985, p. 3). Various definitions have been proposed for this construct. Cook (2005) visualizes “native speaker” as “a person speaking the language they learnt first in childhood” (p. 49). Medgyes (2001) describes a native speaker as “someone who speaks English as his or her native language, also called mother tongue, first language, or L1” in a conventional sense (p. 430). Phillipson (1992) defines native speakers as users of English with superior mastery of the language, equipped with knowledge about the cultural implications of the language as well as about language forms, and therefore as “final arbiters”

(p.194). Native speakers are considered by Widdowson (1994) as arbiters and “custodians” not only of English, but also of English language teaching (p. 387). As “the only rightful speakers of a language” (Cook, 1999, p. 185), native speakers are conferred on the status of “unassailable authority and absolute infallibility” (Rajagopalan, 2005, p. 285). Davis (2003) portrays native speakers as “stakeholders of the language” and interprets that native speakers “have a special control over a language... they know what the language is... and what the language isn’t...” (p. 1). Native speakers are portrayed by Medgyes (1994) as “potentially more accomplished users of English than non-native speakers” while non-natives speakers are viewed as “pseudo” speakers (p.12). Davies (1991) provides a more circular definition: the native speaker is the one who is not a non-native speaker, while the non-native speaker is the one who is not seen as a native speaker. Bellos (2011) offers another circuitous interpretation: a native speaker is the one with entire mastery of a given language and to have the entire mastery of a given language constitutes a native speaker. Walelign (1986) questions the notion of “native speaker” and argues that it encompasses more than a home language (p. 40). Trudgill (1995) proposes a “more or less” (instead of “either-or”) paradigm that “some people are more native speakers than others” (p. 315).

Native speaker and non-native speaker dichotomy. Randolph Quirk (1990, p. 6, as cited in Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 46) demarcates a rigorous boundary between NS and NNS English, and between “nativeness” (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 50) or “real English” (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 58) and “foreignness” (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 54). Nayar

(1994) portrays the NS-NNS division as a “unicorn theory” in an ironic way. “The native-nonnative model was born and lives on the philosophical assumption that there is an animal that can be called native speaker for any and all of the living languages of the world, and that this animal can be identified through a combination of linguistic and non-linguistic defining features.” Higgins (2003) observes that the NS-NNS division is “more of a social construction than a linguistically based parameter” (p. 616) echoing Bourdieu’s (1977c) claim that the speaker as a “social person” matters more than his/her discourse (p. 653). Medgyes (2001) points out that native and non-native speakers are treated as “two different species” (p. 434) and he problematizes the dichotomy in terms of its linguistic, political, pedagogical, practical implications, and derogatory connotations. Moussu and Llorca (2008) rebut that it is hard to categorize some speakers as native speakers or non-native speakers, such as bilinguals, or multilingual native speakers (Canagarajah, 1999). Braine (1999) expounds that it is even harder to define the “native speaker” in the globalized world when the national borders become blurred in the post-colonial era. Kachru (1981) advises that what make the situation more complex is that when World Englishes are taken into consideration, it would be iniquitous to group English speakers in the Outer Circle as NNS only because they do not speak the variety of the center. Nayar (1994) asserts that with the change in the “ethnic dimension” of the Anglo world, the NS-NNS polarization has to be reassessed. Some researchers have offered insight into revisiting and revising the NS-NNS constructs in two approaches: the

continuum paradigm initially addressed by sociolinguists (J. Liu, 1999; Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001) and the “ownership” alternative (Higgins, 2003, p. 615).

According to Nayar (1994), the continuum mode, paralleling World Englishes, affirms the autonomy of “peripheral variants,” “for the contrastive self-identity of the speakers.” Although mainstream codes are ethno-politically bound, they do not work for these “peripheral varieties” since every individual is a “native speaker” of his or her mother tongue. In the continuum paradigm, individuals find it difficult to divide themselves into NS or NNS group and they can be viewed as either NS or NNS based on the continuum paradigm (Rampton, 1990).

The “ownership” option is posed by Higgins (2003) who asserts that speakers in Kachru’s (1985, 1992a, 1992b) Inner Circle and Outer Circle have different levels of “ownership” of English (Higgins, 2003, p. 615), so this ownership could replace the binary NS-NNS distinction. However, the reality that the notion “native speaker” has been heavily and repeatedly used by scholars and educators has presented discrepancies. Researchers who are engaged in the studies of the irrelevance of the native status, in fact first acknowledge the NS-NNS separation so as to embark on their research. Similarly, the self-ascription of NS or NNS status in reference to a specific language situates one as an insider or an outsider of a linguistic and social group (Arva & Medgyes, 2000).

Canagarajah (2005) suggests the notions of “novice and expert” to supersede the polarized NS-NNS constructs (p. 431). Canagarajah (1999) also proposes alternate terms such as “Center speaker of English” and “Periphery speaker of English” that

are more appropriate to a postcolonial context. Likewise, Paikeday (1985) indicates that the term “proficient user” (p. 5), or “expert” (Rampton, 1990, p. 98), seems more appropriate to represent a competent speaker or user of English than the term “native speaker” (Paikeday, 1985, p. 5; Rampton, 1990, p. 98). In a similar way, Davis (2013) uses the label “native user” to refer to “a highly proficient speaker of a language” (p. 26). He considers that the “native user” is linguistically and educationally equivalent to a native speaker.

Linguistic norm. Additionally, the question of whether the “native speaker” should constitute the linguistic norm has become a central issue in the debate about “native speakerhood” (Medgyes, 2001, p. 433), or native speakerism (Davis, 1991; Higgins, 2003; Holliday, 2005, 2013; Kachru, 1992a; Lin, 1999; Llurda, 2009a; Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008; Pennycook, 1994, 2001, 2010; Widdowson, 1994). Phillipson (1992) points out that issues related to the concept of native speakerism were highly contested at the TESL conference held in Uganda in 1961. At this conference, native speakers were labeled as ideal teachers of English. Although native speakers have long been regarded as “default” language teachers (Holliday, 2005, p.46), Llurda (2009a) contends that increasingly English needs to be taught as an international language instead of as a variety linked with a particular English-speaking culture (Holliday, 2005).

The claim that native speakers have fallen (Canagarajah, 1999; Graddol, 1999; Llurda, 2009a) is made based on the purpose of international English, range, growing rate and number of speakers, global status, and discourse of English in intercultural

contexts. The diffusion of English has been expanded to European, African, and Asian continents. Considering the number of speakers, the percentage of native speakers of English, predicted by Graddol (2001), is to fall from 9% in the middle of the last century to only 5% by 2050. Given the overwhelmingly numerical strength (Kachru, 1992b), Graddol (1997, as cited in Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005, p. 218) asserts that non-native speakers will be the “centre of gravity” while native speakers’ status as “representatives of the tongue” will become shaky. Seidlhofer (2011) concurs that non-native speakers have hugely outnumbered native speakers and have reversed the construct as “majority”; hence, it will soon be inappropriate to address this huge, “majority” population as non-natives (p. 45). In the contemporary world, native speakers of English may find their status will become disadvantageous as non-native speakers of English can more effectively and properly use English as a lingua franca (Seidlhofer, 2011).

Native status. Another issue under debate is whether non-native speakers can acquire native status. Davis (1991) contends that as a sociolinguistic form, native language competence can be achieved and that, under certain conditions, non-native speakers can “choose native speaker membership” (p. 165). While conceding that it is far easier to acquire this status when one has learned the language at an early age, and by comparison, much harder in one’s adulthood, Davis (1991), like Richards et al. (1992), believes that it is still possible for adult non-native speakers to achieve “communicative competence,” fluency, and linguistic assurance in terms of grammaticality to obtain such membership (Davis, 1991, p. 166). Inbar-Lourie (2005)

reiterates that it is feasible for non-native speakers to choose the membership to be part of the “speech community” (p. 268). Medgyes (1983; 1992) disagrees with Davis’ (1991) position, maintaining that non-native speakers can never acquire native-like proficiency. Cook (2005) postulates that according to this childhood acquisition concept, it is unrealistic for any user to return to childhood to reacquire the language to be a “native speaker,” so no L2 user can attain the native status in their subsequent life based on this tenet (p. 49). Cook (2005) reiterates the term “L2 users” (meaning “different rather than deficient” users, with reference to native speakers of English) and outlines that “L2 users should be judged by what they are, L2 users, not what they can never be by definition, native speakers” (p. 50), and proposes “the proper goal for an L2 user is believed to be speaking the second language like an L2 user, not like an L1 user” (p. 51).

Native-Speakerism as Hegemony

“Hegemony” signifies “the power exerted by one group over others” (Sergeant, 2012, p. 25) and “is a social condition in which all aspects of social reality are dominated by or supportive of a single class” according to Gramsci (Mayo, 1999, p. 35). Gramsci (1971, as cited in Sergeant, 2012, p. 25) posits that hegemony produces a series of serious and destructive consequences: polarizing native speakers and non-native speakers, perpetuating inequality between English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries, endangering “linguistic diversity,” and resulting in “cultural homogenization” (p. 25).

From a sociolinguistic perspective, Kachru and Nelson (1996b) refute the concept of innateness in language use, arguing that, historically, every variety has had its norms to satisfy the need of a specific linguistic population. Kachru (1986) suggests that the NS-NNS dichotomy should be viewed as a hegemonic construct, in that it assumes a monocultural and monolingual lens as frame of reference; but based on Labov (1972, as cited in Mackenzie, 2014, p. 8), it is unfair to evaluate “one group of speakers against the norms of another group.” This view (e.g., Kramersch, 1997) similarly argues that native speakership is not an innate property; rather, it is a distinction awarded by members of the dominant group who wish to draw a division between an empowered group of native speakers and a subservient one of non-native speakers. Kramersch (ibid) writes: “Native speakers are made rather than born” (p. 363). In her (1997) definition, the notion of native speaker denotes more than birth entitlement, including claims of cultural capital: native speakers represent middle-class and mainstream beliefs, acculturated by education. Kramersch’s perspective is consonant with Bourdieu’s (1977c) notion of the “social person” discussed earlier (p.653). One has to be acknowledged and accepted by a speech community to be a native speaker (Kramersch, 1997; Pennycook, 1994). Norton (1997) observes that there are power dynamics involved: specifically, “native insiders” are unwilling to grant the affiliation to “non-native outsiders” (Medgyes, 2001, p. 431). Moreover, following Moussu and Llorca (2008), the definition of such a community or group is discursive, abstract, and ambiguous, not grounded in research into the contexts or variables that instantiate such a community.

Native speaker myths. The idea that native speakers are by definition linguistic experts (Chomsky, 1965), and therefore superior to non-native speaking teachers, is labeled a linguistic mirage in Paikeday's (1985) book *The native speaker is dead*. Canagarajah (1999) disputes Chomsky's (1965) notion of the idealized English speaker and contends that such a concept cannot be restricted to a homogeneous speech community given that hybridity is an essential feature of multicultural communities (Canagarajah, 2007). Additionally, Trudgill (1999) condemns that the "native speaker" benchmark refers to the model "spoken by those who are often referred to as 'educated people'" (p. 118). Kramsch (1997) visualizes the idolization of the native speaker as an illusion. She adds that the great emphasis placed on the myth of the native speaker was mainly caused by the excessive attention paid to spoken communicative capacity in English language teaching in the 1960s. Moreover, the idealization of native speakers is suspicious because native speakers themselves do not speak rule-based standard language, given local, professional, generational, and class-specific variations. More importantly, it is not realistic for every English learner to become a native speaker. The idea that the ESL or EFL student is seen as a "nicely bounded blank slate on which the language is inscribed" is a "linguistic utopia." What is the point for foreign language learners to ignore their distinctive multilingual insight as well as lens of English and culture to imitate codified monolingual native speakers (p. 364)? Despite all these critiques of the native-speaker fiction, Davis (2003) envisages "naive speaker" as both an illusion

and reality. He (1991) admits that albeit “the native speaker is seen to be an emperor without any clothes,” “that is indeed a myth but a useful myth” (p. 167).

Kachru and Nelson (2006) have expanded this “idealization of native speaker” (p. 123) myth (upholding “monolingual and monocultural” norm as the yardstick) to another two myths: “interlanguage Myth” (p. 123) and “the Cassandra myth” (p. 124). The “interlanguage Myth” polarizes Center and Periphery. It devalues periphery speakers of English and treats them as forever language learners doomed to imitate the native canon. The third myth has derived from the Greek myth that Cassandra who offended Apollo was punished by Apollo via making nobody have faith in her predictions. This borrowed myth can be used to portray the phenomenon that anyone who is a rule or model breaker will be ignored and mocked.

Linguistic Imperialism. Some scholars (e.g., Grant & Lee, 2009; Kramsch, 1998) argue that maintenance of the NS-NNS dichotomy leads to further linguistic stratification which contributes to linguicism (Phillipson, 1992). Phillipson (1992) terms linguicism as “ideologies, structures, and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate, and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and immaterial) between groups which is defined on the basis of language” (p. 47). Skutnabb-Kangas (1998) contends that linguicism parallels racism, according to Holliday (2005), by taking the forms of both consciousness and unconsciousness, explicitly and implicitly, abstraction and concreteness. “Linguicism may be in operation simultaneously with sexism, racism, or classism, but linguicism refers exclusively to ideologies and structures where language is the means for effecting or

maintaining an unequal allocation of power and resources” (p. 55). Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1996) highlight that the inequitable distribution of language rights destroys “language ecologies” (as cited in Pennycook, 2001, p. 60). That is to say, they see the danger imposed by linguisticism on other languages as the violation of “language rights” (Pennycook, 2001, p. 60). Pennycook (2001) elaborates that linguisticism endangers “linguistic human rights” and produces inequity and injustice between this “superior language” and other “inferior” languages (p. 61). However, Tollefson (1991) insists that it is not only a language right, but also a basic human right to use one’s mother tongue.

Phillipson (1992) analyzes that “English linguistic imperialism is seen as a sub-type of linguisticism” (p. 47) and “operates globally as a key medium of Centre-Periphery relations” (p. 56). “A working definition of English linguistic imperialism is that the dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages” (p. 47). Phillipson (2009) affirms that “linguistic penetration” is more entrenched in “settler countries” such as Canada than “in exploitation and extraction colonies (e.g., Malaya, Nigeria)” (p. 2). Phillipson (1992) illuminates that “Anglocentricity” (synonymous with ethnocentrism, by setting norms as criteria and references) and “professionalism” (shown in English language teaching profession) are two chief “mechanisms” to safeguard the legitimacy of linguistic imperialism (p. 47). Thus, linguisticism has shifted from its prior implementation of “sticks, carrots, ideas” in colonialism to “inter-state actors”

who are Center English teachers and “representatives of elites in the periphery” in postcolonism (p. 55). The results of linguistic imperialism are to overlook and devalue minority languages, exploiting the less privileged countries with imperialistic power. Ansre (1979, p. 12-13, as cited in Phillipson, 1992, p. 57) observes that linguistic imperialism has distorted people’s ideas, perceptions, and expectations subtly. Linguicism instills “Center” ideologies into “Periphery” countries to sustain and solidify the center’s prestigious status (Phillipson, 1992, p. 55).

Native Speaker Fallacy. Phillipson (1992) terms native speakerism as a “fallacy” (p. 195). He problematizes linguistic imperialism existing in the TESOL profession in western English-speaking countries, pointing out that it entails two fallacies: the first, that the native speaker of English is viewed as the optimal English language teacher, the second, that English is taught at the price of other languages.

Regarding the first fallacy of “the unquestioned ideology of supremacy of the monolingual NS as the ideal language teacher” (Llurda, 2009a, p. 41): various protests have arisen from myriad literatures to unveil the mask of “the idealization of native speaker” myth (Kachru & Nelson, 2006, p. 123)). Phillipson (1992) attacks this fallacy by postulating that NNSs are better prepared to be English language teachers than NSs because NNSs took up L2 after they became adults while NSs acquired English as their L1 when they were children. Seidlhofer (1999) advances this view with a vivid metaphor: “native speakers know the destination, but not the terrain that has to be crossed to get there; they themselves have not travelled the same route” (p. 238). However, non-native English-speaking teachers have travelled

“the same route,” so they are better equipped with rich learning repertoire to share with their students (Cook, 2005, p. 57). Medgyes (1992) specifies ideal language teachers in two ways: the ideal native teacher is the one with high English competence while the ideal non-native English-speaking teacher is the one with “near-native proficiency” (p. 349). Canagarajah (1999) illustrates the respective strengths of NS and NNS teachers: native teachers are more efficient in EFL classrooms thanks to their cultural background, whereas non-native English-speaking teachers are more capable in ESL environments due to their multiple cultural lenses. Medgyes (1994) states that NNS teachers’ advantages appear most salient in non-English-speaking countries. His claim is synonymous with the finding that NNS teachers are more acceptable as authorities in their own countries than in those ESL settings (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999).

Concerning the second fallacy that English is taught by sacrificing indigenous languages: Shannon (1995) challenges the fallacy by conducting a case study in an American fourth-grade bilingual classroom where both English and Spanish were used. He addresses the recognition of and resistance to the hegemony of English in this classroom, as well as the bilingual teacher’s adoption of effective strategies for fostering students’ Spanish learning. He finds that a linguistic context can be established where English does not take control of Spanish and that a different language can exist in the bilingual classroom. He concludes that the status of Spanish can approach that of English and that the maintenance of a minority language does

not hinder English acquisition, but rather facilitates it. Shannon's viewpoint is echoed by Maria Rebeca Gutierrez Estrada (2015).

Standardization as ideology. Tagg (2012) presents that "ideology" (p. 14) refers to the politics of language, or people's deep-seated ideas and perceptions of the language and pertinent social facets, and how people understand the function and merit of the language in their social life. Analogous to culture, ideology is pervasive and porous in each society. "Language ideologies," to be specific, are people's responses to and outlooks of language and "constitute a shared belief system that influences the way in which we, as users of language, interact with language" (p. 15). Seidlhofer (2011) announces that "Standard English ideology is a special case of standard language ideology." Albeit normalized English is a "linguistic object," it is associated with "ethno-political, socio-economic, and other interests," by residing in peoples' attitudes (p. 42). Granted that English is the tie connecting Center elites in both central and peripheral circles, codes and models are produced by the privileged Center to exert their domination. These prescriptive norms created by the Center people with power have persisted from the colonial time to postcolonialism when Center governs people's "consciousness" even without "the physical presence of the exploiters" (Phillipson, 1992, p. 53). Kachru (1986) concludes that the global domination of English continues and "in many aspects the roots of English are deeper now than they were during the period of political colonization" (p. 14).

Milroy and Milroy (1999) consider standardization "as an idea in the mind rather than a reality" (p. 19, as cited in Tagg, 2012, p. 313) and they postulate that linguistic

gatekeepers make every effort “to keep the notion of a standard language alive in the public mind” (p. 18, as cited in Tagg, 2012, p. 313), as what has been resonated by Pacek (2005). Tagg (2012) asserts that transforming from British English to American English, the standardized English models triumph across the globe as ideology. If there are “language correctness and purity” (p. 314) as standards, there is “politically incorrect language” (Hewings & Tagg, 2012, p. 1) and “politically correct” language (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 57). Such entrenched “prescriptive views about English” glorify codified English (spoken by the powerful class) or “elevated (standard) varieties (Kachru, 1992c, p. 1), and denigrate non-codified Englishes (spoken by disfranchised class) or “not so elevated (pidgin) varieties” (Kachru, 1992c, p. 1), grounded in inequality and injustice (Tagg, 2012, p. 323). The “soft imperialistic” norms are particularly conspicuous in English language teaching (Rajagopalan, 2005, p. 285).

The business of English language teaching implicates both “economic” and “ideological” dimensions (Phillipson, 1992, p. 49). “Profit” is usually at the heart of imperialism and linguistic imperialism is no exception (Phillipson, 2009, p. 12): the economic implications will be addressed in Chapter 4: “Research on teachers of English as an international language.” Rajagopalan (2005) points out that “far from being an innocent theoretical reference point in language teaching” (p. 287), the ideology is embedded in “the TESOL psyche” (Holliday, 2005, p. 9). Pennycook (1998) reveals that since “English language teaching (ELT) was always a highly significant part of colonial policy” (p. 20), it has inherited and kept the traits of

colonialism, with dichotomously ideological demarcation: “Self and Other,” “Superiority and Inferiority” (p. 19), “Us and Them” (p. 34), “native—non-native,” “mainstream—minority,” “first world—third world” (Lin et al., 2005, p. 215), and “Center—Periphery” (Holliday, 2005). Idealized and “idolized,” “the native speaker became the potent and awe-inspiring trademark of the billion-dollar EFL industry worldwide” (Rajagopalan, 2005, p. 285). Kramersch (1999) pinpoints that “it is the teaching of ESL within an assimilation ideology that has canonized (or beautified) the native speaker around the world” (p. 34).

Writing Norms: Monomodality versus Multimodality

Kachru (1992d) defines the “norm” in terms of its “acceptability, generally by the native speakers of a language” and “fulfilling codified prerequisites according to a given ‘standard’ or ‘norm’ at various linguistic levels” (p. 48). Kachru (1992d) extends the “norm” to its outcome — “proficiency scale,” pertaining to “prescriptivism” and “conformity” (p. 48). Kachru (1992c) applies two labels to these norms: “endo-normative” and “exo-normative” models (1992c, p. 7), or “monomodality” and “multimodality” (1992d, p. 66). Kachru (1992d) terms “monomodality” as an assumed “homogeneous English L2 speech community” based on the premises of the same functions of English across all geographical regions, and similarities in various settings and in people’s motivations for learning English (p. 66). In contrast, “multimodality” is labeled by Kachru (1992d) as the norm opposite to the monolingual model, founded in “pragmatism” and “functional realism,” stressing three categories of “variability”: variability related to acquisition,

variability related to function, and variability related to the context of situation” (p. 66).

Writing, as a tool to convey one’s ideas, concepts, social cohesion, and joint goals (Carson, 1992), reflects and manifests identity (Steinman, 2009a, 2009b). Writing, being an integral part of one’s identity, has to be taught (Hewings & Tagg, 2012). Then, what English is to be learned and taught? Do we apply the standardized norm (codified British or American English) stemming from “the homogeneous inner-circle speech communities” with the native-speaker norm, or localized “exogenous norms” of World Englishes founded in “meaningful social and institutional functions in multilingual communities” (Canagarajah, 2006c, p. 230)? Ian Mackenzie (2014) makes the point that to score political points, scholars are neglecting the ample data from research studies that show irrefutably what international students at the college and university level would find most helpful is instruction assistance grounded in native-speaker writing norms. However, Lowenberg (1992) protests that the presupposition of such a yardstick is “no longer universally valid” (p. 108). Kachru (1992d) establishes that the issue of the “norm” (p. 48) is closely associated with the issue of language expansion. Given the linguistic and cultural pluralism and complexities of English, diversified historical and sociopolitical contexts, and dissenting language policies in different nations, Kachru (1992b) contests that native-speaker norm as a “fallacy” (p. 358) owing to “the internationalization of the language,” the sociolinguistic, functional, and pragmatic implications of non-native varieties (p. 355). Seidlhofer (2011) sets forth that the

codified writing norms in the Anglo culture shows the interpretations of writing from one single cultural perspective which seems far apart from the objective of higher education that diversity is encouraged (Steinman, 2009a, 2009b). Kachru (1992d) ascertains that the non-native norm can be a “competitive model” in second language teaching on the grounds that it “fulfills certain conditions” (p. 55). He illustrates “the truth is that the non-native Englishes— institutionalized or non-institutionalized — are linguistic orphans in search of their parents” (p. 66); therefore, the stereotypical “deficient Englishes” and people’s attitudinal rejection to these varieties hurt non-native speakers (p. 66).

Canagarajah (2007) continues to debunk the “native-speaker” myth and proposes a “multimodal, multisensory, multilateral” and “multidimensional” approach in order to be “more socially embedded, ecologically sensitive, and interactionally open” (p. 923). He considers that globalization and multiculturalism have propelled the reconfiguration of the norm of language acquisition since the world is getting more multilingual now as a growing number of people travel across national borders. Canagarajah (2007) argues that multilingual individuals are not approaching the target language, but are using their “interlanguage” with their own norms in their “unique context” (p. 927). Canagarajah (ibid) thus has attacked the “Interlanguage Myth” (Kachru & Nelson, 2006, p. 123) that non-native speakers have to defer to the native English as the norm. In addition, non-native speakers do not observe the standardized conventions to interact with one another in outer- and expanding-communities when English is used as a lingua franca (Canagarajah,

2006c). Canagarajah (2007) uses these data to assert that the native-speaker norm is no longer pertinent. Now that “communication is multimodal” and “one’s competence is based on the repertoire that grows as the contexts of interaction increase” (p. 933), context-specific “acquisition aims towards versatility and agility, not mastery and control” (p. 932). Moreover, the native-speaker norm “fails to give importance to attitudinal, psychological, and perceptual factors that mold the intersubjective processes of communication” (p. 934). Kachru (1992c) explains that approaches to realizing communicative objectives are culture specific and the “speech fellowship” is subject to standards, varying across cultures (p.10). Kachru (1992d) further argues that “before claiming universality for a model, one must understand that what is linguistic medicine for one geographic area may prove linguistic poison for another area” (p. 57). He stresses “functional uses” (p. 64), or “language pragmatics” (Kachru, 1992c, p. 8) [meaning that language has to adapt to its specific culture (Chen, 1992)] and addresses the link between “context of situation” and English norms to refute the two tenets upheld by the monomodel of English: “intelligibility” and “applicability” (Kachru, 1992d, p. 64). Kachru (1992d) concludes that intelligibility is context bound. Canagarajah and Said (2010) suggest that the user of English must follow the mainstream code in “extremely formal institutional contexts” (e.g. in the academia), while utilizing diverse models in communication in outer and expanding circles (p. 160), such as “intranational varieties” of World Englishes and “transnational” varieties as a “lingua franca” (Canagarajah, 2006b, p. 198). This perspective seems to align with Quirk’s (1985)

comments: “different standards for different occasions for different people—and each as ‘correct’ as any other” (p. 3).

Seidlhofer (2011) asserts that the “conceptual gap” needs to be filled and the role of English as a lingua franca needs to be reappraised from its “subordinate” position inferior to the native-speaker canon to an “autonomous concept” and independent status with its own codifications (p. 38). Kachru and Nelson (1996a) call for the deconstruction of the “monolithic English” (p. 76) as “a convenient working fiction” (p. 77) and advocate for “the pluralism of English” (p. 77). Seidlhofer (2011) reasons that akin to native variety, non-native varieties have their “regularities” and “mutual accommodation.” More importantly, non-native speakers are not only passive receptors of English, but also actively adjust English (p. 48) during their “macroacquisition” (Brutt-Griffler, 2002, p. vii, as cited in Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 49), referring to the employment of English and nourishment of “endonormative” competence (Brutt-Griffler, 2002, as cited in Canagarajah, 2007, p. 930). This means that microacquisition needs to be in line with the “macroacquisition” (Brutt-Griffler, 2002, p. vii, as cited in Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 49). On the one hand, one’s acquisition of language needs to correspond with the local codification; on the other hand, one can show variations to resist the prescriptive standard for “voice and individuality” (Canagarajah, 2007, p. 930). Zamel (1998) foresees the future tendency to various writing communities with multinorms. As globalization thrives, future readership will not only consist of ESL, EFL (English as a Foreign Language), but also ESOL (English for Speakers as other languages).

Canagarajah (2006c) contests that it is time to shift from “either-or” to “both and more,” meaning “the ability to negotiate the varieties in other outer- and expanding-circle communities as well” construct (p. 233). He envisions that a linguistic focus needs to be redirected from “grammar to pragmatics, from competence to performance” (p. 234). Given that “norms are relative, variable, heterogeneous, and changing, posing the options as either ‘native English norms,’ or ‘new Englishes norms,’ is misleading” (p. 234). Canagarajah and Said (2010) demonstrate that as English is a “heterogeneous language” (p. 160), multiple norms interplay with one another and any user of English needs to be capable of switching between divergent models and varieties in the “family of languages” (Crystal, 2004, p. 49, as cited in Canagarajah, 2006c, p. 232). Canagarajah (2006c) announces that “To be really proficient in English today, one has to be multidialectal” (p. 133). There are continually new English models emerging as multilingual users interact with one another in the lingua franca. When “intelligibility” is stressed and “accuracy in grammar” is less focused, people will invent more new English conventions apart from “both the local and metropolitan varieties” (p. 234).

“Glocalization” (Robertson, 1995, p. 25) is a coined term by mingling two words: “global” and “local” (Robertson, 1995, p. 32), denoting “the interaction of both global and local forces in specific sociocultural contexts where local social actors are confronted with (often, albeit not always, imposed) the task of learning and using English, and where local social actors engage in different creative practices, exercising their creative discursive agency and strategies of appropriation” (Lin et al.,

2005, p. 217). Lin et al. (2005) recommend a conceptual reorientation from TESOL to TEGCOM (Teaching English for Globalized Communication), with the approaches of “sociocultural situatedness, postcolonial performativity, and glocalization” to deconstruct hegemony and reconstruct ideology (p. 216).

Pennycook (2003) concludes that there could be a possible intersection between “homogeneity position” and “heterogeny position.” “Homogeneity position” implies that language is part of homogenizing globalization, while “heterogeny position” emphasizes bilinguals’ creativity and diversity of English varieties (p.7-8). Seidlhofer (2011) believes that the deleterious effects of “stable homogeneity of English” (p. 33) is that it disapproves of any form of transformation and exploitation of English for local objectives and does not tolerate or affirm the value of any deviance from the standard. As a result, minority people are perpetual losers and are “in an inescapable double bind” (p. 34) because they can neither gain the supremacy of native speakers, nor can they revive the language for their own use. They are “told that they got it wrong because they have the misfortune not to be native speakers” (p. 34) and, as non-native speakers, are doomed to losing (Strevens, 1992b). However, Kachru (1992c) terms non-native speakers’ renovation of English as a “double-edged sword” (p. 8); English could be a “Trojan horse” (Cooke, 1998) on the one hand and an “Aladdin’s lamp” (Kachru, 1986, p. 1) on the other hand. Pennycook (2003) argues that minority people can change politics and rebuild languages and identities to adapt to their own cultures and ethnicities.

Therefore, globalization may be integrated with localization. This innovative transformation is called as “reclaiming the local” (Canagarajah, 2005), or “relocating English” (Saraceni, 2009, p. 175), or “transcending the nativeness paradigm” (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001, p. 99). Kramsch (1993) contends that the attention needs to be shifted from the homogeneity or heterogeneity paradigm to what the “third culture” (Kramsch, 2009, p. 233), or the “third space” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 37) is being produced. In a similar vein, Canagarajah (1999) proposes “worldliness of English” in the sense of adjusting English language teaching to local cultures and values. He visualizes “worldliness” as a “resistance perspective” and articulates that “the intention is not to reject English, but to reconstitute it in more inclusive, ethical, and democratic terms” (p. 2). Pennycook (2003) propose an “appropriation” (p. 15) paradigm where English is used for local purposes, hence, remodeling, renovating, reincarnating, and reviving the language. English has expanded and flourished because it suits “social and communicative needs and purposes of communities of users” outside the inner and the outer circles (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 91). This alternative perspective of thinking rather than continuing accepting “the traditional way of prescribing the English of the subject” (ibid, p. 208) enables the identity change in the countries where English is a societal language. “This identity, while challenging a monolithic, monolingual view of culture, will also create a new form of globalism, which values and upholds diversity” (Joseph & Ramani, 2006, p. 197).

Chapter 4

Review of Research on Teachers of English as an International Language

The research on instructors of English as a global language is prolific, with many studies focusing on the experiences and competencies of EIL teachers outside of English-speaking countries (Llurda, 2004, 2009a; Medgyes, 1994; Tang, 1997) and still others taking up the issue of how these teachers are perceived within the diverse national and societal contexts in which they teach (Medgyes, 1992; Reves & Medgyes, 1994; Walelign, 1986). This chapter takes up this research, with focus on those findings that relate to the topic of my dissertation.

Within countries with English as a societal language, or lingua franca, studies of EIL teachers have focused primarily on the experiences of instructors of international students within institutions of higher learning. Some studies have addressed students' attitudes towards EIL teachers (Liu, 1999; Llurda, 2009b; Samimy & Brut-Griffler, 1999). Other studies have looked at the diverse challenges facing EIL teachers (Holliday, 2005; Liu, 1999; Llurda, 2005; Medgyes, 1994), including linguistic challenges (Amin, 2004; Canagarajah, 1999; Kachru, 1986, 1992d; J. Liu, 2005; Matsuda, 1991; Medgyes, 1983, 1994; Rajagopalan, 2005; Seidlhofer, 2011), sociopolitical challenges (Amin, 1999; Derwing & Munro, 2005; Kutoba & Lin, 2006; D. Liu, 1999; James, 2000, 2001), and employment (hiring) challenges (Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Braine, 1999; Kramsch, 1997; Llurda, 2005; Mahboob, 2003; Moussu, 2006; Rajagopalan, 2005).

Advantages and Effectiveness of Non-Native Language Teachers

Medgyes (1992, 2001) has explored the advantages of non-native speakers in the role of language teachers. Findings indicate that non-native speaking teachers are realistic models since their linguistic mastery constitutes evidence for their students' beliefs that such English proficiency is possible to achieve. Additionally, non-native speaking teachers have been learners of English; therefore, they are aware of and can predict the language problems and difficulties that their students may encounter. These insights allow them to teach in a more effective way as they are more empathetic, sensitive, and responsive to their students' demands. In addition, a shared L1 can enhance non-native speaking teachers' communication with their students (Canagarajah, 1999; J. Liu, 2005; Llurda, 2009a; Medgyes, 1992, 1994; Pacek, 2005; Reves & Medgyes, 1994; Tang, 1997; Thomas, 1999), as they are able to call on more than one linguistic, stylistic, and cultural repertoire. As compared with native teachers' "authenticity" (Barratt & Kontra, 2000) and "fluency" in language (Tang, 1997, p. 578), non-native teachers excel in "accuracy" (Tang, 1997, p. 578) and rich grammatical knowledge (Medgyes, 1994). Native English teachers are viewed as students' "language models," whereas non-native teachers are students' "learner models" (Medgyes, 2001, p. 436), "role models" (Lee, 2000, p. 19), and "confidence booster" (Pacek, 2005, p. 257). Seidlhofer (1999) emphasizes that with bilingual repertoires, non-native English teachers possess the unique advantages in commuting between two languages and "the learner's source and target culture" as "mediators" (Llurda, 2004, p. 320).

According to the research literature, non-native teachers are considered more “insightful,” more linguistically aware (Medgyes, 2001, p. 437), culturally aware (of ESL students’ cultures) (Nemtchinova, 2005), and more pedagogically competent (Medgyes, 1992) than native teachers. J. Liu (1999) suggests that multilingual and multicultural teachers can turn students into “more open-minded thinkers and writers” (p. 168). Cook (1999) illustrates that “multicompetent” (i. e. “the knowledge of two or more languages in mind” Cook, 2005, p. 48) teachers are “incomparably” more effective than teachers who can speak only one language (p. 48) and Milambiling (2000) illuminates that “multicompetence should ... be a goal for all language teachers” (p. 326). Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005) conclude that more of their student participants (i.e. 71.6%) prefer the combination of both native and non-native teachers as compared with fewer student respondents (i.e. 60.6%) who favor non-native teachers. Their findings line up with those of with Benke and Medgyes’s (2005) study that most of students envision that “in an ideal situation both NS and NNS teachers should be available to teach them” (p. 208). To sum up, teachers belonging to either category could be “ideal teachers” as long as they are excellent in teaching with their unique pedagogical methods (Medgyes, 2001, p. 440). This research confirms that native status in deciding on an ideal teacher as discussed in Chapter 3 is “irrelevant and even counterproductive” (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005, p. 232).

Medgyes (1994) believes that as teachers, non-native speakers can have an “equal chance of success” although he posits that the precondition is that non-native

teachers' language "handicap" is overcome (p.103). Llurda (2004; 2009a) argues that effective teaching should be viewed as a product of a combination of mastery of the language, training, and teaching competence rather than one's status as a native or non-native speaking English teacher. Medgyes (1992) points out that there are other, presumably more important, factors that affect the success of a language teacher, such as teacher, student, and contextual variables. Liu (1999) centers on the teacher variables, as shown in interactive abilities, professional and motivational skills, and teaching capabilities. Many researchers endorse similar essential components in making a successful language teacher: for J. Liu (1999, 2005), teaching styles and methods, for Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005), "pedagogy, psychology, and methodology" (p. 230), and in Medgyes's (2001) eyes, "language proficiency," "language awareness," and "pedagogical skills" (p. 437). Pacek (2005) summarizes that "the teacher's personality, not nationality" makes a difference (p. 254). Derwing and Munro's (2005) TESOL research in Canada also highlights that teachers' characteristics are essential in becoming an effective language teacher in North America. Medgyes (1999) renders that "aptitude, experience, personal traits, motivation and love of students" are all indispensable elements in underlying successful teaching (p. 178).

Seidlhofer (1999) postulates that language proficiency has been proven to be interlocking with teaching proficiency. Cook (2005) contests that the only "asset" of native speakers "is precisely that they are native speakers; if this is now immaterial to the goals of language teaching, then it is no longer an asset" especially in non-

English environments (p. 56). Under this concept, non-native teachers do not have inferiority to their native colleagues and “the more proficient, the more efficient” rule does not apply any longer (Medgyes, 2001, p. 440).

Students’ Perceptions of Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers

Braine (2005b) points out that although students’ perceptions are presumably the most important indicator in research into non-native teachers, studies on students’ attitudes toward non-native teachers have not emerged in the research agenda until recently. Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005) contend that there is a shortage of research with respect to students’ perceptions. These research literatures are generally grounded in the settings where English is taught in ESL or EFL settings. In some situations, students realize the benefits of non-native English speaking teachers and in fact favor them for some of their pedagogical practices (Moussu, 2006); but many other ESL learners still prefer native speaking teachers to non-native (Clark & Paran, 2007). Regardless of non-native speaking English teachers’ advantages, the research indicates that on the whole students still question their authority. In fact, non-native speaking English teachers’ situations and their students’ perceptions of them differ from continent to continent, and from country to country (Moussu & Braine, 2006; Tang, 1997). I will examine Asian, European, and North American settings in turn.

In Asian contexts, in the Phillipines non-native speaking English teachers are well accepted since “Philippine English” is quite acceptable, notwithstanding its many deviations from the native norm (Strevens, 1992b, p. 34). However, the status

of non-native speaking teachers in South Korea is totally different, pointing to other economic, social, ideological, and political explanations (Canagarajah, 1999; Grant & Lee, 2009). Butler (2007a) examines Korean students' responses to native and non-native English, by exposing them to varying audio-taped English accents pronounced by the same speaker. It is found that although there is not much difference in the intelligibility of their understanding of these two accents, Korean students favor American English, confirming Grant and Lee's (2009) findings. Similarly, in Kim's study (2007), South Korean students assume that their non-native English teacher's accent influences their comprehension and that less accent will increase their intelligibility. Nevertheless, according to Kim, students can actually equally comprehend their native teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers which shows that students' attitudes are not necessarily in line with the observed facts. Piller and Takahashi (2006) offer the explanation that ESL students have strong "language desires" to use English as a tool to obtain positions in the Western world, given the contemporary role of English in the global market (p. 69). In Japan, although there are some changes in people's language attitudes, Japanese students are found to still prefer native speakers to non-native speakers (McKenzie, 2013). This view is not only shared by Japanese students, but also by Japanese teachers. The majority of the participants who are teachers at a Japanese elementary school respond that NS is the optimal English language teacher and that standardized English is the sole model (Butler, 2007b). In Hong Kong, which belonged to Britain as a colony in the past, non-native English teachers are discriminated against. Lin et

al. (2005) find that in Hong Kong, she experienced “othering” and she was treated as “illegitimate” because of her unauthentic English accent (p.214). Nonetheless, not all teacher and student participants in Cheung’s (2002, as cited in Braine, 2005b, p. 20) study agree that non-native Hong Kong teachers have received unequal treatments.

In European environments, for example, Turkey, non-native English teachers feel that they are discriminated against by their students (Dogancay-Aktuna, 2008) whereas students in the United Kingdom were found to hold more supportive views of their non-native teachers (Pacek, 2005). In Pacek’s study (2005), the responses of two groups of participants (i.e. students and in-service Japanese teachers) studying at a British university have been compared through two questionnaires to explore their attitudes toward an experienced non-native Eastern European teacher who has been very familiar with Japanese students and Japanese educational system. Among student respondents, many of them did not notice or care about their teacher’s non-native status and only some of them held ambiguous or negative attitudes. By comparison, the majority of Japanese teachers of English perceived their non-native speaking instructor very positively and identified more benefits of the non-native speaking teacher than the university students, probably because of their “dual personalities,” i.e., being both students in the U.K. and English language teachers in Japan (p. 256). These findings differ from Butler’s (2007b) research about Japanese teachers’ negative attitudes toward NNS teachers who teach English in Japan.

In North America, the American milieu is examined including both domestic and international students’ perceptions. J. Liu (2005) explores the first-year American

undergraduates' perceptions of their four Chinese graduate teaching assistants in their composition classes, finding mixed responses. American students make positive remarks in terms of their non-native TA's high proficiency in Chinese, productive learning experiences in English writing, hard work, good course plans, respect for their students, and cultural perspectives. Nevertheless, half of the American students react negatively toward these Chinese TAs, mainly because of the linguistic issue that they "do not even speak English fluently" (p. 170) and they are "not even American" (p. 171). Liu (2005) implies that students' negative response is "closely related to who their teacher is not. Their teacher is not a professor, not a native English speaker" (p. 171). There are some similarities shared between American students' and ESL students' perceptions of their non-native speaking teachers in the American context. Coincidentally, Moussu (2002) conducts questionnaires among ESL students at an American university. He notes that Korean and Chinese students dislike non-native English-speaking teachers most. As compared with non-native speaking White teachers who have native-like accent, non-native teachers with colors and accents are less favored. This negative response is especially conspicuous among the students who plan to return to their countries of origin after they get their American degrees. This finding has formed a sharp contrast with the conclusion in McNeill's (2005) study that novice Chinese teachers are very capable of anticipating their Chinese students' problems in vocabulary. This may suggest that NNS teachers' (e.g. Chinese teachers') resources and skills may not be well appreciated by the students from their own culture.

In the Canadian context, Amin (1999) conducted a Toronto-based study in 1994, interviewing five minority women teachers who were teaching or had taught ESL students from linguistically, culturally, and racially diverse backgrounds. Amin examined the teachers' perceptions of their students' idealized ESL teacher. She found that Whites are regarded as the normalized and ideal teachers and that only White teachers were thought to know authentic, real, and appropriate Canadian English. Based on her findings, Amin concludes that social prejudice and the stereotyped image of "immigrant women" perpetuates the illegitimate status of ESL women teachers in Canada (p.102). She advocates the examination of the low position of minority women for empowerment and a higher status to them in the Canadian society. Amin's voice is echoed by Lin et al. (2005) that immigrants' (specifically immigrant teachers') status is like that of other colonized peoples in Canada, being marginalized.

It has been noted that there are some variables linked to students' perceptions and preferences, including students' cultural, ethnic background, educational level, age and expectations, NNS teachers' race, gender, accent, teaching experiences and styles, and students' time length of exposure to or interaction with their NNS teachers (Amin, 1997; Medgyes, 1999, Pacek, 2005). Among these variables, accent will be discussed later in depth in the section of "Sociolinguistic debate on native speakerism." Regarding cultural and ethnic background, students from diverse cultures respond to their non-native teachers differently (Derwing & Munro, 2005; Moussu & Braine, 2006; Tang, 1997). The opinions of the university students from

Latin America, Europe, and Far East vary substantially about the same non-native instructors in Pacek's study (2005). Derwing and Munro (2005) explain that there exist "ethnic and political struggles among the ESL students." The preconceived bias that ESL students have brought to the host country from their home country leads to their dissatisfaction with their non-native speaking English teachers (p.187).

In terms of age and educational level, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005) find that undergraduates favor native speaking teachers more than students at primary schools. Conversely, it is shown that graduate students more accept and acknowledge the value of non-native speaking teachers than undergraduate students (J. Liu, 1999, 2005). In a similar light, Pacek (2005) reports that older Japanese teachers prefer the non-native speaking teacher as compared with younger university students who share the same NNS. With respect to students' expectations, Pacek also discusses that non-native speaking students usually have non-native speaking teachers in their home countries, so they aspire to learn from native teachers to enhance their linguistic skills considerably in the host country. The expectation discrepancy has caused their disappointment with their non-native teachers (e.g. a quote from a student: "English people should teach in England") (p. 253).

Regarding race and gender, Amin (1999) contends that Whiteness emerges as an unwritten feature in Canadian society of native speaker status. Derwing and Munro (2005) argue that gender also plays a role in determining NNS teachers' successful teaching; and Amin (1997) confirms that non-native female teachers have difficulty in establishing credibility. Rockhill and Tomic (1995) explore the role of Whiteness

and linguistic domination in ESL in Canada. They find that White male domination manipulates English. The prescriptive stereotype of an “ideal speaker of English” is referred to as “White, Anglo, male” (p. 210). Regarding teaching experiences and approaches, the Chinese teaching assistant who has more university teaching experiences (i.e. four years of teaching in China) gets the highest assessment by American students as compared with other three Chinese TAs with fewer teaching experiences (J. Liu, 2005). Concerning the variable of time frame, Moussu (2002) addresses that there is a difference between ESL students’ initial impressions and their perceptions of their non-native speaking teachers at the beginning and at the end of the term which may imply that longer time working with non-native speaking teachers could change students’ perceptions gradually. Moussu’s finding is consistent with other research that the perceptions of domestic undergraduates in the United States (J. Liu, 2005), international students in the United Kingdom (Pacek, 2005), and students in Braine’s research (1999, 2005b) of their non-native teachers have changed as the term proceeds and after they have more interactions with or are more exposed to their NNS teachers.

Challenges Facing Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers

Non-native teachers’ challenges mainly originate from linguistic challenges, racial, and hiring challenges. These various categories of challenges intersect with one another to pose problems to and discrimination against non-native teachers.

Linguistic challenges. Linguistic proficiency has been regarded as a “make-or-break” criterion (Medgyes, 2001, p. 440). Although Medgyes (2001) claims that

linguistic deficiency is “paradoxically” non-native speaking teachers’ biggest advantage in rivaling their native speaking counterparts in language teaching since non-native teachers have turned this handicap into their capabilities (p. 440), admittedly, linguistic challenge (e.g. language proficiency) is probably the top challenge facing non-native English-speaking teachers. Concurring with a Bourdieu-ian framework (1977c) that one’s accent provides good signs to reflect one’s social status, one’s power to persuade and control (p.653), besides the affiliation with native speakers of English, accent is another crucial index to symbolize nativeness (Paikeday, 1985). The “language bar” (Kachru, 1986, p. 14), specifically “accent bar” (Kachru, 1992d, p. 67) prevents non-native speakers from being admitted to the group membership. Matsuda (1991) defines accent as any speech that differs from the one spoken by the people with power since the dominant group views their dialect as purified, standardized and unaccented. Amin (1999) explains that members of the dominant group assert that “they either do not have an accent or that they have the right accent” (p.98) which is consistent with James’ findings (1994; 2001). In this manner, non-native speakers are the object of “accent discrimination” (Matsuda, 1991, p. 1348); and non-native speaking teachers’ credibility and legitimacy are thus questioned. This is divergent from Braine’s (2005b) conclusion that students are getting more “tolerant” of accent distinctions between native speaking teachers and non-native speaking teachers (p. 22).

Non-native speaking English-speaking teachers’ eternal linguistic fear is a direct result of their students’ constant challenge to their linguistic proficiency. There are

two states of non-native English-speaking teachers' linguistic "anxieties" (Rajagopalan, 2005, p. 283), or "linguistic insecurity" (Kachru & Nelson, 1996a, p. 89): "inferiority complex" (J. Liu, 2005, p. 156; Medgyes, 1994, p. 38; Rajagopalan, 2005; Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 58) and linguistic "schizophrenia" (J. Liu, 2005, p. 156; Medgyes, 1994, p. 38). The "inferiority complex," concurring with the language deficit model (Sawir et al., 2008) discussed in Chapter 1, means that non-native English-speaking teachers' English proficiency, like that of their international students, is regarded as a deficit. J. Liu (2005) articulates that this "inferiority complex" is especially shown in their accent and L2 skills, judged against the norms of standardized British or American English. As a result, the "non-native speaker syndrome" makes non-native teachers feel inferior to their native counterparts in "vocabulary, idioms, accuracy, and fluency in speaking, as well as "native speaker intuition" (p. 162). The "inferiority complex" shatters non-native teachers' confidence, self-evaluation, and they feel "intimidated" (p. 162), or "panicked" (p. 159), particularly when teaching native English-speaking students: "I was afraid the students will throw me out of the classroom" (p. 159). The term "linguistic schizophrenia" was put forward by Kachru (1986, p. 15; 1992d, p. 60) and is interpreted by J. Liu (2005) as the identity loss in the cultural conflicts in order to integrate with the "target culture" (p. 156). The prescriptive norms place non-native speaking teachers in a schizophrenic state (Canagarajah, 1999; Medgyes, 1983), torn between Center codes and Periphery performances, and between Center goals and Periphery teaching realities. Medgyes (1983) details "schizophrenia" (Medgyes,

1994, p. 38) in his article “The schizophrenic teacher” by describing destructive consequences of this schizophrenic condition that impact non-native teachers: “split personalities” and “adopting either a deeply pessimistic or an aggressive attitude to ELT” (p. 2).

Such “anxieties” (Rajagopalan, 2005, p. 283) are linked to the perceptions and treatment of mistakes. Seidlhofer (2011) defines “errors” as “anything that does not quite meet NS expectations (based on individual institution).” By some, “such ‘errors’ can be taken as ‘barbarisms’ or symptoms of ‘language disease’ offensive to native speaker’s sense of what is ‘right’ and ‘pure’” or “create false and unintended impressions” as viewed by others (p. 35). Students differ substantially in their attitudes toward native and non-native speaking teachers’ mistakes. When native speaking teachers commit errors sometimes, students are tolerant while they will defy and query non-native teachers at once whenever they err (Amin, 2004; Canagarajah, 2005). Non-native speaking teachers are also more self-conscious of their errors. The Chinese teaching assistants in the first-year American writing classroom in J. Liu’s (2005) study are greatly worried about “losing face in front of their students,” guided by the “Confucian doctrine” that any mistake made will shake their authority. One Chinese TA prepared every sentence to be spoken in each tutorial in advance with enormous time and great effort just to ensure the correct pronunciation of every word in class (p. 162).

Canagarajah (1999) points out that linguistic fears affect non-native speaking teachers’ teaching performances and may consequently restrict their classroom

effectiveness. Even individuals who are accomplished non-native English language teachers in their home countries may lose confidence in a new English-speaking context when their competence or identity are challenged (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). To summarize: linguistic insecurity, coupled with students' intolerance, native coworkers' scrutiny, and non-native teachers' self devaluation, puts non-native teachers in a perpetual state of self critique, self suspicion, and a feeling of linguistic insufficiency (Morita, 2004).

Sociopolitical challenges. Amin (1999) contends that in the preceding typification racial composition appears to play a role in the categorization of individuals as to their linguistic competence. That is, non-native speaking teachers' linguistic authenticity is additionally challenged when they are non-White. Following Derwing and Munro (2005), discrimination against accent and race has been constant topics in the studies founded in the Canadian context. They expound that in Canada, "L2 users of English" suffer from not only "accent discrimination," but also "discrimination on the basis of race" (p. 188). James (2000, 2001) investigates sociopolitical challenges facing Black teachers in Canada. James (2001) posits that Black teachers are constantly inspected and evaluated by students as to the degree to which they have lived up to expectations and abided by the social norms as teachers (James, 2000). If students link Blacks with lower social economic status, poor education, and crime, they may perceive a Black teacher in a negative way. He used one of his student's quotes, "I've never had a Black teacher before," as his article title (James, 2001) and he (1994) also raised an additional question on students'

possible perceptions of Asian teachers: Would you feel surprised if you found your English class teacher to be Chinese? James's question was partly answered by Derwing and Munro (2005)'s finding that Asian teacher candidates are treated unfairly (i.e. "bullying") by ESL students from East Europe simply because of their different color (p. 187). As well, Braine (2005b) reveals that Asian American students do not see American born Asian teachers as "native speakers of English simply because they are not Caucasian" (p. 22).

The issue of conflation of racial and linguistic identities is further developed in J. Liu's (1999) case studies, where Ms. DK was perceived by her students as a native speaker of English because of her racial composition (White) and proficiency in English although English was her second language. By contrast, Mr. K., who came from Korea to the United States at the age of nine and regarded himself as a NS of English, was perceived by his students as a non-native speaker of English despite his idiomatic American dialect because of his Asian ethnicity. These case studies imply that a "perceptive difference" could derive from an ideological stance (p. 174). This finding is resonant with the Kubota and Lin's (2006) study that regardless of non-White teachers' background in English, their color categorizes them into non-native speakers while White teachers whose English is not their first language are viewed as native speakers.

Hiring challenges. Native speakers exhibit conspicuous superiority to non-native speakers in job hunting (Kramsch, 1997). Many hiring units uphold the "birthright mentality," asserting that anyone who speaks English as a first language

can teach English and that non-native speakers are ineligible notwithstanding their competencies (Walelign, 1986, p.40). Canagarajah (1999a) interprets that linguistic hegemony prevails in the language teaching profession, comparing this phenomenon to protectionism in business. That is, where few jobs are available, NS teachers act as “language guardians” (Hewings & Tagg, 2012, p. 313) to protect their access to the profession by seeking to define linguistic competence in terms of Center-associated proficiency.

According to Rajagopalan (2005, p. 294), native speaker status is “a key selling point” in English as a foreign language teaching market since it is believed that employing native speakers of English will boost student recruitment. Ostensibly, students’ perceptions and “preferences” have been counted as the cause of the employment of NS teachers rather than NNS instructors at various institutions (Lurda, 2005, p. 6); yet, Moussu (2006) points out that the overwhelming preference for employing native speakers reflects politics, triggered by monetary profits (Rajagopalan, 2005). With globalization, English language teaching has become a “profit-making multinational industry” (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 87) and a globally “marketable” enterprise, including teaching positions, pedagogies, and guiding rules. The “ever-expanding and increasingly competitive language market” is controlled by the powerful to guarantee their “trade privilege” (Rajagopalan, 2005, p. 284). Native speaking teachers help language instruction providers to reap profits and privilege (Pennycook, 1998), while non-native speaking teachers have to “struggle to teach English as an international language” (Holliday, 2005, p. 9).

This market orientation has become “a justification for discriminatory hiring practice” (Rajagopalan, 2005, p. 294). As in the commoditized education, students are turned into “consumers” instead of “critical citizens” (Phillipson, 2009, p. 5), Rajagopalan (2005) establishes that the expensive investment that schools have spent in these native teachers drives students to expect to have native speakers instead of non-native speaking teachers. In addition, Derwing and Munro (2005) analyze that school staff does not think that ESL students can bear with “less than ideal teaching” as their tuition is costly (p.188). Thomas (1999), as an Indian instructor teaching English at a Community College in the United States, encountered many challenges in his ESOL (English as a Second or Other language) teaching trajectory. He finds that instructors who are non-native speakers of the target language are marginalized as outsiders within the ELT profession.

Not only in English-speaking countries, but also in non-English speaking contexts, the standardized native-speaker ideology is prevalent. The “native English speakers only” hiring criterion appears in many Asian countries, exemplified by the job advertisements in China seeking “Enthusiastic NATIVE English teachers” (Cook, 2005, p. 56). More ironically, a number of countries in Asia, including Korea, Japan, and China, have hired waves of English native speakers as language teachers in order to guarantee the English teaching quality (Phillipson, 2009), albeit many of these imported “language teachers” are “backpackers” without any educational credentials or trainings (Medgyes, 2001, p. 433); nonetheless, they are still granted high position and prestige just because they are “native speakers of English” (Derwing &

Munro, 2005, p. 180).

Challenges facing non-native English-speaking teachers were identified at a variety of levels: organizational – from schools; institutional – from society; and interpersonal – from students and native-speaking colleagues (Thomas, 1999). An example: ESL students within Canada were found by Amin (1999) to feel “shortchanged” by being assigned non-native teachers (p.98). Rajagopalan (2005) explicates this discriminatory phenomenon: when English is regarded as a commodity, the concept of native speakerism “has been transformed, as it were, into a certificate of quality, of authenticity, of hundred percent genuineness, of the coveted product on sale.” In this connotation, purchasers (i.e. students) are repeatedly cautioned against being defrauded by fake and cheap goods and are advised to scrutinize the genuineness of the quality (p. 285).

Summary

Notwithstanding the numerous debates in the extant research, it would seem that native/non-native speaker is an important psychological, socio-cultural, political, and ideological distinction for both students and teachers of world Englishes, or English as an International Language. Extensive research into world Englishes and Teachers of English as an International Language shows that context plays a role and studies also suggest how inner/outer circles function and trends toward increasing decolonization processes affect differential acceptance of varieties of English, as well as non-native English speaking teachers. It is also clear that those perceived as non-native English language speakers face unique challenges as teachers, especially

in contexts where English is the societal language. In Canada, a setting different from those non-native English milieus, what may situate students' attitudes toward their non-native teachers and what are the strengths and values of those non-native teachers? What accounts for the paradox between non-native speaking teachers' status as students' realistic learner models (Medgyes, 1992) and "othering," or their marginalization as "strangers in academia" (Zamel, 1995)? Considering other relevant variables, does teaching competence matter? How much does it weigh against language proficiency?

Complicating the interpretation of the preceding studies' findings, of course, is the reality that students who are consumers of EIL services are themselves non-native speakers of the target language and, therefore, also linguistic minorities. Many, arguably, have more in common, from the perspective of cultural congruence, with non-native English-speaking teachers than with teachers who are native speakers of English. From the reference point of the research literature on situated and culturally-referenced pedagogy (e.g., Davis et al., 2005; Pease-Alvarez & Schechter, 2005; Schechter & Cummins, 2003; Schechter & Ippolito, 2008), EFL students would presumably be in ideal positions to benefit from the linguistic resources and cultural sensitivities that non-native-speaking English language teachers bring to the classroom. For example, at my university there are large numbers of Chinese students, many of whom use the services of the Writing Center where I work. Given that Chinese students and I share the same cultural and linguistic background, I am in a position to use Chinese when my students

experience difficulty with communication in English, to alleviate comprehension issues and help my students to bridge the language barrier (Cummins & Schecter, 2003). I am also able to greet students in their native language and show interest in the knowledge of the countries where they are from. Why is it, then, that teachers' statuses as non-native speakers more often than not alienate them from the trust and confidence of their students (Braine, 1999b)? Why do their statuses as non-native speakers place them at the outer periphery of the "community of practice" of EFL teachers (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 42)? My two theoretical frameworks have shed light on the racial, economic, sociological, and political roots of the predicament of non-native speaking teachers. In my dissertation research, I aim to further deconstruct, examine, and re-theorize these seminal issues by investigating the perceptions of students of their non-native teachers as well as the challenges confronting non-native teachers through the prism of my own case study.

Chapter 5

Methodology

In this chapter, I describe the methodology of my dissertation study. Basically, I pursued two complementary investigative agendas: in the first instance, using my own experience as a case study, I investigated the problems and challenges confronting non-native-speaking teachers of English in English-dominant societal contexts. Secondly, I probed both native English-speaking and EIL students' perceptions of their non-native-speaking English language teachers as well as the reasons behind EIL learners' perceptions in the context of foreign or immigrant students' own goals and aspirations.

Research Questions

The following questions were used as heuristics to explore my research issues:

1. What are the perceptions of students regarding the professional and personal attributes of non-native English language teachers?
2. How do the individual locations of students influence their perceptions of native vs. non-native English-speaking instructors?
3. Describe the experiences faced by the author who is a non-native English language teacher in an English-dominant higher educational context. How do these experiences compare with those of non-native English-speaking instructors in the research literature?

Research Site

The research site where I conducted my study is located in a large city in Ontario province, Canada. The university at which I undertook this research is a

multicultural institution, with racially, ethnically, and linguistically mixed communities. The Writing Center at the university serves cross-disciplinary students (including undergraduates and graduates) from linguistically, culturally, and ethnically diverse backgrounds.

Participants

My respondents ranged from first-year to fourth-year undergraduates, from diverse departments, and with multiple specializations. The cohort comprised native-speaking and non-native speaking students, male and female, White and non-White, older teenagers and mature undergraduates. Anonymity was assured via the use of pseudonyms. Each respondent was offered a 25-dollar gift certificate for participating in this research.

Demographic background.

Table 1: Social and Demographic Features of Student Participants

Name	Gender	Age	Year of Studies at University	Program	Country of Birth	Residence Time in Canada	Status in Canada
Gang	M	24	Second	Business and Society	Mainland China	2 years	Permanent Immigrant
Chung	F	20	First	Law and Society	Vietnam	2.5 years	International Student
Ava	M	22	Fourth	Social Science	Canada	22 years	Canadian Citizen
Olivia	F	24	Second	Humanities	Canada	24 years	Canadian Citizen
Annabel	F	19	First	Business Economics	Hongkong China	7 months	International Student
Simon	M	31	Second	Kinesiology	Iran	18 years	Canadian Citizen

Purposeful sampling. All six subjects were selected by me via purposeful sampling. The criteria for choosing the subjects were: accessibility, willingness to

share information (e.g., being happy to talk with me and willing to offer me elaborate information that I needed), and their relationship with the themes investigated. It seemed to me from the informal signs from the students who sought assistance at the Writing Center that whether the writing instructor was a native or a non-native English-speaking teacher was a significant variable for some. Where I had the indication that this was the case I considered these individuals as potential respondents for my study. Patton (2015) defines the significance of purposeful sampling in this way: “Strategically selecting information-rich cases to study, cases that by their nature and substance will illuminate the inquiry question being investigated” (pps. 264-265). Patton (ibid) also emphasizes the importance of the purposeful sampling for qualitative “in-depth” inquiry (p. 264). Similarly, Gorden (1980) asserts that careful selection of subjects reduces repressive factors which inhibit the participants from providing relevant information.

A Qualitative Research Approach

In the main, I employed qualitative research approaches. Different from quantitative research where data are “numerical,” qualitative studies are verbal and visual (Bryman, 2009, p. 46). Creswell (1998) defines qualitative research as an inquiring process “involving an interpretative, naturalistic approach” (p. 15). Similarly, Denzin and Lincoln (2011) indicate that “[q]ualitative research is a field of inquiry in its own right” (p. 3), “a situated activity that locates the observer in the world” (p. 3). Tedlock (2009, as cited in Tedlock, 2011, p. 334) describes it as “an enterprise” composed of explorations, introspections, and modeling people’s

experiences. Sherman and Webb (1988) explain that the word “qualitative” denotes “a direct concern with experience as it is ‘lived’ or ‘felt’ or ‘undergone’.” By this they mean that the goal of qualitative research is to comprehend “experience as nearly as possible as its participants feel it or live it” (p. 7). Following Sherman and Webb (1988, p. 4), qualitative research aims to uncover people’s interpretations of their experience, construction of the meanings related to their experience, and to “involve one personally and intersubjectively in conscious pursuits of meaning.” In Patton’s (2015, p. 3) words: “Qualitative research interprets the meaning-making process.”

While quantitative research studies “a few variables and many cases,” qualitative research aims to examine “a few cases and many variables” (Ragin, 1987, as cited in Creswell, 1998, pp. 15-16). Creswell (1998) compares qualitative study to “an intricate fabric composed of minute threads, many colors, different textures, and various blends of materials” (p. 13). Denzin and Lincoln (2011) put forward that “Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials ...that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals’ lives” (pp. 3-4). Denzin and Lincoln (2011) perceive qualitative research as a crystal with “multiple lenses” (p. 5), a “quilt making” (p. 5), or “jazz improvisation” (p. 5) process, and “a set of complex interpretative practices” (p. 6) “that each practice makes the world visible in a different way” (p. 4). Nelson et al. (1992) further assert that “Qualitative research is an interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, and sometimes counterdisciplinary field. Qualitative research is

many things at the same time. It is multiparadigmatic in focus” (p. 4). Although a multi-method approach is not in itself a measure of validity, according to Flick (2002, p. 227) it is an “alternative to validation.” This “pluralization” of life modes and interpretation approaches (Flick, 2006, p. 11) turned me—the researcher, into “a quilt maker or a jazz improviser” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 5), handling different pieces together. Plus, I had to battle against the “double-faced ghost” in qualitative study -- to integrate my participants’ authentic experiences seamlessly with my own observations and interpretations (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 11).

Creswell (1998) argues that a qualitative research approach is needed when the research design entails complexities, expansive timelines, considerable data, descriptive language, and respondents’ varying lenses. My field work spanned nearly two years, and involved students from linguistically, culturally, and ethnically diverse groups and multi-modal delivery methods. Where language and perspectives were concerned, I utilized different strategies to delineate my students’ multiple points of views of me as their non-English-speaking writing instructor. As my dissertation investigated a non-native English-speaking instructor’s experiences at a higher education Writing Center, the qualitative research method enabled me to deeply inquire into this experience, and excavate the complicated “social meanings” of my students’ different viewpoints caused by their “subjective perspectives and social backgrounds” (Flick, 2006, p. 16). A qualitative approach helped me to elicit my students’ stories, understand why and how they were important, combine them with my interpretations, and consequently address my research questions. I entered the

“natural setting” (Creswell, 1998, p. 17), the Writing Center, to conduct the field work as both the object and the instrument for inquiry (Patton, 2015), and thus my research was both “personal” and “interpersonal,” consistent with the two essential features of qualitative research as suggested by Patton (2015, p. 4).

According to a majority of qualitative researchers, qualitative data are employed to “develop theoretical ideas” (Bryman, Bell, & Teevan, 2012, p. 130) as qualitative research is “inductive” (ibid, p. 128). Flick (2006) agrees that the primary objective of qualitative research is to frame and develop theories. Therefore, “grounded theory” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 2) came into being as shown by its characteristic of “oscillation between testing emerging theories and collecting data” (Bryman, Bell & Teevan, 2012, p. 130). Following Glaser and Strauss (1967), discovering or “generating a theory from data means that most hypotheses and concepts not only come from the data, but are systematically worked out in relation to the data during the course of the research” (p. 6). They also illustrate that the generation of grounded theory “is a general method of comparative analysis” (p. 1), involving “a process of research” (p. 6).

An Autoethnographic Study

In order to describe and recount my experience and my students’ perceptions of me from multiple angles, I immersed myself in the naturalistic context, the higher education Writing Center. I talked to my students extensively, listened to them, instructed them, observed them, and interacted with them to get to know what their points of views were, and why they held such perspectives. I used three main data

collection strategies, expanded upon below, to inform my inquiry: autoethnography, autobiographic interviews (of students), and observation. These different data sources allowed me to triangulate my research findings in order to enhance their credibility and validity (Creswell, 1994, p. 189). Guided by my theoretical frameworks of Critical Race Theory and Bourdieu's notions of "cultural capital" and "legitimate language," I tried to discover the extent to which my racialized body in a White elite university space depicted me as a teacher deprived of cultural capital and legitimate language and as the teacher of color at the bottom of the postsecondary career ladder.

Autoethnography. The term "autoethnography" was first put forward by David Hayano (1979). While ethnography researches into the other as "an unfamiliar topic" (Patton, 2015, p. 101), autoethnography utilizes self as a familiar topic to study the other by placing personal narratives at the core of the examination and "searching for understanding of others (culture/society) through self" (Chang, 2008, p. 49). "Self" here refers to the "ethnographer self" (Chang, 2008, p. 46). The "introspective, personally engaged self" (Ellis & Bochner, 2000, p. 742) includes "self-awareness about and reporting one's own experiences and introspections as a primary data source" (Patton, 2015, p. 102). Ellis (2004) demonstrates that autoethnography encompasses narrative or reflective ethnography, personal ethnography and so on. Following is a more detailed, often-cited definition of autoethnography and its interplay with ethnography.

Autoethnography is an autobiographical genre of writing and research that displays multiple layers of consciousness, connecting the personal to the cultural. Back and forth autoethnographers gaze, first through an ethnographic wide-angle lens, focusing outward on social and the cultural aspects of their personal experience; then, they look inward, exposing a vulnerable self that is moved by and may move through, refract, and resist cultural interpretations. As they zoom backward and forward, inward and outward, distinctions between the personal and cultural become blurred, sometimes beyond distinct recognition (Ellis & Bochner, 2000, p. 739).

Autoethnography, being both a lens and a methodology (Muncey, 2010), “has become the term of choice in describing studies and procedures that connect the personal to the cultural” (Ellis & Bochner, 2000, p. 740), “the personal and the social,” and “link macro and micro levels of analysis” (Chamberlayne, Bornat, & Wengraf, 2000, pp. 2-3). Chang (2007) points out that it is the feature of being at once “analytical and interpretative” (Chang, 2008, p. 43) that differentiates autoethnography from other narratives. Ellis and Bochner (2000) comment that “[a]utoethnographers vary in their emphasis on the research process (graphy), on culture (ethno), and on self (auto),” and that “[d]ifferent exemplars of autoethnography fall at different places along the continuum of each of these three axes” (p. 740, as cited in Chang, 2008, p. 48). Chang (2007) interpreted Ellis and Bochner’s words in this way: “autoethnography should be ethnographical in its methodological orientation, cultural in its interpretative orientation, and autobiographical in its content orientation” as “auto-ethno-graphy.”

Autoethnographers aim at seeking cultural interpretations of their autobiographical data by associating self with the society in a critical fashion (p. 3-4). Most importantly, in Chang's (2008) vision, autoethnography is especially effective for research in multicultural contexts and for fostering intercultural awareness and promoting cross-cultural understanding and tolerance, and will consequently enhance "self-healing" (p. 54), "self-transformation" (p. 57), and "self-empowerment" (p. 54) through "self-reflection" and "self-understanding" (p. 57). In this manner, the community with "unfamiliar others" (p. 53) can be turned into an "inclusive community" (p. 54) or "extended community" (Greene, 2000, as cited in Chang 2008, p. 53).

As an autoethnographer, I am both the author and focus of the story, the one who tells and the one who experiences, the observer and the observed, the creator and the created. I am the person at the intersection of the personal and the cultural, thinking and observing as an ethnographer and writing and describing as a storyteller (Ellis, 2009, p. 13).

Pavlenko (2007) points out that over the past ten years autobiographic narratives have become a popular approach in eliciting data in applied linguistics (p. 163) and that it is a valuable and legitimate approach to use in inquiring into issues in education, sociology, and sociolinguistics (p. 164). Autobiographic narratives probe into researchers' inner worlds and deploy the "insider's view" (p. 165) which cannot be approached by "experimental methodologies" (p. 164). In addition, while people from the dominant class view some phenomena as "transparent," subordinate people

can use autobiographic narratives as their weapon to analyze issues of inequality critically (p. 175).

I used autoethnographic, first person narratives to record my emotions, challenges, struggles, and experiences at the Writing Center. Pavlenko (2007) proposes that conceptual premises and perspectives are constructed before the data analysis, albeit the ensuing analysis could rectify some theoretical anticipation. My autoethnographic analyses were embedded within my two theoretical frameworks. The advantage here is that researchers do not have to pretend that their findings are “extemporaneous and objective, instead they make their assumptions clear, conceptual constructs explicit, and analyses replicable” (p. 175).

Data Collection Strategies

I adopted various forms of qualitative data collection methods. Following Creswell (1994, p. 174), the use of a mixed methods approach enables the researcher to understand the phenomenon or the notion being investigated better. The following data collection strategies constitute dimensions of my qualitative methodology: reflective journal entries, autobiographic interviews, and fieldnotes (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). These different data sources allowed me to “triangulate” my research findings (Creswell, 1994, p. 189).

Reflective journal entries. I used reflective journals as a vehicle for my autoethnographic explorations and analyses. As compared with descriptive fieldnotes, journal entries involve more subjectivity. Despite some claims of their “therapeutic” value, the goal of journal entries is to improve the author’s documentation of features

and conditions that obtain at the moment of the reported incident. “It is important to remember that the reflections are a means to a better study, not an end in themselves” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p.114).

I kept a record of my reflections on my teaching experiences at the Writing Center. Not encompassing all the characteristics of “reflective notes” regarding introspection on methods, analysis, “ethical dilemmas and conflicts,” and “the observer’s frame of mind” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p.115), my journal entries comprised, in the main, my impressions, feelings, and reflections on my students’ activities, behaviors, reactions, prejudices, as well as their overt or covert conflicts with me. In my journal reflections I strove to excavate the causes of these “dilemmas and conflicts” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p.115) as well as to opine on problems and challenges faced by non-native English language teachers.

In order to distinguish my reflective journal entries from my fieldnotes, I used single-spaced italics in formatting my journal entries. I wrote these entries after every encounter at the end of the tutoring sessions. I recounted both my students’ positive and negative responses to me, documenting my own emotional reactions when I encountered behaviors such as resistance and hostility, and paying close attention to recurring patterns. There were two occasions where I observed changes in the patterns. As I depicted my students’ reactions during the whole process of each appointment, in the first occasion, I found the changes in some of their words, facial expressions, actions, and attitudes toward me as the tutoring session proceeded. In the second instance, since some students returned and kept visiting me and I recorded

each of their visits, I narrated the evolution in their perceptions of me by comparing their initial behaviors and responses to me and those during their subsequent visits.

Autobiographic interviews. Mishler (1986) considers the interview to be “a form of discourse...a joint product of what interviewees and interviewers talk about together and how they talk with each other....How we make that representation and the analytical procedures we apply to it reveal our theoretical assumptions and presuppositions about relations between discourse and meaning.” According to Seidman (2006), the main aim of the interview is to make sense of others’ experiences by situating their actions in context in order to capture the meaning of those experiences.

I interviewed six university-level students from linguistically, culturally, and ethnically varied backgrounds about their perceptions of non-White, non-native English-speaking writing instructors. My respondents were both male and female undergraduates, aged 18 to 31, pursuing their bachelor’s degrees at the same university. They were from diverse disciplinary backgrounds and comprised native and non-native speakers of English. All interviews were conducted in English.

Following Patton’s (2015) guidance, I asked “singular questions” (i.e., each question had only one idea) to avoid misunderstanding and confusion (p. 451). Since wording plays an important role in obtaining information from participants, I formulated my questions carefully and deliberately to be sure that I used the same words of each question to ask my interviewees and that each of my words made full sense to them and that I minimized “dichotomous questions” (Patton, 2015, p. 447).

My interviews were of the structured, sequenced variety; that is, I asked all respondents the same questions in the same order (Schechter & Bayley, 2002). I utilized a standardized interview protocol in order to reduce the variability produced by varying interview questions. However, I was also aware that the biggest disadvantage of the standardized interview was its lack of flexibility. I divided my interview protocol into four parts: background, motivation to study at university, academic and social life, and experiences at the Writing Center. As suggested by Patton (2015), I asked easy questions at the very beginning of the interview about students' demographic background to relax and warm up my participants. Subsequently, I asked more complicated (Why, How, and What) questions about their feelings and experiences (Patton, 2015).

With respondents' permissions, I audiotaped the interviews to record every word said by my participants. Gorden (1980) argues that audiotaping is a very useful instrument in interviewing. The advantage was that not only did I have accurate and comprehensive transcripts of my six participants' responses for comparison and contrast, but I also captured the exact words that they had used in the interview. This strategy allowed me to reproduce direct quotations from my students' responses in my dissertation. It also left me free, while conducting the interviews, to take notes on my respondents' facial expressions, laughter, and (short or longer) pauses in their speech, information that I subsequently integrated in brackets in my transcripts (Mishler, 1986).

Fieldnotes. Fieldnotes are “the written account of what the researcher hears, sees, experiences, and thinks in the course of collecting and reflecting on the data in a qualitative study” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p.110). Clandinin and Connelly (2000, p. 83) believe that these “field texts” “help fill in the richness, nuance, and complexity of the landscape, returning the reflecting researcher to a richer, more complex, and puzzling landscape than memory alone is likely to construct.” In addition, fieldnotes provide the researcher with a written record of the progress and advancement of their study, including changes in conditions or perspective that occur across the duration. I took fieldnotes of my six participants/interviewees at the Writing Center during the time period when I conducted interviews with them in order to supplement the audiorecorded data.

All my fieldnotes were formatted as follows: double-spaced with regular font. My fieldnotes included direct quotations of my six participants and the use of representative quotes in my dissertation. I also recorded my six participants’ (with their pseudonyms) appearances, activities, ways of speaking and behaving with regard to specific or interesting revelations.

Data Analysis

My analyses are based on recurring themes and repeated patterns in my data. I adopted the “constant comparative method” (Glaser Strauss, 1967, p. 101) undertaking inter- and cross-case comparisons. My inter-case comparisons refer to comparisons between my informants’ answers to interview questions (e.g., regarding their reactions to me) and my fieldnotes based on my observations of their responses

(to me on the site). My cross-case comparisons refer to comparisons between my different participants to identify their commonalities and differences on a holistic level.

As well, I compared my respondents' perceptions of me (in interviews) and my perceptions of them (in my reflective journal entries). This cross-perspective analysis was addressed by Bogdan and Biklen (2003) as follows: "write about how you see it as opposed to how they see it" (p. 190). I also compared my three sites: the Writing Center with its conventional booking mode, the Writing Center under the impact of the new on-line booking system, and the drop-in pod in the library. Following Creswell's (1998) remarks that qualitative research is "multimethod in focus" (p. 15), I compared my three methods: internal data (i.e., fieldnotes and reflective journal entries) from an insider's perspective and my external data (i.e., autographic interviews) from an outsider's angle. In addition, I compared and contrasted my sources of data with those in other literature I reviewed.

As well, in my data analysis I paid attention to the connections between my data analysis and my conceptual frameworks. Bogdan and Biklen (2003) elaborate that an important function of theoretical frameworks is to enable the researcher to discover gaps and inconsistencies, as well as excavate in depth to "expand theory" (p. 172). My autoethnography was informed by many scholars (such as Bourdieu and many critical race theorists) and my methodology flowed out of my two theoretical frameworks. Hence, my interview questions were conceptualized as part of an invented dialogue between Bourdieu and CRT researchers.

My research questions, and respondents' answers to them, determined my coding categories. For example, I used my participants' responses on their life and career goals, views of ideal English language teachers and of NS teachers and NNS teachers, to identify different categories of disposition. In addition, I examined the individual socio-historical locations (Gutierrez & Rogoff, 2003) of my students in order to interpret their preconceptions and perceptions.

Chang (2008) points out that the comparative method probes into similarities and distinctions of one's "consciousness" so that one can better comprehend "self" (p. 136). I read Chang's works (2005, 2007, 2008) on autoethnography after most of my data analysis was completed and I had submitted drafts of the findings chapters; therefore, following Dr. Sandra Schecter's advice (personal communication) I used her criteria as a validity check. Chang illuminates that the utilization of external sources (interviews) helps to "confirm, complement, or dispute internal data generated from recollection and reflection" (p. 8). Chang (2008) also regards conceptual frameworks as "explaining tools" to account for "a social phenomenon" instead of being "a hard core 'tested hypothesis' in a scientific sense" (p. 137). My analyses and interpretations of my participants' locations are aligned with Chang (2008)'s contextual interpretative approach to considering "sociocultural, political, economical, religious, historical, ideological, and geographical" factors in data elicitation (p. 136) to "zoom in on the details of your life" and "zoom out to the broad context" (p. 137).

Researcher's Positionality

In this section, I briefly expand on my positionality as a researcher. (I use the term “expand” because in Chapter 1 I have provided some autobiographical information that helps to contextualize my sociohistorical locations vis a vis this study.) In conducting this study I have been able to access both the “emic,” or insider, and “etic,” or outsider, perspectives (Harris, 1976, p. 330; Feterman, 1998) on issues that may have shaped my student participants’ positions on seeking help from native vs non-native English speaking instructors. Because I am also a foreign-born student, newly immigrated to Canada, I am able to place myself in my ESL students’ shoes, as it were. I even share a common cultural, i.e., racial, ethnical, and linguistic background with the Chinese students whom I interviewed and observed. This emic perspective enabled me to establish rapport with my respondents and to pursue hunches and elicit authentic data from my informants.

At the same time, given my status as instructor I was considered an outsider to most students who sought services at the Writing Center in that I represented the university. My outsider’s position allowed me to view myself as a “subject” (Ellis & Bochner, 2000, p. 733) and as a participant-observer in my own research, and created “some important degree of detachment” (Patton, 2015, p. 101) from my students and the views they expressed. In the end, I found myself embracing a position of “empathic neutrality” vis a vis my respondents, many of whom were not highly familiar to me. This neutrality was reinforced by the practical circumstance that due to the structuring of academic schedules in higher education, my relationships with

students generally had a duration of no longer than one term, that is, not long enough to engender close, enduring bonds (cf. Whyte, 1943).

Summary

In summation, given that I was both the researcher and the object of my research, to investigate the lived realities of non-native teachers of English in North American institutions of higher education I undertook an autoethnographic study, grounded in conceptual frameworks of anti-racism education and Bourdieu-ian notions of cultural capital. I triangulated my study's findings through data collection strategies that included reflective journals and autobiographic interviews, and an extensive literature review of research on the topics implicated. In the two chapters that follow, I report my study's findings – beginning with my students' perspectives on the issues taken up in this dissertation and continuing with my own efforts to make sense of my experiences as a NNS writing instructor, both concurrently (through my field notes and journal entries) and throughout the process of this research.

Chapter 6

Study Findings 1: Students' Perceptions of the Role of English and English language Instructors' Characteristics

In this chapter, I take up several major findings from my research concerning: socio-historical locations (Gutierrez & Rogoff, 2003) that impact students' views on the role of English in the world economy in general and in their future lives in particular, respondents' perceptions of both native and non-native English-speaking instructors, and the evolution of students' perceptions and preferences regarding ideal characteristics of English language instructors. The following section is devoted to discussion of the sociohistorical factors that impacted students' perceptions of me as a non-native English-speaking instructor — factors that situate students' socioeconomic, sociocultural, sociopolitical, and sociolinguistic locations. Consistent with Gutierrez and Rogoff (2003), I use the term “socio-historical factors” to reference conditions that rather than viewing “regularities” as being stable and concentrating on people's “traits,” researchers and educators are encouraged to regard students' cultural practices as “repertoires” and deal with students' “differences” instead of deficiencies (p. 19). Less influenced by the “deficit-model thinking” which treats minority students as inferior as being evaluated against the dominant normalized standard, the “socio-historical” locations stress students' cultural activities and examine similarities in differences across cultures and communities (p. 19).

Students' Socio-historical Locations

Family background. In this section I discuss students' family backgrounds, focusing on parents' level of education, economic situations, and family expectations regarding respondents' future missions and life choices. Students had lived for many years with their parents and most of my respondents were still living with their parents while I was interviewing them. They were raised and nurtured by their parents; therefore, their parents' education, values, and expectations all affected their visions and perspectives of the Canadian society and people in Canada. Their parents' educational levels, economic backgrounds, and expectations continue to exert an influence on their' life goals, career interests, and world outlooks. My student respondents' social and demographic characteristics are listed in Table 1 in Chapter 5—my method chapter.

Generally speaking, my participants' parents and their other family members had attended universities or colleges in Canada or in their home countries. The exception is Chung, 20 years old, who moved to Canada from Vietnam in 2012. She is the first in her family to attend university.

Ava and Olivia were born in Ontario, Canada. Their parents and other family members went to colleges in Canada. Ava's father got his degree in Toronto in the 1990s. Her brother, aunts, and uncles also received degrees. For Olivia, her father and brothers earned college degrees in Ontario and her mother completed her university degree online.

Simon, 31 years old, immigrated to Canada from Iran at the age of 13. His whole family attended universities, and his parents earned their Master's degrees in his home country--Iran.

Gang, 24, immigrated from China to Canada to join his family in Toronto in 2012. His parents held university degrees and his father had majored in business at a Chinese university. Gang's sister was attending university in Toronto as well.

Annabel, 19, came to Canada from Hongkong in 2014 as an international student. Her father earned his Bachelor's degree in Toronto in the 1980s and he went back to Hong Kong after graduation. He sent his two children back to Ontario for further education around thirty years later. Annabel's brother was enrolled in another Ontarian university. However, Annabel's other family members only received secondary education.

Besides parents' educational backgrounds, families' economic conditions affected students' lives, studies, and perceptions. Most of my participants' parents had jobs and were still working up to the time when I interviewed them. However, students from wealthier families did not have to worry much about their tuition fees and daily life expenses while students from less endowed families were more concerned about their financial situations and tended to express a more firm desire to earn money after they graduated. There were two university students in Gang's family (i.e. his younger sister and him) in Toronto. Although his mother quit her job in China and was living with the two siblings in Toronto, his father's income in

China was quite sufficient for the whole family. Gang told me that he drove to school every day.

Huo: Are your parents still working or have they retired?

Gang: Like my father, still working in China. But like my mom, gave up her job in China, like, so...

Huo: So she is taking care of you and your sister.

Gang: Ya, ya.

Huo: You're very lucky. What's your father's job?

Gang: My father's job, like, like, eh...

Huo: In business?

Gang: Yes, he is a business man.

Huo: Great, so he can travel here and there!

Gang: Ya (laughed).

Huo: Have you encountered financial challenges at university?

Gang: Financial challenges? No.

Huo: No?

Gang: Ya.

Huo: So you have a car!

Gang: Ya, but not for me, like for my parents.

Huo: That means your parents can offer you everything, so you don't worry about money. You don't have to get up early in the morning to wash dishes, or to be a cashier.

Gang: Ya. Ya.

Huo: You don't do part-time jobs, right?

Gang: I don't do the part-time job.

[1-54-73]

Similarly, in Annabel's family, there were two international university students studying in Ontario, Annabel and her older brother. Their parents who resided in Hong Kong paid their two children's tuition fees in Canada.

Huo: Are your parents still working or have they retired?

Annabel: Working. Both are working. Mother is working like an administrative work.

H: So she's an officer, right?

A: Yes. Yes.

H: So in what field?

A: It's environmental, like company that do qualifications for other companies.

H: That's very good, so your mom has power, right?

A: Ya (laughed loud).

H: How about your dad?

A: My dad is working like a, he's working in Hongkong university.

H: Hongkong University?

A: Ya. Maybe the Computer Department.

H: A professor?

A: No, no, like a technician.

H: Do you have any financial challenges?

A: Not really.

H: So you don't have any part-time jobs?

A: No.

[5-53-70]

By contrast, Chung was suffering from financial constraints and a tight budget as an international student. Chung and her mother were living in Canada, but her younger sister was in Vietnam alone, waiting to move to Canada for the family reunion after Chung and her mother got their permanent residency.

Huo: So only you're in Canada.

Chung: My mom is here too, but my sister is back home.

Huo: So you mean your mother is here and your father is at home.

Chung: My dad passed away when I was in Grade 7.

Huo: Sorry.

Chung: It's O.K.

Huo: Is your mother still working or has she retired?

Chung: She just stay home because she just got married with a Vietnamese guy in Canada, but he's a Canadian, so we're doing, we try to apply for permanent residency, but right now, she doesn't work; she just stay home and like doing housework.

Huo: O.K. What's his job?

Chung: He works in a factory, but I'm not sure of the name of the factory.

Huo: Do you have any financial challenges?

Chung: Since I'm an international student, I had to pay like three times like other Canadian, so it's financial. Financially, it's my problem.

Huo: Will your stepfather pay that for you?

Chung: Ya. He have to help me, like to pay it because my mom, she doesn't work here and then she doesn't really have many money, so my stepfather have to help me, so that's why we try to do the permanent residents, so we, I can just borrow from the government and I pay back after I graduate.

[3-45-58]

Simon, born to a middle-class family in Iran, owned a car and had a tennis club membership in Toronto. However, he admitted that he still had financial issues

despite his secure family background.

Huo: Where are your parents now?

Simon: Being back and forth. Maybe be here half a year and be back in their country.

Huo: Are they doing business?

Simon: Ya. Ya.

Huo: Internationally?

Simon: Back home.

Huo: What business if you don't mind?

Simon: Well, my dad still works back home in his clinic.

Huo: "Clinic?" So he is a ...

Simon: He's a radiologist.

Huo: Really? How about mom?

Simon: My mom just goes with him, too. She stays with him. They go together.

Huo: I see. Do you have any financial challenges?

Simon: Financial challenges, absolutely. I think everybody faces financial challenges. And, it's the school itself, or education in Canada is like one of the most expensive places to study, you know, so I don't think undergraduate students should be paid so much tuition before they begin their life. They're under so much debt that they can barely afford to pay their own tuition let alone they have to get married, have a child, and buy a home. And you know, it's just a prolonged process that you're going to work and pay your debt. The whole system is kind of... I don't agree with. If it was me, I would change the whole... we look at things.

Huo: Do your parents pay your tuition fees, or by yourself?

Simon: OSAP.

[4-65-80]

Olivia, Canadian-born, had financial concerns as well. Although Olivia's parents were still working in Canada, like Simon's parents, they did not pay her tuition fees.

Huo: Are your parents still working?

Olivia: They are still working.

Huo: What kind of work are they doing, generally speaking?

Olivia: My mom is a nurse and my father is a mechanic.

Huo: Do you have any financial challenges?

Olivia: Yes, I have a lot because currently I'm not working and I commute here and it's a kind of hard because buses are very expensive and you have to pay for food and... Sometimes like when you're taking a course, the book will be like two hundred something dollars. You have to pay for another book, so a lot, so I have a lot of financial challenges.

Huo: Do your parents pay your tuition fees?

Olivia: No, no.

Huo: How can you afford it?

Olivia: I know. I have OSAP. I have to return that.

[6-46-55]

To a large degree, my participants' career interests and overall life goals were influenced by their parents' expectations and their perceived family responsibilities. Although Simon did not explicitly mention that he would inherit his family's business, he told me that engaging in health care like his father was his career interest, a goal that motivated him to come back to the university for his second Bachelor's degree in Kinesiology. Being his own boss, as it were, also played a role in his decision. "I also want to do something in the health care industry. I would like to be self-employed. That was why I came back to school. I was looking into physiotherapy, eh, or, mm, medicine, or dental school, so either of these" [4-118].

Although Gang's dream job of opening a bar conflicted with his parents' expectations and wishes, he felt the weight of his responsibilities as one of the heirs to his family's business: "Oh, like, it's like a family business, so, if I graduate, they may like, like, they want me to inherit their business—a company, real estate" [1-249]. His program, Business and Society, and his sister's program, Accounting, may be interpreted as clear indications of their parents' success in socializing their children to take on the family business in the future.

Sociocultural locations. Students' family histories, educational backgrounds, and corresponding sociocultural challenges all constituted important factors that shaped students' perceptions. Ava and Simon are perceived by me as White, with Afghanistan and Iran origins respectively. Unlike Ava who was born in Canada, Simon immigrated to Canada in 1997 when he was 13 years old. He had a strong

sense of belonging to Canada and regarded himself as a native speaker of English.

Olivia, Black, a descendent of Saint Vincent, was born in Canada. All three were Canadians, having resided in Canada for twenty years or so, and had accumulated more cultural capital than the other three ESL students who had lived in Canada for a much shorter period of time (less than three years). My participants admitted that they had encountered challenges in both their academic and social lives.

Academic challenges. All participants recounted that they had experienced academic challenges, in relation to academic writing particularly, and related to their participation in class.

Academic writing. Academic writing posed a great challenge to students. Even Canadian-born students considered writing to be difficult for them.

Even if I understand the assignment requirements, when you have to write an essay, it's very difficult for me to... I have to admit the thesis is the hardest part because sometimes it's really hard to put your flow of ideas into a thesis form. It's hard to put my thoughts in the paper. For instance, if I read something, I'll read until I understand. That's fine. I'll put it aside, but when I come to writing, I find it more difficult because you need to make sense for others to read it and you need to put your ideas in a way that does make sense. (Ava, Canadian-born)

[2-146]

Some of the issues that I've encountered is essay writing, like coming up with a thesis statement, something could be challenging. (Olivia, Canadian-born)

[6-249]

ESL students also experienced considerable difficulty with their academic studies at university, especially with respect to written assignments. They attributed these academic challenges to cultural differences and varying educational norms and expectations.

Eh, like, my TA told me, like, eh, eh, he said, my comprehension is O.K., but "when you like, write an essay, or something like that, you cannot write clearly,

or express, or demonstrate your idea clearly, so the only problem is you do not know how to write.” Because like, probably like different culture, like, for the Chinese people, they don’t think specific things; they always think the wider things, you know. Ya. It’s little complex because Chinese religion is Buddha and Daoism, so their ideas demonstrate wider; that means you, you shouldn’t care about too much detail. (Gang) [1-349]

Sometimes because there’s a big difference between university and like ... secondary school, the expectation and also Hongkong or Asian education system and Western system is also very different, so sometimes, I would need to find help from the Writing Center to know more about what is expected in my assignments. (Annabel) [5-175]

Besides Annabel and Gang, other students whom I did not use as respondents also pointed out the differences in the ways they were taught to write academic essays in their countries of origin and western discursive style.

Class participation. My respondents had difficulty in participating in class as well. Among my six respondents, Ava was the only student who enjoyed participating in class discussions. “I like to participate. I would say I was not so active, but I do try to be as active to get a good mark for the discussion part” [2-114]. My other five interviewees did not actively engage in their classes. Through the interviews three major reasons for this outcome emerged: shyness, age gap, and limited language skills.

Olivia stated that the low degree of participation was caused by her shyness and lack of interest in some courses.

Huo: Do you like to participate in class discussions?

Olivia: Sometimes. I’m a shy person, but...I don’t mind participating.

Huo: Actually in what courses you tended to participate more?

Olivia: Right now, I’m in a women’s studies course, and when they have an open discussion, then I’ll be able to openly discuss what I read and, you know, but...

Huo: But?

Olivia: History course, I’m so shy saying anything.

Huo: Because you don't have interest or do you have stage fright?

Olivia: Ya. I really don't have interests.

[6-205-212]

Annabel also attributed shyness as the leading cause to her insufficient participation in class discussions. She additionally volunteered that the topic of the discussion decided the level of her engagement.

Huo: Do you like to participate in class discussions?

Annabel: I think it depends on the class discussion topic, but I, honestly, I'm quite shy, so I seldom participate.

Huo: For what topics are you more active in the discussion?

Annabel: Maybe something related to my own culture, like Hongkong.

[5-156-159]

Simon was an extrovert and displayed a cheerful disposition; however, he did not like to participate in class discussions. He accounted for this by citing an age gap with his classmates.

Sometimes I do (participate); sometimes I don't because I feel, I kind of feel an outsider. Because I'm older than the rest of the students, in one of my classes, actually I am the oldest student (laughed). I feel like the class is just concentrating on little things that are unimportant to me and I rather not get involved with while other students have trouble talking about and are not quite understanding it. Maybe I will speak with the professor one to one to get my point out, but I haven't participated in school because I didn't think it was my place. Even I mention something, I don't think I get a lot of feedback from the rest of the students maybe just the professor will be able to discuss things with me and I would waste everybody else's time, so it's just a matter of the age thing, that's I feel.

[4-212]

Chung and Gang both thought that they were much more active in their ESL classes than with their Canadian classmates in subject matter classes. In their view, their inadequate English skills prevented them from full and effective class participation.

If, if, I were in the ESL class, I would speak, more confident, in there, because we are all international students. Ya. I don't care! Ya. If, like, like, like, Canadians in a small class, I was afraid of talking. Like, like, it seems like, like,

you show your, you show your, you show your...I mean, I mean, they can speak very well; so, I can't, so when I speak, are they going to, can they understand or no? (Gang)

[1-318]

I actually speak a lot in my ESL class, but in my other class, I don't know why I, I couldn't. I love to speak in class, but since my English is not that good, so I sit lonely. Right now I'm not (active), but I really love to, like to discuss in class, so I'm trying to improve my English and I try, try everything to, so I can answer the question. (Chung)

[3-177]

Social challenges. My participants expressed the idea that they had experienced social challenges such as making friends. ESL students also experienced communication problems that they attributed to language barriers. I listed my participants' responses based on two categories: "friends circles" (e.g., who they chose to hang out with) and "the language chosen to speak" (e.g., what language they wanted to speak with others).

Friends circles. My participants discussed their social lives under two umbrellas: in classroom and extra-classroom. ESL students generally did not know their classmates' names and vice versa. For Chung, the large size of the class prevented her and her classmates from getting to know one another.

Huo: Do you know all of them in the whole class?

Chung: The whole class, I don't think so.

Huo: Do they know your name?

Chung: I don't think so.

Huo: But the professor knows your name, right?

Chung: I don't think so.

Huo: You don't think so. How can that be?

Chung: Because the class is like two hundred people.

[3-168-175]

Similarly, Annabel thought it hard to make friends with her classmates and she had only a few friends from her classes. "I think it's hard to make friends in

university because all the class is different. You only see those people when you're in class and there's not much time to social activities" [5-134].

Gang felt a sense of isolation and estrangement because he remembered his classmates' names, but nobody remembered his name, except for his professor and teaching assistant. This situation was clearly upsetting to him.

Gang: I always like to remember others' names. When I say "hi," they forgot my names, you know, like, I remember their names. You know, sometimes I just say "hi, Eric," but, but, they don't know my name. They say "hi" like this.

Huo: They don't know your name?

Gang: Ya. Ya.

Huo: So who knows your name? Nobody knows your name?

Gang: My TA and my professor.

[1-339]

Although Simon had been in Canada for 18 years and was no longer an ESL student, he still found it very difficult to make friends with his fellow students.

Huo: Do you have friends in your class?

Simon: No. No. Impossible.

Huo: Since they are young?

Simon: Exactly.

[4-238-241]

Notwithstanding their distinct cultural and ethnic backgrounds, outside of class students, either native- or foreign-born, mingled mainly with people from their own cultural backgrounds while in Canada. When I posed the question, "Do you hang out more with Canadian friends, or international students, or people from your culture?"

I received the following responses.

People from Afghanistan. They can speak English. They have also been raised in Canada, and born in Canada. (Ava, Afghanistan Canadian) [2-105]

People from my own culture (Iran). We speak English because we were all raised here. Eh, some of them, ya, like my girlfriend, she is Persian, but she was born here, so we speak English. (Simon, Iran Canadian) [4-186]

Most are Chinese. I know some friends is CBC (i.e., Canadian-born Chinese). (Gang, Chinese) [1-308]

People from my own culture definitely, and China, a lot easier to communicate. Because culture, it's too different; it's hard. (Annabel, Hongkongese) [5-150]

The language chosen to speak. As compared with native students, ESL students had experienced extra social challenges in terms of interaction which was revealed by the language (i.e., their first languages or English) that they would like to speak.

Gang and Annabel mentioned that they spoke Chinese with their friends. In general, respondents' second language was English; and if they were from the same linguistic and cultural background, they were inclined to speak their native language together rather than English. Contrary to Gang and Annabel who mainly made friends with people from their culture of origin, Chung, from Vietnam, avoided peers from her culture of origin in order to have as many opportunities as possible to practice her English.

Most of my friends, who speak English, like are Chinese friends. I don't have any Vietnamese friends at school. Because since I have Vietnamese friends, it gonna be hard for me to, like, speak English because we gonna speak Vietnamese. We cannot speak English because it gonna be very awkward, so...so...so I have to find someone who is not Vietnamese. I prefer to learn my English better. (Chung) [3-132]

ESL participants stated that they had difficulty in communicating with Canadians in particular.

I think the most challenging problem is communication, like I have to speak English because anyway, like English is my second language, and sometimes it's hard for me to express what I want to say in English and I need to think about them, but when I try to mingle with Canadians, like Canadian-born, they speak so fast; I couldn't catch them when they're saying something. I feel bad about it. (Annabel) [5-181]

Sometimes it's hard for me to communicate with, like Canadians, like. It's hard sometimes they don't understand me. Most of the time, I can communicate with

them, but sometimes they don't understand; I feel awkward. I felt bad because I couldn't express, I couldn't tell them to understand. (Chung) [3-201]

On the one hand, ESL students longed to incorporate themselves quickly into the mainstream society in order to advance; on the other, they experienced impediments in terms of cultural integration.

The most important thing is culture. The culture, like, can connect, not only the language, but also a lot of the, the, things, so, that's very complex. For me, I need to know the Canadian culture. If you, you, really want to fit in the, the, the, the, the... Canada, you need to, like, totally like, like, fit in their culture. That is very difficult for international students, like, and other people. (Gang) [1-186]

I experienced culture shock in the first week, it's the hardest time in here because it's the first time, like very very first time to come here and exposed to an all-English environment, and I found it very hard to mingle with the students who are native in English—very lost. (Annabel) [5-185]

Sociopolitical identities and positions in the Canadian society. Students' race and class in the mainstream society clearly exerted an influence on their perceptions of their non-native English-speaking instructor. Except for Ava and Simon (perceived by me as White), the other four respondents were visible minorities. Both Ava and Olivia were born in Canada. Simon, as an immigrant, had lived in Canada for 18 years. Although Gang had also got his immigrant status, he had been residing in Canada for only two years and a half, the same residence period as that of Chung, an international student who waited anxiously for her application for permanent residence to be approved.

My participants encountered challenges at the ESL Open Learning Center, Writing Center, at university, and in their university courses. Their experiences impacted their attitudes to and perceptions of their language instructors. Chung talked about her unpleasant experiences at the ESL Open Learning Center at the

university. She attributed these experiences to racism on the part of members of the host culture.

First, she (the instructor) made me wait for her for ten minutes to get her coffee. She was there. I was there, but then she said she wanted to get coffee, so she went out. I was waiting. She said she was going back in five minutes, but she actually came back late, ten to fifteen minutes. Maybe sometime, like you know, Canadian people they don't mean that, but sometime they become racists, but they don't mean that, they just become racists naturally. I really really don't like ESL opening center because I, I went there twice and my experience twice is, was not good. [3-253]

Although Annabel had only been studying in Canada for over half a year, she keenly felt that she was discriminated against, not only by White Canadians, but also by Canadian-born Chinese students.

I think for race and language and accent discrimination is quite serious. Sometimes for example if I phone some sort of company, or clinic, I feel, I can feel they, their impatience because they know I'm non-native. And then when I go to clinic, the way they look at me is very...I feel very sad. What is the most ironic thing is that, like, if you're from a different race, and you discriminate another race, or other people who speak with accent, I think, it can, somehow, be reasonable. The most ironic thing is, I, the most, the most discrimination I cannot tolerate is from the Canadian-born Chinese. [5-299]

Olivia was born in Canada and English was her sole language. Nevertheless, she felt that she was racially discriminated against by her White Canadian instructor at the Writing Center because she was Black.

Even though I was born here, they still discriminate. I believe that in, being here, I felt they discriminated at the Writing Center, like some, not all, maybe they won't help you because of you color, the color of your skin. [6-390]

Olivia addressed that one of her White professors who taught her a course discriminated against her as well.

I think it (discrimination) could be in the lecture. I felt that one of my professors, mm, he would give me a low grade. Sometimes, like, like, one of my assignments, I didn't go to the Writing Center for this particular assignment, but he just failed me and then when I saw the pages, it looked like the pages were even not open, like he didn't look at it. [6-401]

Students' Views on the Role of English

Influenced by their socioeconomic, sociocultural, and sociopolitical locations, students held varying views of the role of English in society. However, they agreed on one aspect: all of them recognized the importance of English in the contemporary world and in their lives. Whether they wished to work in Canada or abroad after graduation, they all linked the English language closely to success in their future careers and lives. Students qualified English as a “dominant language,” a language of “power,” a communication medium, an “international language,” a means of integration, and a commodity.

Ava, White and Canadian-born, avowed that she felt grateful to be a native speaker of English in Canada where English is both a societal language and a world dominant language. Her career objective upon graduation was to teach, first in Dubai as a high school teacher and then in social sciences upon graduation; she then wished to return to Canada, teach and settle down two or three years later.

I'm actually really thankful to be born and raised in the country where English is the first language because English is basically the dominant language in the world, so either you go to China or Japan, English is what everyone knows, so I'm thankful because it's easier for me to communicate with people. I think I'll need English a lot because even if I do teach abroad, it'll mostly be English I'll be teaching, so English will be very important to me. [2-74]

As an international student from a non-moneyed family, Chung had a burning desire to master English. In her opinion, English was more important and useful than her mother tongue—Vietnamese.

I think English is really important in my life. Even right now, like, like for my personal, I think, I actually wish that English is my first language because I see I came to Canada, like English is very helpful; it like, it helped me, like to become

better. I like the way English can express the words like, more, better than using Vietnamese. I mean I learn Vietnamese well, but I prefer English better. [3-88]

Her major was Law and Society, and she longed to work in the area of criminal law the future. She realized the great importance of English in fulfilling her dream.

If I can find a job in Canada, I would like to work here, but if I cannot find, I want to go back to my country to work, to like, to develop the country. I think if I work in Canada, I absolutely have to speak English fluently, to like, compete with other native speakers of English. If I go back, in Vietnam, I think right now, like everyone can speak English; like English is the second language in my country, so I think if I want to like, get a really really good job, I need to speak English (well), so, because like many companies around the world come to Vietnam, so I think a Vietnamese company needs, like people who can speak more English than Vietnamese to communicate. Ya. [3-99]

However, as an ESL student in Canada, Chung sensed that despite her avid desire to learn the English language, mainstream native English-speaking Canadians control and dictate the way how non-native English-speaking people should use the language of English. In her eyes, English has power, but in the hands of native speakers of English only.

Since my English is not good enough, so sometimes they (Canadians) don't understand me and sometime because they think English is their first language, so they think they have more power that, to other people who are non-native English speaking. I think that I have that feeling for many people who are native English speaking. I don't really remember, but when I talked to, like Canadians, English-speaking, sometime, they really, they feel like, they feel that English is their first language, so they have power to tell other people what to do, you can do what. [3-283]

Simon, who planned to work in the health care industry either in Canada or elsewhere in North America in the future, deemed English to be a critical tool of communication in his prospective profession.

The language itself is, is a means for me to be able to communicate with others. I live in Canada, so I'll need to speak English. If I don't speak English, then it'll be very difficult for me to communicate with my patients in the future, so, eh, and express myself, so... [4-135]

Table 2 outlines my respondents' rationales for the importance of English.

Table 2: Respondents' Rationale for the Importance of English

Rationale	Examples
1. English as a dominant language	"I'm actually really thankful to be born and raised in the country where English is the first language because English is basically the dominant language in the world, so either you go to China or Japan, English is what everyone knows, so I'm thankful because it's easier for me to communicate with people."
2. English as a language of power	"I don't really remember, but when I talked to, like Canadians, English-speaking, sometime, they really, they feel like, they feel that English is their first language, so they have power to tell other people what to do, you can do what."
3. English as an enhancement of competitiveness in the job market	"I think if I work in Canada, I absolutely have to speak English fluently, to like, compete with other native speakers of English. If I go back, in Vietnam, I think right now, like everyone can speak English; like English is the second language in my country, so I think if I want to like, get a really really good job, I need to speak English (well)..."
4. English as a tool of communication	<p>"The language itself is, is a means for me to be able to communicate with others. I live in Canada, so I'll need to speak English. If I don't speak English, then it'll be very difficult for me to communicate with my patients in the future, so, eh, and express myself, so..."</p> <p>"I think my English has to be very good. It'll play an important role in communication, especially for people, who, English is not their first language, so I'll encourage them to speak, you know."</p>
5. English as an international language	"Also I think now English is the international language. I think no matter what career or what job you do, you'll be exposed to a lot of English, so English is very important."
6. English as a means of integration	<p>"Ya. Eh, like, mm, for me, like, language is the basic thing. Like, even though like, I've been in Toronto for two years, something from English is different from the native and international student."</p> <p>"Eh, I have a dream. I also like, want to have a Canadian girlfriend, but if you, like, if you can't speak (English) very well, how can you, like, get close, close to them?"</p>
7. English as a commodity/capital	"In my opinion, like, the writing center can have like, can set up other department, like you need to pay, but the writing instructor, they have, like, they are REALLY, REALLY (raised his voice with emphasis) helpful! You know, you can improve you in a short time! And you can pay. Even you pay, that's fine, you know."

Olivia, who was eager to become a kindergarten teacher in the United States, expressed the same understanding of the crucial role of English in her future career.

I think my English has to be very good. It'll play an important role in communication, especially for people, who, English is not their first language, so I'll encourage them to speak, you know. [6-192]

Annabel's life goal was to become a flight attendant. Not only did she regard English as a useful means of communication, but also she regarded English as an "international language."

English would be extremely important because like in airplane, mostly, you communicate in English. Also I think now English is the international language. I think no matter what career or what job you do, you'll be exposed to a lot of English, so English is very important. [5-110]

Gang, born and raised in an affluent Chinese family, hoped to live and work in Toronto after he received his degree. He believed that English played a crucial role in integrating in Canadian society and in finding a Canadian girlfriend.

Ya. Eh, like, mm, for me, like, language is the basic thing. Like, even though like, I've been in Toronto for two years, something from English is different from the native and international student. And, how can I say that? They (Canadians) also like make jokes. Even though, I, like, even though I've been here for two years, I still cannot get their jokes, so, so, in my opinion, that's the fundamental thing, ya, like to, to, like, to represent your language. English is very important, like, eh...like...eh... (clearing his throat). Eh, I don't know (clearing his throat again). Like, I also have a dream, you know (laughed). Eh, I have a dream. I also like, want to have a Canadian girlfriend, but if you, like, if you can't speak (English) very well, how can you, like, get close, close to them? [1-178]

Gang also associated English as a commodity with monetary value. At the end of the interview, he suggested that the Writing Center should provide students with services for which they could pay, and implied that if students paid for these services, English skills such as writing strategies could be acquired at a more efficient rate. From the following excerpt it is clear that he considered English as a commodity that could be bought and sold on the open market.

Huo: Is there anything I have forgotten to ask you, but you think important?

Gang: Eh, O.K. In my opinion, like, the writing center can have like, can set up other department, like you need to pay, but the writing instructor, they have, like, they are REALLY, REALLY (raised his voice with emphasis) helpful! You know,

you can improve you in a short time! And you can pay. Even you pay, that's fine, you know (laughed).

Huo: You think because we are free, the quality is bad?

Gang: (laughed loudly). You know, like the Canada's free health care, O.K. like that, you need wait like 20 hours in the hospital! You know something like that, you know. [1-421-424]

In the above excerpt, we see how in Gang's eyes, economic capital and linguistic capital are exchangeable commodities. With economic capital, one can acquire linguistic capital.

Students' Perceptions of Native and Non-Native English-Speaking Instructors

The default English language teacher: "a walking dictionary." Unanimously my respondents volunteered that before meeting me, they expected that a Canadian-born native speaker of English would be their instructor at the Writing Center.

I thought they would be fluent in English. Like Canadian, someone not necessarily like White, but someone, who, eh, you know, with fluency, can help me with my vocabulary, with my verbal...structure, transition, content, and thesis, all that stuff, so someone, who has, you know, maybe completed an English undergraduate degree, or something, that can help me, basically. I would imagine that I would go to someone who is very articulate, and who can, who is, very well-spoken, and you know, eh, can tell, like...when I was writing an essay, right? I can't even write, I can't come up with certain words, right? And I automatically go to synonyms, and I try to find a more difficult word, or something that sounds more articulate, or smart, you know what I mean? So I, we all do it, so, eh, I would think that if I want some help, someone has to be like a walking dictionary. (Simon) [4-262]

I thought it would be a White lady. I didn't, I never thought it would be any man in the Writing Department. I thought it would just be a White woman, born in Canada, like as if English is their major, like they're studying, like English teachers, for example. I thought that they were like the Internet; they knew everything. (Olivia) [6-320]

I think, I think it's going to be like, like...I just thought it would be like a Canadian person. I thought that because when I went to high school, most of...when I go to my teacher for help, I thought like they only hire Canadian teachers. I didn't know they have...like, other...teacher. (Chung) [3-227]

I would expect maybe it's around 30 to 40 years old, and I, sometimes, I would, like at first, I would expect, is this a, like a native, Canadian instructor. (Annabel) [5-211]

Students' perceptions of native vs. non-native English-speaking instructors.

Both non-native and native English-speaking students identified oral proficiency in English (e.g. idiomatic pronunciation, no "accent," accuracy, fluency, lexical knowledge, and superior understanding of assignment expectations) as the most noteworthy advantages of having native speakers of English as instructors. Other strengths associated with native speakers were: listening comprehension accuracy, lexical mastery, grammatical correctness, and better understanding of the expectations for assignments. Table 3 sketches the perceived advantages that my respondents associated with native English-speaking instructors.

Table 3: Respondents' Perceived Advantages of Native English-Speaking Instructors

Categories	Examples
1.Pronunciation	"I guess, native, one of the advantages is that they don't have an accent. It's easier to understand them more quickly." "Advantages for a native person, like would be their English-speaking pronunciation..."
2.Accuracy and fluency in listening and speaking	"For native, the advantage is maybe about listening and speaking parts because they speak very fluently and very accurately English, so this is the advantage."
3.Lexical mastery	"So, again, with native speakers, they might have a broader vocabulary; they might have easier...eh, they might be easier to communicate with."
4.Better understanding of assignment expectations	"When I work with the native English-speaking instructor, their English is really good. That's why when they help me do an assignment, my assignment, they gonna more understand what the professor wants."

First, about the English-speaking, like Canadian writing instructor, the advantage is that like, because English is their first language, they are better when I give them my assignments to them to help me. When I work with the native

English-speaking instructor, their English is really good. That's why when they help me do an assignment, my assignment, they gonna more understand what the professor wants. That was what I think. I don't know if it's true or not, but that was what I think. (Chung)

[3-278]

For native, the advantage is maybe about listening and speaking parts because they speak very fluently and very accurately English, so this is the advantage.

(Annabel)

[5-235]

I guess, native, one of the advantages is that they don't have an accent. It's easier to understand them more quickly. (Ava)

[2-290]

Advantages for a native person, like would be their English-speaking pronunciation, and grammar. (Oliva)

[6-376]

So, again, with native speakers, they might have a broader vocabulary; they might have easier...eh, they might be easier to communicate with. (Simon)

[4-295]

However, native English-speaking students also talked about the disadvantages of having native English-speaking instructors. They volunteered that their native English-speaking instructors at the Writing Center did not seem to want to offer them help, or did not invest sufficiently in helping them, or did not understand them.

All of the tutors I have worked with are native-speaking instructors except you. I feel like they didn't really understand me. To be honest, I just felt like they were not really willing to explain something well to me. For instance, just the English-Canadian background people, tutors, that I would go see, they would, I felt, I don't know, I don't want to say anything bad. They are really good tutors, but I just feel they did not understand, or could not, not understand, I mean understand me, my problem. I guess, like, they would explain the assignment thoroughly for me, but they did not really help me out how to write a thesis statement, how to write a proper title, or what I should keep in mind for grammar mistakes. How I can word this properly? For instance, me, I have parents who don't speak that well English. And they speak well English, the tutors, so when you ask for help, for instance, they would never read it (the essay). (Ava)

[2-215]

Ava ascribed the disadvantages that she associated with native English-speaking instructors to their assumptions about students' language abilities and understanding of the assignments. She believed there was a discrepancy between Canadian-born instructors' assumptions and her actual proficiency in English.

The disadvantage for the native is, mm, I guess they have the assumption that everyone are good English speakers and understand English, so they are not that detailed. I felt like they had the assumption that I had already known all the rules, and I knew all grammar stuff. Do you understand what I mean? (Ava)
[2-288]

Olivia, Canadian born, voiced similar opinions about her native English-speaking instructor at the Writing Center.

I thought that native may understand more my assignments and she (her native English-speaking instructor) didn't really help me. I believe that the native one, I expected her to help me out more and I thought that maybe she would know more. She didn't help me out and she didn't show really that she knew much. (Olivia)
[6-382]

In Olivia's experience, native English-speaking instructors were believed to "know more"; however, it turned out that there was a disjuncture between her expectations and native-speaking instructors' actual practices. Native-speaking instructors did not prove as competent as she had thought and, most importantly, the native instructor who she had worked with at the Writing Center did not really help her to improve her academic writing skills. Olivia attributed the teacher's lack of empathy to her (Olivia's) skin color.

If I were White, I believe they would have smiled. She didn't smile when she saw me. I believe that they would have smiled and they would help me out more so that they could reach higher, so since I'm not, that's why they didn't really help me.
[6-422]

Simon, as an immigrant student, asserted that monolingual and monocultural native-English speakers did not have as many rich experiences as non-natives who were bilinguals and bicultural.

Maybe their (native speakers of English) view might be a little narrower. Eh, if they haven't had different cultures exposed to, like, if they are not bilinguals, they haven't been living in two countries. Maybe they don't have as much as broad experiences compared to a non-native. Maybe if you're talking about like "sociological factors," right? If they haven't traveled the world, if maybe they were only raised in middle-class or upper-middle-class families, if they haven't seen, you know, poverty, if they haven't seen, if they haven't traveled the world. We come from countries where you see massive differences in class and you see poor and you see rich rich. Canada is very, not...it's very ... It's very...What's the word? There're a lot of differences in, in class, like U.S., or maybe other countries, so maybe someone from Canada wouldn't be exposed to it, wouldn't be able to experience it. (Simon)

[4-297]

In addition to lack of empathy, non-native English-speaking students linked the disadvantages they associated with native English-speaking instructors to failures in understanding because of language issues. Either native-speaking instructors had difficulty comprehending their non-native-speaking students' English or ideas, or the students themselves had difficulty in understanding native English-speaking instructors because of the inaccessible language the teachers used or the fast pace of the instructors' speech.

Sometimes they don't understand me because since my English is not good enough. They don't understand; they don't know that, how hard it (English learning) is. They don't know. Sometime they don't understand the idea; they couldn't because it's not clear to them. (Chung)

[3-272]

The disadvantages are eh, probably, they, they express some ideas you cannot get it, probably like, like their English, like some word I don't understand. (Gang)

[1-382]

If they're nice, they know, like they can know once they speak, they know you're ESL, they'll speak slower, but some they will use their own speed. Sometimes, it's too fast to like... Sometimes they speak too fast, I think.
(Annabel) [5-247]

Table 4 summarizes the perceived disadvantages that my respondents associated with native English-speaking instructors.

Table 4: Perceived Disadvantages of Native English-Speaking Instructors

Categories	Examples
1. Lack of understanding on teachers' part	<p>"I feel like they didn't really understand me... They are really good tutors, but I just feel they did not understand, or could not, not understand, I mean understand me, my problem."</p> <p>"Sometimes they don't understand me. Because since my English is not good enough. They don't understand; they don't know that, how hard it (English learning) is. They don't know."</p>
2. Lack of understanding on students' part	<p>"Sometime they don't understand the idea; they couldn't because it's not clear to them."</p> <p>"The disadvantages are eh, probably, they, they express some ideas you cannot get it, probably like, like their English, like some word I don't understand."</p>
3. Reluctance to help	"To be honest, I just felt like they were not really willing to explain something well to me."
4. Insufficient help	"I believe that the native one, I expected her to help me out more and I thought that maybe she would know more. She didn't help me out and she didn't show really that she knew much."
5. Lack of empathy	"If I were White, I believe they would have smiled. She didn't smile when she saw me. I believe that they would have smiled and they would help me out more so that they could reach higher, so since I'm not, that's why they didn't really help me."

Native-speaking students listed advantages of having non-native English-speaking instructors: more cultural diversity and experiences, and patience. For ESL students, non-native English-speaking instructors understood their

propositional content better, were better familiar with ESL students' language problems, were able to find the best strategies for tackling those problems, and, what applicable, ESL students, also enjoyed a comfort level from a shared first language. Native-born students, as well, held that non-native English instructors had a rich variety of experiences, paid more attention to details, and cared about their students' learning outcomes and academic success.

Oh, so advantages, would be, if they're from my own native culture, I could speak with them in my own language, maybe. Maybe if they speak Farsi, then maybe I can if there're a couple of words I can't express in English since every language has certain words that are not transferable, so if it's a native of my own language instructor, then I could, maybe speak with him, express myself in that way. I would say maybe for non-native English-speaking writing instructors, they would have some experiences that someone else wouldn't have, like cultural, ya, many kinds of experiences that they could have just because being raised somewhere else that might be helpful, you know, that maybe raise concerns, like having a light bulb switch to turn on, you know. Just more cultural diversity, that's what I mean. If you're diverse, you might be exposed to more...eh, you know, more things in your life than someone who was just born and raised here and have a narrower view of the society. (Simon)

[4-284]

O.K. Advantages, eh, just in my opinion. They are more, ya, more patient. Ya, more patient, more patient than native writing instructors. (Gang)

[1-390]

So for the advantage of the non-native English-speaking writing instructor, the advantage is that like, because they also study English, so they understand I said; they understand how hard it is to, to learn English and they know what is the best thing in their writing instruction, so they know what is the best way to improve English, and how, how to go through an assignment. (Chung)

[6-292]

In terms of like help, or the kind of writing a, the, eh, how to approach the problems that non-native students have, then non-native instructors have a better understanding of what like ESL students are struggling in terms of their assignments. (Annabel)

[5-235]

Nevertheless, when I probed Annabel about whether she thought that non-native English-speaking instructors would also be more helpful to native speakers of English, she answered differently.

I think they [Canadian-born English-speaking students] would better speak to native because it's more comfortable for native to listen to native. Ya, I think it's more comfortable for them (native Canadian students), like to talk to, speak with a native instructor rather than a non-native.

[5-263]

However, as it turned out, my two Canadian-born respondents held positive viewpoints on the strengths of non-native English-speaking instructors with regard to their native English-speaking students.

The non-native teachers, for instance, pay more attention to details—which is good, like you're paying so much money; they make sure that everybody understands them. I feel like people that, like for instance, when English is your second language, if you're a professor instructing the class, I feel like they pay more attention to make sure that all students do understand because they themselves know that English is their second language, right? So they emphasize more on making sure that everybody understands them, but teachers that already speak English, they are not; they're like really fast, like they just get over...

(Ava)

[2-272]

I think you smiled and you greeted me and you wanted to help me more than somebody who is a native speaker even though I'm Canadian and I speak native English, they didn't want to help me, but somebody who was a non-native, really helped me a lot. The non-native shows patience. They show that they care. I believe that the native, they don't really show that much patience. (Olivia)

[6-417]

Table 5 describes the perceived advantages that respondents associated with non-native English-Speaking Instructors.

Table 5: Perceived Advantages of Non-Native English-Speaking Instructors

Categories	Examples
1. A comfort level from shared first language	“Oh, so advantages, would be, if they’re from my own native culture, I could speak with them in my own language, maybe.”
2. Cultural diversity and more experiences	“I would say maybe for non-native English-speaking writing instructors, they would have some experiences that someone else wouldn’t have, like cultural, ya, many kinds of experiences that they could have just because being raised somewhere else that might be helpful, you know, that maybe raise concerns, like having a light bulb switch to turn on, you know. Just more cultural diversity, that’s what I mean. If you’re diverse, you might be exposed to more...eh, you know, more things in your life than someone who was just born and raised here and have a narrower view of the society.”
3. Better understanding of ESL students’ problems	“In terms of like help, or the kind of writing a, the, eh, to approach the problems that non-native students have, then non-native instructors have a better understanding of what like ESL students are struggling in terms of their assignments.” “So for the advantage of the non-native English-speaking writing instructor, the advantage is that like, because they also study English, so they understand I said; they understand how hard it is to, to learn English and they know what is the best thing in their writing instruction, so they know what is the best way to improve English, and how, how to go through an assignment.”
4. Attention paid to more details	“The non-native teachers, for instance, pay more details attention to details—which is good, like you’re paying so much money; they make sure that everybody understands them.”
5. Concerns about learning outcomes	“They show that they care.”
6. Patience	“They are more, ya, more patient. Ya, more patient, more patient than native writing instructors.” “The non-native shows patience...I believe that the native, they don’t really show that much patience.”

Students, irrespective of their native or non-native English-speaking status, unanimously listed “accent” as the most conspicuous disadvantage of non-native English-speaking teachers. They also regarded lack of proficiency in grammar, lack of expertise in writing and limited cultural knowledge regarding expectations for

writing at North American universities as other disadvantages of non-native

English-speaking instructors.

For non-native, the disadvantage is their accent because sometimes it takes a while for someone to get used to their accent. (Ava)
[2-292]

Non-native, they might struggle in a way with grammar. Disadvantages, I don't know. Maybe for some, maybe, it would be harder for them to understand whereas somebody from a native that was born in Canada, they'll understand more. Oh, yes. They're not from this (culture); they're not from Canada. Maybe the language barriers, accent and maybe the other grammar, they have the disadvantage. Vocabulary, cultural knowledge, and language understanding maybe would be a disadvantage, understanding of the culture, and maybe a little bit of the writing. (Olivia)
[6-432]

Disadvantages again, like having difficulty understanding them, accent, maybe like not understanding what they're saying. Ya. Maybe knowledge, ya, not knowing ...not everybody knows all the words are in the English language, but you know, with living here for a longer period of time, you get exposed to more words and more vocabulary, obviously. It's maybe easier to understand, or you know, explain. (Simon)
[4-290]

Mm...probably like the, the accents, probably this one. (Gang)
[1-397]

The disadvantage is sometime, because English is not their first language; they're still learning. I mean they used to learn it, so some words I don't understand since we have different accents. (Chung)
[6-290]

Table 6 summarizes perceived disadvantages that respondents associated with non-native instructors.

Table 6: Respondents' Perceived Disadvantages of Non-Native Instructors

Categories	Examples
1.Accent	<p>“For non-native, the disadvantage is their accent because sometimes it takes a while for someone to get used to their accent.”</p> <p>“Disadvantages again, like having difficulty understanding them, accent, maybe like not understanding what they’re saying.”</p> <p>“The disadvantage is sometime, because English is not their first language; they’re still learning. I mean they used to learn it, so some words I don’t understand since we have different accents.”</p> <p>“Mm...probably like the, the accents, probably this one.”</p>
2.Lack of proficiency in grammar	<p>“Non-native, they might struggle in a way with grammar.”</p>
3.Limited cultural knowledge about writing norms and expectations	<p>“Vocabulary, cultural knowledge, and language understanding maybe would be a disadvantage, understanding of the culture, and maybe a little bit of the writing.”</p> <p>“Ya. Maybe knowledge, ya, not knowing ...”</p>

Students' Evolving Perceptions

The preceding notwithstanding, students' perceptions on the matter of the ideal English language instructor evolved and changed dramatically over the duration of my study. In this section, I discuss the nature of these changes in perception, and draw inferences on the reasons for these shifts.

Both native and non-native English-speaking participants reported that at the outset they questioned my linguistic competence, professional credentials, and expertise. Native English-speaking students were “worried,” while non-native

English-speaking respondents were either “surprised,” “upset,” or even “scared” since they all assumed that a Canadian-born English speaker of English would be assigned as their instructor. All expressed concern that a non-native speaking instructor would not have the required cultural knowledge about academic expectations at North American universities to be in a position to help them with their assignments.

I was a bit worried that you might not know, like how to help me, like with my assignment, understanding the assignment, and maybe the grammar. Looking at you, I thought you were a student, too. (Olivia)
[6-440]

Well, I thought that you might not be, I don't know how to say this (a long pause). In the beginning, I thought you may not have enough knowledge or thing, but I also trust the university; they wouldn't really hire someone that would not have that knowledge about the paper, but I also had this assumption that I may not be able to understand you. (Ava)
[2-327]

Eh, mm, honestly, at first, I, I even remembered telling you when I met you that I had...eh, as soon as I met you and you started speaking, I, automatically, even though I am not a racist person, and I don't think anything like... stereotypical at all, I automatically thought that how much help you could be to me, how much can she, how much knowledge could she have to contribute, right? (Simon)
[4-293]

Oh, is it necessary to talk (about this topic) (laughed)? Because like, like, I know, the Canada culture, is not very polite to, to talk...you are very nice, ya, in my first image...but I am, I am really surprised, like, like, like, like the writing center, I saw that, you should be like the native writing instructor, so when I first time meet you, I was really, really surprised, but I thought you must like, like work, work, work hard, eh, work harder than other peoples. (Gang) [1-402]

Like first time when I talked to you, because you have the accent. I mean like everyone who learn English have the accent. Then I was scared. The first time I was scared because you're also learning English, I mean. Is it hard for you to help me to like, like, to help me to do my assignment? I thought that you looked so young. I thought you were only twenty, or something. I'm serious. You look so young. How can you become an instructor? When I registered, first, I, I

thought it gonna be a Canadian instructor. Then I remembered when I registered, I did do ESL (wrote down my ESL background in my profile), so I think that's the reason why they gave me to you. I think maybe they think I'm Chinese, or something (laughed). That's why, that's why, if like, if maybe something I don't understand, I can talk to you in Chinese, so you can help me. First I was actually upset because I think, I was thinking like if she is also an ESL instructor, it's hard for her sometime to help me when she's also learning English. (Chung) [6-294]

Students reported having changed their perceptions of me either after “the first fifteen minutes” of conversation with me in their tutorials, or after they received the marks of the assignments with which I helped. Ava visited me regularly after our first meeting, having arranged with the Writing Centre to have me assigned as her permanent instructor.

Then as I came in, I started... that change. I was actually surprised not to be judgmental because with the amount of help that you've given me, the amount of rules like writings, the amount of writing skills that you have, I was surprised by that. I was really impressed because to, for someone, for a non-native tutor can work in the Writing Department. That means you that you have really high writing skills. I was actually proud of you. (Ava) [2-329]

Mm, first I was worried about maybe the grammar, not understanding the assignment, but that all changed when I met you and I gave you the assignment to read over and how you helped me get a B. Before I visited you, it was a C. You know, it changed my perception. (Olivia) [6-460]

But then when I actually talked to you, I actually felt very happy. It's really helpful because after I saw you, you helped me a lot, so I really like to come back to talk to you to help me with my assignment. (Chung) [6-329]

But when, as soon as we had our deeper conversation and you actually were able to analyze different things for me and opened my eyes to certain ideas, I was automatically...ashamed (laughed) that I made such a judgment, such a quick judgment about someone who, just based on their accent, eh, or...their...you know...eh...just because they weren't exactly what I imagined. It was...I made that judgment about them, but...I quickly realized that you have so much more to offer than I could. You know, if I was in your shoes, I couldn't give the person half the amount of advice you gave, so, so I really appreciate it. Ya, so, even in that interview, at first, in the first fifteen minutes of that session, I realized that,

you know, you're well-qualified, to help explain my questions, and, so, the change was that I did not think you, I might not understand you, you might not be able to add anything valuable to my essay, but I quickly realized that you were able to greatly help me with my essay, and open my eyes to certain ideas that I had no idea how to organize, or, even new ideas that you mentioned. I realized you were well-qualified. (Simon) [4-295]

Students attributed the causes of the evolution of their perceptions to: the knowledge and expertise that I demonstrated; their improved scores on assignments following my instruction; progress with their writing skills and strategies that they perceived they had acquired with my help; my teaching style; my personality.

I guess, because I was assigned to another instructor, after our first meeting, I realized you helped me a lot. I had to change my instructor to become your student, so I guess... I guess that's... that's because I need you as my instructor, so every time I book an appointment, I have to come to see you. It's because the little things that you've noticed with my paper. They helped me a lot. (Ava) [2-331]

I think my grades. Looking at my grades, and I, my, you helped me with my essays and my assignments. I could tell that it really changed my perceptions because... it's like... I'm dealing with somebody who's Canadian, you know, somebody who was born here; it's like you were born here. (Olivia) [6-467]

First, I thought that she couldn't help me. I thought you couldn't help me because you're still learning English, but then after I talked to you, you gave me many helpful information, show me like, instructed me how to revise an essay, and you show me the writing style of like Canadian writing and everything, so I learn a lot. I say honestly it's really helpful to me, and the way you helped me is actually better than if I have a Canadian (instructor), when I went to a Canadian instructor in the ESL Center. I think because you're really nice to me. I think you're very nice and you're very sweet to me, like, like no matter how like... If, if, sometime I'm like a crazy person; sometime if I meet someone like me, I'll be so mad, but you were very nice to me, and you, no matter how hard it is, you're always nice to me. That's why I think I really like you. You always said, "It's O.K. We can do it." Then, I feel I can do it. I finished my assignment with a better mark. (Chung) [6-331]

Before, ignorance. I think it was because of ignorance. (Before) I would imagine that I would go to someone; he has to be something out of this world to be able to help me, and again, like... a walking encyclopedia, and like, again, my experience is different because I've written so many essays for my previous

undergraduate, but I want someone, I want someone with that much more experience, someone with so many credentials to come, and be a poet, and do poetry for me, you know what I mean? But the important thing that I learned from you is that you can spend a lot of time just making something sound sophisticated, but if you don't really have a point, that doesn't really matter how good you make it sound. What you helped me with was very important, and I think, even if it's a person who is well-spoken, they have to have good ideas in order to be a good instructor and you had that which is good. And I think even after that conversation, I said that frankly to you. Honestly, I said, "You know, I had different expectations for the first five seconds of meeting you, but, but you were so organized in your thoughts and you were able to draw things out of me, you know, open my eyes that I really appreciate that and I apologize for my, for my quick judgment, basically." (Simon) [4-234]

I asked Simon about the score that he had got for the essay I had helped him with.

Huo: Did your essay get a satisfactory score?

Simon: I think I got a "Perfect!"

Huo: "Perfect?"

Simon: Ya. I think I got nineteen and a half out of twenty, or twenty out of twenty.

Huo: "Nineteen and a half out of twenty"? That is an A+.

Simon: Ya. I do credit to you.

[4-249-254]

Notwithstanding, it is instructive to note that the only two native-born students in my interview expressed a preference for non-native English-speaking instructors. Consistent with their expressed views, they kept visiting me throughout the term. In comparison, foreign-born students differed in their preferences. Some felt more comfortable working with non-native English-speaking instructors while others did not care about which category the instructor belonged to as long as they were helpful and understood them.

I am more comfortable working with the non-native English-speaking instructor. I just feel comfortable, you know. Ya. You made me feel very comfortable. You greeted me with a smile; you asked me what do I need help with and really you helped me. (Olivia)

[6-362]

To be honest, non-native English-speaking instructors. The only reason I say for “non-native English-speaking instructors” is because I feel like you have done a lot to understand English, writing rules, like grammar, and I feel like, I feel like, you...give more significance than the English-speaking people. (Ava)
[2-255]

I think I feel more comfortable with non-native English speaker. I don't know why, but I think I feel like they can understand more about what non-native students, what trouble, what problems they're struggling with, so they can tackle the problems more directly than native because there's also an English problem before for non-native students. (Annabel)
[5-233]

I don't really mind, like in the future, if I have to work with whoever of them. If I work with someone who can understand my situation, it'll be better. (Chung)
[6-280]

Mm, for me, both is O.K. because we talk about the, the academic, eh, eh, essays. Ya, not like, like talk some jokes, you know. Ya. (Gang) [1-380]

As...it wouldn't matter to me whether they're native or non-native as long as they're able to help me with the required coursework, so as long, I don't care if they're female, male, tall, short, Black, White, gay, non-gay, beautiful, ugly, one leg, two legs, it doesn't matter. As long as I'm here to get help for my specific coursework, I'm not here to find a wife (laughed), you know what I mean? So that's what I'm here for, so you can help me with that, that's all I need, so anything else is, is redundant. (Simon)
[4-298]

Chapter 7

Study Findings 2: A Non-Native English Language Instructor's Experiences at a Higher Institution Writing Center

This chapter constitutes the analysis of my field notes and journal entries. As explained in Chapter 5, I recorded journal entries over the period September 29, 2014 to April 8, 2016 and took field notes at the times when I audio recorded interviews with my six participants. I have organized my data presentation and analysis under three sites of experience. The first is the physical environment of the Writing Center at which I carried out the majority of my responsibilities as instructor. The second site is virtual: here my narrative focuses on my observations and experiences with a new online booking system, introduced about half way through the study. The third site is the drop-in pod at the Library, another service offered by the Writing Center.

Site 1: At the Writing Center

At the start of my study, to book (50 minute) appointments with instructors students called the receptionists or went to the Writing Center in person. The students did not know who their instructor would be; nor did they receive information about the instructor's background before they visited the Writing Center for the first time. The Writing Department paired the student with his or her instructor based on the congruence of the student's discipline and background with those of the instructor. Generally speaking, if students were satisfied with the instructor they continued to work with the same individual for their ensuing appointments unless the instructor was unavailable. However, students were allowed to change their instructors if they voiced complaints to the Writing Department. At Site 1, during my data collection phase I tutored numerous students from linguistically, racially, and ethnically diverse groups across departments and disciplines. The data were coded under three headings corresponding to themes that emerged in the course of ethnographic observations:

linguistic issues, sociocultural issues, and racialized stereotypes.

Linguistic issues: “Have you tutored any student in my program?”

As linguistic challenges constitute the first issue for me, I faced opposition and disapproval as a non-native English-speaking instructor. The linguistic challenges took the forms of students’ frontal confrontations, interrogations about my language abilities, requests for reassurance, and disjunctures between students’ “promises” to revisit me and their subsequent disappearances.

Frontal confrontations. *Feb. 24, 2015* When a Black student met me, she said immediately that she did not know she would see me again and that she was not satisfied with my feedback last time. Since her instructor was not at the Writing Centre that day, she was assigned to work with me. She was critical all the time during the tutorial, questioning all my feedback. I thought that she would not come to visit me for the third time as she held such a negative attitude toward my feedback. Accidentally, several months later, she was assigned to me again due to the absence of her instructor. I said hello to her, but she was avoiding my eye contact. “Do please give me some APPRIOPRIATE feedback.” She stressed ‘appropriate’.” “If I think the feedback ‘appropriate,’ I don’t know whether it will seem ‘appropriate’ to you. You may wait for other instructors if you like...” I responded. She replied that there were no other instructors available on that day and her assignment would be due the next day. Despite her apparent dissatisfaction of me as her instructor, she still treated me as her last resort, paradoxically.

Oct. 6, 2014

A White, mature student looked emotionless. She told me that she had a permanent instructor (with seniority), but she was not at her office that day. Although she was busy in jotting down notes while I was offering my comments on her assignment, she looked incredulous. She laughed once, but grimly. At the end of the tutorial, I said, “Hope it helps.” “Hope it will be helpful.” She snorted the words with freezing irony and burning sarcasms, fraught with doubts. Two weeks later, when I was meeting my student at the reception room, I saw her again. She was waiting for a native English-speaking instructor. I waved my hand to her and said “hi,” she ignored me.

A couple of first-year Chinese students argued with me as they did not agree to my feedback. Their behavior was quite opposite to the traditional Chinese learning style or the ordinary way of behaving of Chinese students. Chinese students seldom

challenge authority openly even if they disagree. One of the possible explanations of their resistant behaviors was that they did not regard me as an authority although they were newcomers at the university.

Jan. 20, 2015

At the beginning of the tutorial, the first-year Chinese student thanked me and said that her last assignment instructed by me got a score of 85 which she had never received before (the score of her former assignment was a C when she first visited me). While I was trying to interpret her new assignment requirements to her as requested, she said that she did not agree with me at all regarding my explanations. Although I helped her improve her writing skills and her score after three tutorial sessions, she still questioned my linguistic capabilities and did not seem to be persuaded by my legitimacy.

Following is another example of my interactions with this Chinese student which further illustrates her suspicion of my competence as a legitimate linguistic authority.

Jan. 27, 2015

When I was reading her long assignment requirements carefully, she suddenly asked me whether I would have time to explain my comments to her. I told her that I would definitely offer her all my feedback before she left my office. When hearing this, she still looked suspicious, half believing what I had said. Several minutes later, she asked me that she had the Chinese translation for her assignment requirements and wondered whether I would need it. I smiled and said, "No, thank you." When I was done and told her to condense her thesis statement, she did not understand my word "condense," so I continued, "I can speak Chinese to make you understand it better." Unexpectedly, she replied, "No Chinese. Please say it again in English." In fact, she had language barriers in both speaking and listening. It often takes me a long time to explain everything to her in English in order to make her fully understand me. The irony was that she purposefully avoided using Chinese herself in the conversation with a Chinese writing instructor. However, she wanted to lend me the Chinese version to help me better comprehend her long assignment requirements.

The Chinese student refused to speak Chinese with a Chinese instructor despite her utter confusion and misunderstanding of me indirectly. This incident inferred that she believed the utilization of Chinese would hinder the development and improvement of her English, as well as the process of approaching the native English norm. In her opinion, she had to use English as much as possible with all

means in order to master it as soon as possible to gain this linguistic capital, to be part of the mainstream Canadian society. One explanation can be that like many other Chinese students, she lacked adequate knowledge about the instrumental role that L1 played in one's L2 acquisition and enhancement. However, the deeper connotation behind this could be that in her eyes, monolingualism was the sole norm. She deliberately refused to use Chinese in any occasion. Although she refused to use Chinese under any circumstance herself despite our communication breakdowns, she enthusiastically offered to assist me with her Chinese version of the assignment requirement. This suggested she thought that I, a non-native English-speaking instructor, might have to rely on Chinese to fully comprehend her assignment which was disparate from her preconceived notion of exclusive English or monolingual English; therefore, she questioned the legitimacy of her bilingual instructor whose Chinese competence was thought to be detrimental to her English studies.

Interrogations. My students often grilled me upon their first meeting with me. Both native and non-native English-speaking students repeatedly asked me the questions: "Have you tutored any students in my program?" or "Have you dealt with this type of assignment (e.g., report) before?" "Will you be my permanent instructor?" The following question was routine.

Oct. 21, 2014

Student: Do you know how to write a literature review?

Huo: I write literature reviews all my life.

Student: That's good.

Simon, a White immigrant student, had the first appointment with me. "Have

you tutored any essays in my major?” This was the first question that he asked me on our way to my office. “Yes, last term.” He said that he had difficulty in organizing his ideas and that he wanted to brainstorm with me. “I would like to introduce this course to you.” He spent over ten minutes explaining the goal and the contents of his course to me in great detail. He was the first student to give such a lecture to me about a specific course. (Feb. 10, 2015)

Feb. 10, 2015

Simon seemed to educate me as a student, while the way he spoke resembled that of a teacher. Honestly, I did not realize his motives for explaining his course contents to me until at the end of our appointment when he told me directly that he was doubtful about my qualifications.

Simon stood up at the end of our tutoring session. He said, “I am not the person who makes judgments at the first impression, but from my first conversation with you, I thought we would have language barriers.” Yet, he admitted that his perceptions of me had changed completely during the tutoring session: “You are really knowledgeable and helpful. You have helped me a lot. Thank you so much!” His testimony was exactly in line with his response in my interview with him discussed in Chapter 6. (Feb. 10, 2015)

Requests for reassurance. Some students were more cooperative and seemed to hold more positive views of my linguistic abilities. However, they still needed to reconfirm my linguistic competence before they began their formal tutorials with me, as though checking the genuineness of the commodity that they were about to purchase.

Nov. 10, 2014

There was a francophone student. As a genuine ESL learner, he could not speak English before he came to the university. “You have written a lot?” He asked.

“Yes.” I answered. “You have read a lot?” He asked again. “Yes.”

April 13, 2015

“So you are good at writing?” This was the first question raised by a Canadian student when we met. I knew that a background check-up would follow. I told her that I had taught English writing at university level for over a decade before. “Incredible!” Her eyes were dancing and her face was glowing with satisfaction with the result of my background check. She began to ask me, an authority confirmed just one minute ago, questions on her essay one after another.

Promises and disappearances. Besides students’ overt confrontations and grillings, there were more subtle indications of their lack of confidence in my linguistic abilities, manifested in the disjuncture between their polite “promises” to contact me for further assistance and their virtual disappearances. Usually at the end of my tutorials, many students (both native and non-native) asked me about my full name and wrote it down. They said to me in an affirmative manner, “I will book an appointment with you next week.” However, the majority of them did not show up not only in the “next week,” but also for good. It is hard to know with certainty why they behaved the way that they did; however, from my conversations with colleagues it appeared as though these students were able to book an alternative appointment with a native English-speaking instructor. Given both options, a student will resolutely work with the native teacher no matter how useful s/he thinks the non-native instructor’s feedback was in the initial tutorial.

Oct. 6, 2014

Near the end of my tutorial, a White Canadian-born student said to me in a definite tone that he was going to receptionist to make a follow-up appointment with me next week right then. I told him that students also had the freedom to choose whoever they wanted to work with. As soon as he confirmed with me that all those alternative instructors were native English-speaking instructors, he changed his diction at once, “I will PROBABLY make an appointment with you.”

His tone was not as certain as that of his just now. It turned out that I had never seen him again from then on.

In summary, my students appeared to link the linguistic competence of the instructor with their opportunities for acquiring the linguistic capital needed to attain their academic goals, that is, completing their assignments with satisfactory marks and obtaining their degrees. In turn, in students' minds, linguistic capital was closely intertwined with social and cultural capital, as reflected in the relation between students' future socioeconomic status and their ability to integrate within the mainstream society.

Sociocultural issues: “I don’t think you know it.”

Sociocultural issues were not only manifested in students' suspicion of my legitimacy, double check of my cultural capital, but also revealed in their open resistance and defiance, as well as covert protest and rebellion.

Suspicion of my legitimacy: “I don’t know whether you can help me.” In many cases, before I began to read my students' papers and offer any feedback, the first statement that my students said to me was, “I don’t know whether you can help me,” or “I don’t think you know it,” or “It is hard for people outside our field to understand this.” They expressed doubt about whether I had sufficient cultural capital and knowledge about the Canadian society, educational system, their disciplines, and the institutional goals to help them complete their assignments.

Oct. 20, 2014

A Canadian-born student came to visit me. She said that her course was anthropology, so she wanted to find an instructor who specialized in anthropology. She said, “I don’t know whether you can help me with my anthropology essay.”

April 7, 2015

A domestic graduate student complained when she first met me. She said that the Writing Department assigned her to another instructor, but the instructor was not at the Writing Center that day. "I don't know whether you can help me," she said. I told her that I would try my best. She wanted to read her essay to me, but I suggested that I would prefer looking at it while she was reading so as to use my eyes, ears, and brain together to absorb the information fully. She consented, but reluctantly. Then I asked her, "Can I offer my feedback from the perspective of a reader?" I changed the word "instructor" into "reader" so as to make it sound more acceptable to her. She seemed to prefer this new status of mine and agreed to show her essay to me more willingly. My humble and modest status degraded from "instructor" to "reader" satisfied her pride as a native English-speaking student writer, and began to accept reading her essay to a non-native English-speaking spectator and listener.

Over time, "I don't know whether you can help me" conveyed the message that:

"Your English is illegitimate and how can a non-native English-speaking instructor teach a native-born Canadian?"

Double check of my cultural capital: "Are you sure?" Besides the often-heard statement "I don't know whether you can help me," there was another repeatedly voiced question: "Are you sure?"

Jan. 20, 2015

A Black, self-conscious student had an appointment with me. She said that she had visited me before and that she liked me, so she asked the department to assign me to her as her regular writing instructor. Her words showed her recognition of my value. However, when I began to talk about the problems existing in her proposal, she asked me, "Are you sure?" I nodded my head. She then accepted my feedback. She revisited me in the following week, wearing a big smile. She got an A for her last proposal, so she thanked me for my help. She wanted me to help her develop her proposal into a paper during that session. I naturally assumed that the "A" which she had received had established my credibility for her to trust my expertise in instruction. Surprisingly, while I was tutoring her, she asked me once more, "Are you sure?" I explained the rationales of my feedback, but she did not seem to have believed me fully. She took out a hard copy and showed it to me. It was written by her classmate. She told me that she thought it a great paper, but what I said was different from her classmate's paper. She compared my expertise with that of her classmate (probably native English-speaking) and did not think what I offered was as legitimate as what was in her classmate's paper. However, when she visited me

for the fourth time, she did not ask “Are you sure?” any longer; instead, she told me, “I got an A again this time for my last paper. I followed your advice.”

Open resistance and defiance: “I need you to tell me my problems.” *Oct. 20, 2014 A Canadian-born student came to visit me. I asked her whether she had shown her essay to her professor, she said “yes.” I continued to ask her what her professor had said about it. She told me that he said there were too many unnecessary points and asked her to delete them. When I asked her the last question “Did he mention where?” She replied extremely impatiently and unhappily, “I want you to tell me my problems!”*

This remark betrayed her doubt of my qualifications and her dissatisfaction. She assumed that I did not have the ability to detect her problems, let alone offer her any useful remedies. Below is my response:

Oct. 20, 2014

I smiled and said slowly, “I have done a lot of research into writing. The relationship of you and me as student and instructor is like that of a patient and a doctor. The doctor will have to ask the patient a series of questions first about his/her symptoms, such as ‘Do you cough?’ ‘Do you have a fever?’ in order to know the patient’s health conditions better to diagnose his/her illness and treat him/her later. I saw her smile. She did not say anything later to reject my way of tutoring.

Covert protest and rebellion. *May 11, 2015 Obviously, the White European student’s arguments did not support her thesis statement at all. I offered her my feedback and tried to help her revise her thesis. However, she did not seem to listen to me; instead, she wrote down some other arguments (even more irrelevant and inconsistent than her first version, to my surprise). I was saying to her that she need ponder over them again carefully, but she neglected my comments. I felt that I was like the air in the room, transparent and invisible. She just ignored my presence.*

Gang was a second-year immigrant student from China. He was very slim with a sharp chin. He asked me a lot of questions during our first meeting. “Do you teach Chinese students only?” “No, almost half native Canadian students and half ESL.” “Are ESL all Chinese?” “No. They are from different countries of origin.” (Dec. 2, 2014)

During Gang’s second visit, he told me his puzzles and asked me another

question. “At the beginning when I registered with them (the receptionists of the Writing Center), I said I was available on Monday and Tuesday.” “I am working here on Monday and Tuesday.” I said. “Can they not schedule my appointment on Monday?” he asked. (Jan. 6, 2015)

Jan. 6, 2015

I could sense Gang’s looming unwillingness of working with me. The interview with him (in Chapter 6) proved my guess.

Racialized stereotypes: “You don’t look like a professor maybe because of your nationality.”

Racialized stereotypes were revealed through students’ routine background inspections of me and their blatant attacks and challenges.

Routine background inspection: “Are you a student?” The routine background inspection usually consisted of several reiterated questions at the beginning of the tutorial: “Are you a student?” “Are you an immigrant?” “Have you got your Master’s degree?” “Do you go to university here?” “Did you graduate?” “Are you a volunteer? Do they give you a pay?” “How many years have you been in Canada?” “How many years have you studied English?” “Where did you graduate?” Among all the above questions, “Are you a student,” the question raised by both native and non-native English-speaking students, immigrant and international, and both young and mature students, ranks top with overwhelmingly highest frequency of use.

Chung, the first-year international student from Vietnam, asked me a series of questions when she first met me. “Did you go to the university here?” “Yes. Why did you ask this question?” “Oh, nothing.” “But not undergraduate studies; it’s Ph.D.”

“So you are studying now as a Ph.D.?” “Yes, but I have taught English before for many years.” “Really? You look so young.” (Jan. 12, 2015)

Consonant with James’s (1994) experience that he was repeatedly seen by others as “a student,” I was bombarded with the same questions, “Are you an undergraduate?” and “Are you a student?” Clearly, race plays an essential role in people’s assumptions and evaluations of non-native English instructors.

Blatant attacks and challenges. Blatant attacks and challenges were vehicles for my students’ disdain and contempt, rage and fury, suspicion and inspection, perplexities and fear, as well as despair and disillusionment. Moreover, these strong responses occurred before they knew who I was, and how much I could offer them as their writing instructor.

***Distain and contempt.** April 27, 2015 This was a Brown Canadian-born student who met me for the first time. She did not bring any draft with her, so I decided to use this session as an orientation tutorial for her. Before I uttered the first word, she was looking at me, sizing me up in a patronizing and contemptuous manner. She was on tenterhooks, frowning slightly. Her tiny and delicate face was like an open book, with every of her facial expressions written there clearly. Even before she knew who I was, what experiences I had before, and what I could offer her, she went off in a huff.*

April 3, 2015

A blonde Canadian student said that it was the first time for her to visit the Writing Center. During our conversation, she was polite, respectful, and did not show the slightest sign of distrust in my qualification. I offered my comments, suggesting that she revise it, yet she said that her version was better than the feedback suggested by me. I continued to read the following paragraphs of her essay and sensed that she was staring at me. When I looked up at her at the very moment while she was totally unprepared for my eye contact, I suddenly noticed there was a glitter of scorn in her eyes. Although it was swift and subtle, it did not evade my eyes. This scornful glance made me feel humiliated. What made me confused was how she could behave totally differently covertly and overtly? Was she an actress? My confusion was verified very soon by her subsequent words. “Can you write something for me?” She requested. She told me her TA asked her

to visit the Writing Center, so she could get extra marks. She asked me to write down my name and contact address for her TA as a proof of her visit. Upon hearing her words, I realized the real intention of her visit of me at the Writing Center.

Rage and fury. *March 2, 2015 A mature student who had immigrated from Asia said that she had resided in Canada for many years. She was eager to revise her thesis statement. I gave her some advice and was trying to help her improve her thesis, but she wanted me to tell her exactly word by word how to reformulate her thesis. I did not agree. Instead, I tried to instruct her to rewrite it by herself. She flew into a rage and shouted, “When other instructors said my thesis was wrong, they showed me the correct one.” I knew what “other instructors” exactly meant. She was comparing me with her White and native English-speaking instructors, so she was judging me as compared with them who she thought as legitimate references. I told her that different instructors had different styles and approaches and that I could only offer her suggestions, but could not write the thesis for her. When hearing my answer, she stormed out of my office in a fury.*

Obviously, racialized stereotypes and preconceived biases stigmatized me as a non-White, non-native English instructor. If the above student was resentful about my refusal of her “request” as a blasting fuse that ignited her wrath, coupled with the cause of my race, other students (both White and non-White) bristled with anger simply because of my immediate appearance as their writing instructor.

Feb. 3, 2015

The ESL student’s instructor was not at the Writing Center today. As soon as she saw me and knew that I was her substitute instructor, she changed her facial expressions immediately. When we were walking together outside of the reception room, she looked so painful that she refused to look at me. She turned her face aside, about to cry. I could almost see her angry tears. The dead silence made me feel she was so enraged that she was clenching her fists and grounding her teeth. Her assignment’s deadline was the next morning and she knew clearly that she was not allowed to visit another instructor again during the same week, so her last hope was ruthlessly shattered by the appearance of me. I began to ask her some questions on her assignment. She was impatient in answering any of them raised by me. She first said on the way to my office, “I want you to look at my whole paper.” However, at this moment, she reformulated her request, “I want you to look at the literature review only. I am fine with the rest of the part.”

Her expectation and hope had shrunk.

Nov. 11, 2014

A White mature student was new to the university. When I was introducing myself to her, she looked greatly surprised, turning her head toward to receptionist and protested, "You assigned Emma to me instead of this one." "Emma" sounded like the name of a White, native speaker of English, while my name was "this one" although I exactly told her my name just now. On the way to my office, she was pulling a long face and gave me an irritated look, keeping on saying, "My instructor is Emma."

It is reported that racial discrimination has transformed from overt to covert forms (Zong, 2007; Zong & Perry, 2011). However, some of my students still demonstrated nakedly racial discrimination against me from which I can infer how deep seated discrimination is in people's minds, hearts, and blood cells.

Suspicion and inspection. Not only White Canadian-born students and White foreign-born students (e.g., East Europe) scrutinized and inspected me closely; non-White foreign-born students also examined me carefully.

Sept. 30, 2014

A White native-born student was the first student to visit me today. She said that she had visited the Writing Center many times and that she had another instructor here. I found that like many other native students, she was not really interested in the materials that I shared with her to warm her up so as to better prepare her for my subsequent feedback. She glanced over them in a perfunctory manner. While I was reading her essay, she was looking at me secretly, examining my facial expressions and checking my speed to inspect whether I would have any problems or difficulties in offering her any feedback.

Oct. 21, 2015

A White Canadian-born student was looking at me straight into my eyes all the time throughout the whole session like an inspector and invigilator. Her fixation was different from that of many other students. It was more inspective and penetrating. I felt the air inside the room terribly hot, humid, and suffocating. I also felt that I was like the bacon being grilled by her scorching stare. Honestly, I did not feel comfortable to work under such close scrutiny, so I looked aside intentionally to avoid confronting her direct, investigative gaze although I knew it was not very polite to do so. From time to time, I kept telling myself that it was my occupational ethics to calm myself down and fully concentrate on her paper

without being disturbed and distracted by her suspicious inspection.

Oct. 6, 2014

A White Canadian-born student looked perplexed and astonished when she first saw me. After I started tutoring her, she was still gazing at me suspiciously, seemingly questioning my oral feedback. The inspective way that she was looking at me and examining me made me feel the tense atmosphere in my office at once. Honestly, under such gaze or close inspection, the tutoring session that I often enjoy had changed into a torture for me. Ironically, her paper was about racism and I talked about racism with her under such White gaze and scrutiny.

Nov. 4, 2014

A White East European student told me that he was new to Canada. He said that the educational norm in Canada was different from that in Russia. When I heard this, I showed him some writing templates as a starting point. "My essay is not a literature review!" He protested. I answered calmly, "Do you want me to give you a fish or teach you to fish? It may not work exactly for this essay, but it is a key to open many doors of other assignments. If you know the skills of fishing, you will have countless fish to eat instead of only one." He became silent. I thought that he had accepted my writing philosophies and styles. However, while I was reading his paper and assigned more handouts relevant to his assignment for him to read, he put them aside and did not glance over them at all. He was just watching me skeptically all the time. His paper seemed like a priceless fragile art craft in my hands, so he had to watch me closely all the time to be sure that I would not have the slightest chance to break it or damage it. I had several East European students before. They all appeared the same, doubtful and inspective. None of them came to revisit me later.

Jan. 19, 2015

She was an immigrant from East Asia. Her instructor was a senior White teacher who was unavailable that day. She was staring at me, like watching an animal escaping from the cage of the zoo, or a beast, or a monster from a forest, or someone from UFO. She was examining me long and intensively, up and down, trying to find any cue if possible whether I had any expertise and professionalism in tutoring her like her senior instructor, or had any knowledge that might be equivalent with that of her White, experienced Canadian instructor.

Perplexities and fear. Many of my White Canadian students were greatly

surprised when they saw I was assigned to them as their writing instructor.

April 7, 2015

There were several students waiting in the reception room. While I was reading my next student's name aloud, I saw a White young man sitting in front of the computer in the middle of the room turning his head slowly to me. I was not sure

whether he was exactly the student on my appointment list since his reaction was so slow, seeming that the name I had called was not really that of his. I read the name again. He looked totally confused, as being struck by lightning. He did not smile or say hello to me. Dumbfounded, he refused to accept the fact that I was his instructor. His facial expressions told me that he felt that he had been betrayed by the Writing Center, but he did not realize the truth until a second ago while I was standing there, calling his name. He was looking at me like watching a trader in human being, about to transport and sell him to a faraway deserted land, but he had no way to flee. I tried to shake hands with him as what I had done to every student of mine for the first meeting; he was reluctant, seeming to escape as quickly as possible. "Please take a seat." I said to him in my office. He was still staring at me, like examining who I was, why they sent me to the Writing Center, and what on earth I was doing here.

This has confirmed the research findings that many students examine their non-native teachers like checking the genuineness of their recently bought commodity and double check whether it is fake.

"Who is my next student?" I asked the receptionist. The secretary pointed at a White female student named Ava, but she looked shocked. Her eyes were full of enormous fear, suspicion, and confusion. She seemed unwilling to stand up to follow me to my office. When we arrived at my office, she did not appear to have got over her astonishment of the sight of me. I have long been used to this dubious glance, but many other students either disguised their great surprise skillfully or secretly examined me. Her face was a barometer, manifesting every facial expression of hers vividly. She seemed not to believe her eyes yet. In order to ease her panic, I asked her, "Have you visited the Writing Center before?" "Yes, many times." "Who is your writing instructor here?" "I don't have one. I have a different instructor each time."

Ava was of Afghan descendant, born in Canada. This was her fourth year and all the instructors she had had at the Writing Center before were exclusively White native speakers of English except me. (Nov. 25, 2014)

May 4, 2015

I greeted a White, gray-haired, Canadian student, sitting in the chair, “How are you?” He looked at me with widening eyes and yelled, “Wow! Wow!” He was still sitting there, showing no sign of standing up to follow me to my office. I waited patiently for him to “wake up” from his great surprise. After some time, he stood up finally and began to walk with me toward the door of the reception room and said, “We are supposed to have professors as our writing instructors; you don’t look like a professor!” I replied seriously, “I was a professor in China for 15 years and have been working here for a couple of years, so you see people cannot be judged by their appearances.” “Maybe because of your nationality, you look younger than your age.”

Similar to James’ (1994) students who used the word “accent” to comment on his difference so as not to be accused of being a racist (p. 48-49), the word “nationality” has a safer ring than “race” to save one from troubles. Did my “nationality” or visible color make me look young and inexperienced? What is the relationship between one’s race and one’s perceived professionalism? I surmised that if I were a White, speaking Canadian English, he would not have had such strong reactions. It is noteworthy that not only White Canadians, but also non-White ESL students, felt astonished at the sight of me, including some Chinese students whose reactions were not more muted than those of my White Canadian students.

Annabel was the first-year international student from Hongkong. When I first met her in the reception room, her eyes were widened, full of surprise. I smiled at her. Although she smiled as well, she was looking at me intently. However, when I looked into her eyes while I was discussing her assignment with her, her eyes were drooping and there was not much eye contact between us. (March 2, 2015)

Despair and disillusionment. *Jan. 19, 2015 I smiled and said hello to an ESL student from Asia. She looked downcast and despairingly. When she was walking through the long corridor side by side with me to my office, her looks were like those of the wax statues at Madame Tussaud’s Wax Museum. It seemed that she was following me to attend a funeral that she was neither prepared for nor*

willing to, grim looked and leaden-hearted.

Jan. 26, 2015

When I entered the reception room, I saw a Chinese student talking with the receptionist. When I was announcing his name, he turned back. Immediately when he saw me, he looked anguished, his face distorted. He looked aside in agony, appearing despaired to death. He kept a long distance from me and was unwilling to look at me, so I even did not have a chance to shake hands with him since he was several meters away from me. On our way to my office, I tried to initiate the conversation with him, but he was reluctant. Finally, he began to answer my questions in my office. From the conversation, I knew that he had a White Canadian instructor at the Writing Center and his paper would be due a couple of hours later. Like some other students, he came to the Writing Center at the last moment to clutch at straws in the hope of rescuing their papers. He anticipated that miracles would emerge when an efficient and proficient White native English instructor would appear in front of him at the Writing Center, helping him out. However, my emergence as his instructor threw him to the abyss of despair.

Summary of Site 1 Findings

At Site 1, besides a number of native Canadian students, I also tutored numerous students from Africa, Asia, Europe, Central America and the Caribbean Sea, and South America. In line with the mandates of the Writing Department, I interpreted students' revisits as a sign of their approval of the instructor's service and a sound indication of their positive attitudes. Of the overall students who visited me, 40% of them booked revisits. Among the students who revisited me, over 85% were non-White ESL students (mainly international students), nearly 11% were non-White Canadian-born students, and only less than 2% were White native-born and the other 2% were White ESL students. What is worth mentioning is that nearly 60% of the total of revisiting students had revisited me multiple times (ranging from three times to over fourteen times). Therefore, for some weeks of the term, I saw the same students repeatedly. Second, among the small number of the non-White native-born returning students of mine, most of them were of Asian descent (i.e. Indian Canadian

and Chinese Canadian). Similarly, most of my returning ESL students were from Asia among whom Chinese students (more Chinese international students than Chinese immigrants) took up the highest percentage. However, this finding may be skewed by the relatively large number of Chinese students assigned to me by the Writing Department. Some Chinese students spoke Chinese exclusively with me while some other Chinese students intentionally avoided speaking Chinese. Seventy percent of the Chinese students who had visited me returned and half of them revisited me on a regular basis, i.e., weekly, throughout the term or the academic year.

Next, among my returning immigrant students, there were a larger number of relatively recent immigrant students than of immigrants who moved to Canada before the age of five. On the whole, White Canadian-born students and immigrant students who had resided in Canada for a relatively long time appeared to hold less positive views of my qualifications and abilities than recent immigrant students who had resided in Canada for no more than five years. International students of color showed more positive responses, while White international students, especially from East Europe, demonstrated negative and hostile attitudes (cf. Derwing & Munro, 2005). Finally, and somewhat ironically, the student demographic whose attitudes changed most dramatically from negative to positive was White native-born Canadians. Still, the majority of these students never revisited me.

Site 2: The New Online Booking System

Something unexpected and totally fresh emerged at the Writing Center during my data collection process—a brand new online booking system! With the former

booking system, students either called the receptionists or went to the Writing Center to book appointments in person. They were assigned by the Writing Department to an instructor for their first appointments. Students then continued to work with the same instructor for their following appointments if they were not dissatisfied with their instructor. In my case, sometimes when my students were not very happy with their pairing with me at the beginning, after they had been tutored by me, many of them changed their perceptions and followed up with me regularly. With the new online booking system, from the very first appointment students have total freedom to book their meetings with any instructor at the Writing Center that they would like to work with by simply clicking on the instructor's name displayed on the booking website page. It is conspicuous that among other Canadian or English names, my name is the only noticeable Chinese name, which makes my race salient to all students who did not know me before. As well, the information of every instructor's available time slots, whether their appointments are booked, when they are booked, and by whom, is manifested clearly to every instructor at the Writing Center. Once the instructor's appointment is booked, the color of the box of their available time slot will be changed to blue while the vacancies remain blank.

When I got to know how the new online booking system would actually work, I spoke to my colleague before the booking system was in formal operation. I protested, "Students will not come to visit me when they see my Chinese name." My colleague agreed that there would be discrimination and replied, "I cannot

understand why some Chinese students said to me, ‘We’re Chinese, so we don’t want a Chinese teacher.’ You have excellent linguistic skills and a lot to offer them.”

No Appointments: “It is so Weird to See a Chinese Name among All other Names.”

My worries soon turned into reality. During the first week of the new term, my office hours were on Monday. After the new online booking system was in operation during the first week, it turned out that I was the only one out of eight instructors working on Monday who did not have any appointments.

During the second week, I was the only instructor among all instructors (39 in total) at the Writing Center who did not have any appointments that week while all other instructors were fully booked. A Chinese international student told me honestly at the end of the term, “It is so weird to see a Chinese name among all other names.”

I was like a plague that every student was trying deliberately and desperately to escape, or a dangerous monster that no one dared to approach. I was thinking about conducting an interesting experiment—changing my Chinese name into a White Canadian one. The result could be quite interesting, I thought.

At the end of second week, I uploaded my biography to the new booking system as a response to the call of the Writing Center to help students take better advantage of the new system with the help of the information of each writing instructor. Several days after my biography was uploaded, I did not have a single appointment still. It seemed that whether I posted my biography or not did not make much difference to either Canadian students or international students.

Late Appointments: “Your Appointment was the Only one Vacant.”

Finally, the situation was beginning to change. Students started to book me. My office hours were extended to Monday and Wednesday. Although I still had some vacant appointments as compared with my native speaking Canadian colleagues who were almost fully booked, students began to book me gradually. Like the appointments of other instructors, my appointments started to be fully booked, even by students whom I had never met before.

My supervisor, who had hired me, met me one day. He asked, “How about the new online booking system?” I answered, “I am fully booked this week.” “Fully booked?” He looked surprised, but happy, “I worried students would not come to visit you because of your name.” “Honestly speaking, I did not have any student at the beginning of the term. Hopefully, students will not have that name discrimination.” I answered.

However, I noticed that although my appointments were filled up, they were always booked at the last minute. That means students only booked my appointments when there were no other instructors’ appointments available that week. The students did not book me until one day or half of a day before the scheduled appointment. I seemed to be the last desired teacher in students’ eyes. I observed that I was always the last instructor whose appointments were booked at the Writing Center after all other instructors’ appointments were fully booked over one week or a couple of days ago. Although my position seemed to go upward as the term continued, changing from the last available appointments in the whole department during the full week to

the last vacant appointments on the specific day when I worked, my appointments were still the last ones to be filled up by the students who had not met me or known me before.

Early Appointments: “My Instructor is Unavailable Today.”

One week I found that all my appointments were fully booked over one week previously by students whom I had never met before when half of my native Canadian colleagues' appointments were still vacant. It seemed that I had become popular all of a sudden. However, students' explanations for why they booked me relatively far in advance revealed that I was not in fact so sought after as I appeared to be. A Canadian-born student told me that her instructor was unavailable that day. She viewed my biography and thought it matched her educational background. “So I think MAYBE you can help.” Another White student said that only my time suited her availability. She also viewed my biography and was informed that I had worked with students from various disciplines. “There is no point making an appointment with someone whose background does not match mine.” A Chinese international student told me that she first visited a Canadian instructor at the Writing Center, but the instructor said he could not understand her essay. “He said I should find a Chinese instructor, so I come to you.” Although the booking system was different from the former booking system, my status did not change in essence. In reality, these students who had booked me considerably in advance had already visited several other instructors before they came to visit me. It was obvious that I was not students' favored type of teacher at all. I continued to assume the role of the last

straw, the substitute for other unavailable instructors.

However, there were some different voices. One Black international student booked me after having visited several White native English-speaking writing instructors. She told me at the beginning of our tutorial, “I thought you would be easier to work with.” She also came back to revisit me. This sentiment was shared by several other Chinese students who started booking me and revisited me after having visited some other native English-speaking instructors. A first-year Chinese student said to me, “A Chinese teacher is easier to communicate with (in Chinese).” He said that he had been in high school and university for many years, but no other teachers had pointed out to him those writing skills and strategies he thought to be very helpful. “I will come to visit you frequently from now on.” Another Chinese student also told me, “A Chinese instructor is more useful to me.” I laughed. “Because I can speak Chinese with you?” “No. Because you can tell me many useful writing strategies.” It can be seen that my image as a non-White, non-native writing instructor, on the one hand, had excluded me totally from many of my students’ selection lists of their potential and ideal instructors; on the other hand, this open information released on line about my race maybe also made me become a prospective refuge, a hopeful alternative, and a potential source of support for marginalized, racialized, and disenfranchised students. As a result, the great majority of students who chose to visit me and revisit me at Site 2 were non-White. Also, there were more ESL than native-born students, more recent immigrant students than early immigrant students, more international students than immigrant students among

my tutee cohort. I also discovered that students who did not enjoy stable statuses such as visa students and new immigrants to Canadian society also visited me. I wondered whether visible minorities preferred visiting me because of our shared marginalized racial, ethnic, and social positions.

Full Appointments: “I am not Sure whether I’ll be Able to Book you Next Week.”

As the academic year proceeded and while the new online booking system was in full swing, I was no longer the last instructor whose appointments were booked as students’ last resort. At many times, my appointments were filled up over ten days or two weeks ago while nearly half of my other native English-speaking colleagues’ appointments were still open. Students began to complain, “I could not book you last week since you were fully booked” or “I am going to book you as soon as I’m back, but I am not sure whether I’ll be able to book you next week.” My appointments began to be filled up at a much earlier time for several consecutive weeks. I checked the names of the students who booked me at an early time and found they were generally my returning students. These returning students fell into two categories. They were either the students who had already recognized my teaching effectiveness since they visited me in the new booking system, or my former students who visited me one term or one year ago before the new system was in operation.

Then a third category emerged. I was attracting students who had got to know my teaching style and abilities indirectly through a workshop that I gave in the Writing Department. An immigrant student from Taiwan visited me. I recognized her

as she was a member of my audience in my writing workshop last term. She did not visit me at the Writing Center before, but she told me, “I have attended your workshop, so I think I know you well.” Unlike other students who booked one appointment each time, she booked two appointments with me in two consecutive weeks at one stroke even before her first visit. It seems when students booked me ahead of time, they were familiar with me either as my returning students or they thought that they knew my effectiveness through indirect channels (e.g., my workshops on writing), so they were determined to schedule the appointments with me particularly and did not want to wait until the last minute when there was a possibility I would not be available. The number of my returning students was on the rise. Nearly half of my students had follow-up appointments with me since the new system was in operation; and at the end of the term sometimes five out of six of my tutees were returning students.

Summary of Site 2 Findings

Consistent with Site 1, in Site 2 I had more ESL students—both immigrant and international students than native speakers of English, and more relatively recent immigrants than more established ones. Of the whole booking population, ESL students (including immigrants) of color took up 65%, non-White Canadian-born students 20%, White native students 5%, and White ESL students 10%. Although Canadian-born students (one fourth of the whole booking population) booked me, the number of the White, native students ranked the lowest. Still, no White native-speaking students ever revisited me in Site 2 which is similar to the finding in

Site 1. Also akin to Site 1, among the ESL students, there were proportionally more students from Asian backgrounds choosing to book follow-up appointments with me. However, there were some noticeable changes in the Chinese student population in Site 2 as compared with that in Site 1. During the first term after the new booking system was in operation in Site 2, Chinese students overwhelmingly chose to work with White, native-English speaking instructors. This experience differed from my findings at Site 1, where in the older booking system Chinese students took up a large percentage of my total ESL student population and the highest percentage of my returning student population. As a general rule, Chinese normally do not like anything from China. Xuan (2014) points out that Chinese people disdain goods and services of Chinese origin and worship foreign objects, believing them to be superior. Overall, Chinese students regarded native speakers of English as normalized ideal English teachers and were not positively disposed toward a “made in China” instructor if they had alternative choices. Nevertheless, during the second term at Site 2, the number of Chinese students was on the rise. I found that among my Chinese student population, half of them had visited other native instructors several times or many times before visiting me first. Consistent with Site 1 regarding Chinese students’ high percentage of revisits, at Site 2 nearly half of my Chinese students returned to visit me; among them, over half of the population had visited me throughout the term or the academic year. As well, similar to Site 1, at Site 2 Chinese returning students covered the highest percentage of the total revisiting student population--approximately 40%. This statistic is a good indication of students’

gradual recognition of my value as an instructor. Also, it showed that Chinese students found it more suitable for them to work with a Chinese instructor from their own culture.

Instructively, like Chinese students, over one third of the students who booked me had visited several other instructors before they (first) visited me. Additionally, half of the students who returned to have follow-up visits with me in the new online system had already visited other instructors as well prior to their meetings with me. This is not in line with my findings at Site 1 where students who had other instructors before were more demanding especially when first seeing me. Last, but not least, the students who had booked me by themselves directly at Site 2 registered higher degrees of satisfaction as compared with those who were paired with me by the Writing Department at Site 1. This is likely because unlike students in the original booking system, students at Site 2 had a chance to view my biography before their appointments with me, and therefore were not shocked or confused upon encountering a non-native speaker of Chinese origin.

Finally, in the new booking system, besides my native Canadian students, my foreign-born students came from the same continents with those in Site 1, except East Europe. As compared with the students at Site 1 who were assigned by the Writing Department to me, at Site 2 no East European students ever booked me on their initiative.

Site 3: The Drop-in Service in the Library

To supplement the full appointments (fifty minutes in length) at the Writing Center, the drop-in writing service is provided every afternoon in the university library. Only one instructor is assigned by the Writing Department to work there every day. Every student has up to fifteen minutes to discuss any aspects of their academic assignments with their writing instructor. Before I worked at the library, several colleagues who had worked there before told me that students would line up before the drop-in session began. After I started working at the library, there was a line every time as described by my colleagues. Sometimes, students had to wait from fifteen minutes to sixty minutes during the peak seasons (before exams or the assignment deadlines) to ask me questions. As with Site 1, students came to the drop-in service unprepared. They were not aware that the only available instructor was a non-White, non-native English-speaking woman from China. However, most of them still chose to wait in the line because many of them went to the library specifically in order to work on their assignments with an instructor. This aligned with the situation at Site 1 where students came to the appointments with me at the Writing Centre without any prior knowledge about the instructor and without an alternative option. I wondered what the situation would be like if there were two instructors working in the library simultaneously, one a White native English-speaking instructor and the other a non-White non-native. What proportion of the students would have made a different choice?

The student demographic varied greatly at Site 3 as compared with students at

Site 1 and Site 2 since the student population was more random at Site 3, unlike the deliberate pairing (in terms of both the instructor and the student's backgrounds) by the Writing Department at Site 1 or students' self matching with that of the instructor's background at Site 2. Plus, there were some changes in the proportion of native, immigrant, and international student population respectively. As compared with the percentage (i.e., 25% of the whole population was native) at Site 2, at Site 3 domestic students took up a higher percentage of the total visiting population. 44% of my drop-in students were born in Canada. Among them, there were also White Canadian-born students, but they represented an insignificant proportion - approximately 14% - of the whole domestic student population which was in line with the findings in Site 1 and Site 2. White ESL students covered 5% of the whole visiting population which echoed the finding in Site 2. Non-White ESL students still took up the highest percentage—51% of the entire drop-in population. However, different from Site 1 and Site 2, at Site 3 there were more immigrant students than international students, and more immigrants who had resided a long time in Canada than recent immigrants. Chinese students seldom dropped in, except for three. This situation was comparable with that at Site 2 especially during the first term where only a small number of Chinese students chose to book and visit me.

Although many students' responses and attitudes appeared positive, six students returned the cards to me as soon as seeing me. One said, "I've been to the wrong place. I should drop in the Research Desk over there." She was pointing to the Research Assistant at the pod next to me. The second student said, "The waiting is

too long. I'll come next time." The third student explained, "I have to go to my lecture now." The remaining three returned the cards to me immediately upon seeing me without a word of explanation. Besides these six students, two others simply vanished with the cards and never appeared before the drop-in service closed. It was hard to know the true motives of the students who returned the cards or just disappeared, but those students might think that this non-native English-speaking Chinese instructor would not be of much help, so they did not think it worth waiting. Like students at Site 1, some prospective students also checked my background and questioned my credentials. I served a Black Canadian-born mature student. Our conversation is reproduced below.

Oct. 28, 2015

I asked the student, "Which year are you in?" She replied, "First year. You, which year?" "You think I am an undergraduate?" I went on. She was silenced by my reply.

Dec. 2, 2015

A White domestic student double checked my expertise. She asked, "Do you know APA?" "Sure." I answered. "Do you know how to cite it?" "Yes."

There were also several other students who did drop in on me, but demonstrated resistant reactions to me. Their negative responses were consistent with those displayed by students at Site 1; however, all the students at the drop-in site who showed suspicion, confusion, and negative attitudes were native born - White and non-White - students. This differs from the resistant students at Site 1 who represented both native-born and foreign-born students.

Feb. 3, 2015

A black, Canadian-born student waited in line for fifteen minutes to see me. She was staring at me with great suspicion and deep mistrust. After I began to read her essay and started to offer her some feedback, she looked even more

suspicious, not believing what I was commenting. As the tutorial proceeded, she appeared totally intolerant, turning off her laptop suddenly and quickly while I was still reading her essay on her laptop screen.

March 3, 2016

The two White Canadian students visited me together. They wanted me to check whether their group presentation was critical. I discerned a certain coldness in their greetings. They were looking askance at me, inspecting me closely. While I was offering them my feedback, they were wearing a sour look, seeming not being persuaded by my feedback.

March, 23, 2016

A non-White, Canadian-born student had been ashen-faced and sulky-looking from the very beginning since he saw me. When I began to explain my feedback to him, he darted a sideways look of disapproval to me, sneering and cynical. It seemed that he was watching a clown's performance which could not amuse him and he just wanted to get his ticket refunded at once. At that moment, it was not a dialogue between an instructor and a student, but a confrontation between the accused and her accuser, and the last trial in court between a defendant and her judge. No matter how hard the accused tried to defend her herself, the adjudicator appeared undisturbed by the defendant's words in the slightest degree. He was trying desperately to trace any clue from the accused' face through his long, investigative, and discerning gaze that might tell him whether the accused was virtually a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Summary of Site 3 Findings

At the drop-in site in the library, my experiences paralleled findings at Site 2. Similar to the students who booked me on line after having viewed my biography, although the drop-in students did not schedule appointments with me they came to the drop-in site also on their own initiative. If they decided to follow through with the session, they were psychologically prepared since they saw me in person and were fully aware that I was non-White, and a non-native speaker. When comparing my experiences at Site 3 with those at Site 1, some similarities can be found. At both sites, students did not appear to have anticipated before they arrived that their instructor would be a non-White Chinese teacher. At Site 3, as at Site 1, the students

had no chances to see a second instructor for a full appointment during that week, as I was the only instructor available at the drop-in pod on that day. Therefore, as at Site 1 most of my students chose to wait as they knew that they did not have better alternatives to choose from.

Reflections on my Evolving Status as a Writing Instructor

From the Periphery to the Center

When I first assumed the position of the writing instructor at the Writing Center, I encountered differential treatment — indifference and unfriendliness on the part of some of my White colleagues. Although I smiled at everybody attached to the Writing Department, some of my White colleagues, including graduate instructors and faculty members, avoided eye contact with me and ignored me although I kept greeting them first every time I met them.

The watershed of my transformation from a novice instructor to “one of the three ESL experts” was the workshop I gave to my colleagues in my second year of employment as an instructor at the Writing Center. There was a one-day retreat (professional development workshops) designed for the faculty and staff members of the Writing Department. My former supervisor who recruited me recommended me to the chair of the Writing Department and the chief organizer stating that I was “one of the three ESL experts” in the Writing Department, and so I was invited as an expert to lead a panel with another two ESL specialists on how to teach ESL students writing at the Writing Center. My presentation which had blended my 15 years of university teaching experiences with my writing center pedagogic practice proved a

huge success. My chair spoke very highly of my presentation. My White colleagues also commended me one after the other as soon as my workshop was over. “I was enormously impressed.” “It was very informative, useful, and interesting. You had the charm to attract your audience.” “It was fabulous!”

I found that my workshop was a watershed experience in terms of my status as an instructor at the Writing Center. After that, some colleagues who attended my workshop began to smile at me and appeared friendlier to me than before. More colleagues began to speak to me. Even months later, some of them still complimented me on my workshop. One professor told me that she tried the strategies that I recommended in my workshop in her class and they worked. As well, although I did not have a chance to view my teaching evaluations, I learned about them indirectly from a couple of my White colleagues. They said some nice words to me and highly spoke of me. It seemed that my teaching abilities were finally gaining some recognition in the department.

A Skillful Substitute

I observed that at the beginning, only undergraduates were assigned to me by the Writing Department, instead of graduates. Among those undergraduate students, the majority of them were ESL learners. However, there were cases that when students were coming for their appointments, but their instructors were not present at the Writing Center. Then, like a substitute for regular soccer players, I began to play the dual roles of working as the regular instructor of undergraduates and the substitute instructor for postgraduates and many native-born students whose instructors were ill,

“unavailable,” “had to leave early today,” or away at conferences. While I felt the stress that resulted from being repeatedly compared to students’ permanent instructors who were generally full-time professors, I also knew that I was being presented with opportunities to accumulate capital (Yosso, 2005) and empower myself as an Asian instructor at a Canadian Writing Center. If I could turn the situation around and get more native English-speaking students coming back to revisit me, I could be recognized for my knowledge and expertise instead of my color and nationality. It turned out that I successfully tutored all those students of other instructors (some whose disciplines did not match my background), ranging from undergraduates to Ph.D. students across a spectrum of disciplines. Through this chance to get to know me, some students (both domestic and ESL) who had other instructors switched to me as their permanent instructor after they visited me.

Trouble Shooter

Some of my students told me later that they saw me as a fire fighter. When everything is going well, no one recognizes the existence of this individual; but in an emergency everyone is aware of their importance and indispensability. There were some immigrant and international students assigned to me by the Writing Department as long as they (both undergraduates and postgraduates) were not satisfied with their native English-speaking instructors. It seemed that the Writing Department regarded me, a non-native English-speaking instructor, as the first choice to replace those ESL students’ other instructors once those students voiced complaints. As all the students who were switched to me by the department were very satisfied with my tutoring, it

was becoming routine for the department to keep doing this in order to extinguish the “fire” of non-native English-speaking students’ dissatisfaction with the services they had received to date. From these occurrences, I infer that many international and immigrant students may feel more comfortable to work with non-native English-speaking instructors who understand their problems as non-native writers of English and had an intuitive sense of the contrastive rhetoric issues at play. An ESL M.A. student said to me during her second visit that she was not satisfied with her former instructor, so she changed that instructor. She said that she did not like that instructor’s style. “Your feedback last time is really very useful. I am happy I changed.” Finally, a clear sign that my performance as a writing instructor was becoming recognized was that the chair of the Writing Department offered me this position for five consecutive years.

Empowerment: A Legitimate English Instructor at the Center

I was happy that I was no longer a provisional substitute since many more native-born and graduate students were being assigned to me directly as my students. The Writing Department was placing much more trust in my pedagogic competence and expertise. Moreover, as time progressed I was managing to change the perceptions of many of my students within a 50-minute full session or a 15-minute drop-in tutorial. Many students who would say to me coolly at the beginning of our tutorials, “I will stay here for only a couple of minutes” or “I won’t stay here long,” actually stayed for 50 minutes (the full session of the appointment) with me. Many of the initially arrogant or resistant students began to take detailed notes, thanked me,

and recorded my name at the end of appointments. A few of them shook my hands enthusiastically when my instruction was done. There was also a “snow-ball” effect (Atkinson & Flint, 2004, p. 1044) that some of my Asian students recommended me to their classmates or roommates after their own visits, so their friends came to visit me afterwards.

And so, with effort I was able to turn my students’ initial resistance and hostility into “resistant capital” (Yosso, 2005, p. 80) which has promoted my growth and development as a writing instructor and ESL professional. I also see a new identity emerging as a legitimate speaker, user, and teacher of English. The recognition of my legitimacy by the Writing Department, my colleagues, and students enables me to continue empowering myself and my non-native English-speaking students to become recognized as legitimate English speakers (Xuan, 2014). This said, the gains I have described in this last section of this chapter are too few and far between to be considered as other than outliers from the norm.

Chapter 8 Discussion and Conclusion

In his book, *Non-Native English Language Educators in English Language Teaching*, Gorge Braine (1999a) cites a story from *The New Yorker*. An excellent Indian doctor got an internship opportunity of working for a well-known hospital in the United States. However, his Indian friend advised him to give up this chance. He explained that the hospital had “never taken a foreign medical graduate... We are...like a transplanted organ — lifesaving and desperately needed, but rejected because we are foreign tissues” (Verghese, 1997, as cited in Braine, 1999a, p. xiii). Braine (1999a) goes on to say that similar to the Indian doctor non-native educators are not seen as “vital or lifesaving; instead, they are often regarded as unnecessary by-products of the MA and Ph.D. programs in applied linguistics and TESOL in North America” (p. viii).

My dissertation investigated challenges confronting non-native English language teachers in Canadian higher education institutions. The findings from this research were interpreted based on my two conceptual frameworks—Critical Race Theory and Bourdieu's cultural hegemony theory. Critical Race Theory focuses on the centrality and intersectionality of race and racism, the challenge to White ideology, the non-neutrality of space, commitment to social justice, and the centrality of experiential knowledge and its interdisciplinary perspective. Bourdieu interrogates the concepts of “cultural capital” and “legitimate language.” The two frameworks are important and useful to my data analysis in that they both have illuminated clearly the root of inequality and injustice, hegemony, power dynamics, class hierarchies,

social caste and distinction, as well as the interrelationships between language, race, culture, and identity. My data analysis was informed by these two conceptual frameworks and my findings could be utilized to supplement and enrich the conversation between Bourdieu and Critical Race theorists.

Synthesis of Study Findings

In this dissertation, I investigated my students' perceptions of the role of English, their attitudes of native and non-native English-speaking teachers, their opinions of their ideal English language teacher, as well as my experiences at the Writing Center working and dealing with linguistic and sociocultural challenges and racialized stereotypes. By comparing and contrasting my findings in Chapter 6 (the students' perspectives) and Chapter 7 (my own perspective as their writing instructor), I found that my students' expectations were informed by what could be considered the norm in North America: it should be an Anglo-speaking, White teacher instead of a non-White, non-native English-speaker instructor. While I regarded some of my students as racists and saw myself as a victim of racism, my students saw themselves as victims as well. They thought of me as an illegitimate teacher without cultural capital who was assigned by the Writing Department to serve them as their writing instructor. In short, both they and I were impacted by the hegemony of native speakerism.

My study's findings indicate that students' sociohistorical and sociolinguistic locations – including length of residency in Canada, family background, financial and social means, and previous experiences with university study - wield strong

influences on their orientations toward their studies in institutions of higher education and their orientations toward the importance of English and English language instructors. Besides differences in my six respondents' personalities, as well as linguistic, cultural, and social identifications, all of them admitted that they initially expected that their language instructor would be a Canadian-born native speaker of English. Gang, the Chinese participant in my study, doubted the effectiveness and values of a Chinese language instructor although he fully recognized my strengths of "patience," "responsibility," and "kindness." However, in his opinion, none of these qualities are as important as being a White, native-born English teacher who is familiar with North American norms and expectations. Albeit two international students, Chung and Annabel, acknowledged my value to them and to other ESL students, Annabel firmly believed that for Canadian-born English-speaking students, native English speakers were more suitable instructors. Also, although the two native-born students, Ava and Olivia, affirmed my value to them as a writing instructor, they did not go as far as to generalize to other non-native speaking teachers, probably because I was the only non-native English-speaking teacher they ever encountered at the Writing Center. From my findings, it would appear that the norm of an idealized, White, native English-speaking language teacher who can assist one to achieve academic success still hovers over the TESOL and English language teaching profession – at least in higher education - shaping both native and non-native-speaking students' perceptions of their ideal English language instructor.

Several important themes and patterns emerged from my research data. There are five categories emerging from my findings related to: oral communication, contrastive rhetoric, curriculum, personal attributes, and the system.

Oral communication. Two ESL participants Chung and Annabel admitted that they had difficulties in verbal communications with Canadians. Chung “could not express” herself in English to make Canadians understand her while Annabel owed the communication breakdown to the language speed of Canadians: “They speak so fast.” Canadians’ fast speaking was addressed by the Canadian-born participant Ava as well: “They’re (native English-speaking teachers talking) like really fast” which made it hard for her to catch up in class. Annabel, together with another ESL participant, Gang, attributed their communication barriers to the difficulty in cultural integration with the Canadian society. It can be seen that both native and non-native English-speaking students had difficulties or problems in oral communication — difficulties they associated either with their own limited proficiencies or the way that their instructors delivered their lectures.

Contrastive rhetoric. Gang mentioned discrepancies between Chinese and Western cultures and ways of thinking; and Annabel addressed the differences between North American and Asian educational systems and expectations. ESL students underscored their awareness of differences in rhetorical styles and devices that they did not quite master and articulated their expectations that their instructors elucidate for them the L1 forms that were considered appropriate in the context of the requirements of their assignments so that they could meet the academic standards

in their chosen disciplines. At the same time that they emphasized the need for more explicit guidelines with regard to discursive structure and rhetorical expectations, they indicated their resignation to the reality that the university curriculum was not particularly learner centered; nor were university instructors cognizant of issues in contrastive rhetoric that could impede their academic success.

Curriculum. Participants expressed problems associated with their program's curriculum, claiming it failed to engage or involve them. Five out of six participants responded that they faced problems in participating in class either due to the lack of interest in the subject/topic or age gaps. ESL students attributed their silences in class to language obstacles and reported that language (ESL) and culture-related courses were easier to become involved in. My findings have shown that there is a huge gap between curricular goals and actual learning outcomes based on students' perspectives.

Personal attributes. Participants' personal attributes encompassed their financial, academic, and social challenges. Participants' (both native and non-native) financial challenges were mainly linked with their tuition fees. All domestic participants depended on the student loan, OSAP, to finance their studies. Their high tuition fees posed a great burden and debts for them before their careers started, from what Simon told me. Chung, the international student, had to pay tuition fees three times as high as those of domestic students. All participants unanimously reported experiencing challenges in academic writing. Participants' social challenges were revealed through the certain kind of friends they mingled with and which language

they chose to speak with their friends. Four out of six participants found it extremely “hard” or “impossible” to make friends with their classmates, most of whom were ESL students, and they thought it much easier to make friends in their ESL classes. Except for Chung, all the other participants hung with people from their own cultures and as ESL students they chose to speak their first language with their friends. However, Chung deliberately avoided making friends with people from her heritage culture (Vietnam) in order to have every chance to speak and practice English to enhance her language skills. ESL participants also described their social isolation as cultural others, by saying that nobody in class recognized their name (Chung, Gang).

The system. Participants identified the university system as a problem as well. When it came to the “coda” part of my interview, when I asked participants “Is there anything that I have forgotten to ask that you think is important?” they told me of their sufferings and distress at university. Chung remarked:

I think, maybe, if you, like, maybe you can ask some more questions about experiences, not only in the Writing Center, but like somewhere else in the university, like, like other centers because I went to many offices of school, and I had to deal with many of them. I don't have many good experiences with school (sighed). I only like you. The Registrar Center, do you know the Registrar Center? They cancelled all my courses in my exam time. They don't tell me a word why. I didn't even know then. The exams were coming in three days, so I emailed them and they said that my English has not met the requirement yet. I understand maybe my English requirement is not good enough, but they should tell me. You know they let me in the whole year and they cancelled all my courses without even telling me. I pay, like three times Canadians! I tried not to cry in front of them (in tears). Then they blamed me for that my fault. That was their fault, but they blamed me. That like they don't want to take all the responsibility, but like it's my fault my English is not good enough, but they let me the whole time in the school. You pay; they give you bad attitude. What can you do? (3-347)

Chung's words indicate there are some serious systemic problems existing at the university. Together with Chung, other ESL students and a native-born Black student

vented their unpleasant experiences with the discrimination (linguistic and racism) they experienced at the university (e.g., at the Writing Center, ESL Open Learning Center, and in classrooms) and in the wider Canadian society. Stein and Andreotti (2016) state that “global imaginaries” uphold Western superiority and hierarchy, and rank postsecondary education in developed countries top in the globe (p. 225). Stein and Andreotti (2016) address that such codified constructs place minority people from developing countries as inferior “global Others” (p. 228). International students, regarded as the combination of “cash” (financial income), “competition” (potentially global competitors), and “charity” (the subjects of Western benevolent educational support), rank low in this caste. Racialized sentiments are permeated into multiple layers of international education, ranging from words and behaviors to enrollment and services, embracing teachers, staff, and peers. The supreme hierarchy of Western education bears responsibility for racism and various forms of discrimination on campus (p. 225).

My findings also uncover that students have limited exposure to non-native English-speaking instructors and to diverse teachers overall. Questions have thus arisen: To what extent do universities represent diversity? Does the university recognize different Englishes? Who is legitimate? When, where, and how does the university break down numerous barricades to limit access to non-native English-speaking teachers in hiring practices? Does the university enable space to represent and project marginalized voices on behalf of faculty, administrators, and students?

I should note that initially in my dissertation, I had intended to describe only my own disenfranchisement. However, in researching my students' perspectives and in acclimatizing to their ways and the ways of writing tutoring centers in North America, I became more empowered. Ironically, my research problem became my vehicle for self-emancipation. In the postcolonial context where English is used as a global and universal language, arguably, even my non-native English may evolve to be considered legitimate given all the issues I have raised in my literature reviews and my research findings, including both my students and colleagues' revised perceptions of me during my data collection period.

Implications of the Study

The expansion of English has brought unprecedented theoretical, methodological, and pedagogical issues to light (Kachru, 1997). Kachru argues that the teaching of World Englishes has opened up new horizons for cross-cultural studies (1992b) for which two forms of shift are required: shift from theories exclusive to monolingual nations and shift from pedagogy and research to the efficacies of English. This means that the “pluralism of English” has to be addressed in conceptual and pedagogical ways (1992a, p.11). My dissertation encourages additional awareness on the part of language teaching professionals of the implications of authenticity, the status of English as an international and intranational language (Kachru, 1983, 1992a), and of the potential of a critically revisioned EIL pedagogy for enhancing pluralistic understandings (Kachru, 1992a, 1992b).

Theoretical implications. There are two important theoretical implications revealed by my dissertation.

The first implication is drawn from a sociolinguistic/World Englishes perspective. My dissertation sheds light on the significance of transnational movements of World Englishes within contemporary globalization processes and contributes to the reassessment of conventional frameworks for the classification of target language varieties (Kachru, 1983, 1992a). Kachru (1985) addresses this phenomenon as a “linguistic challenge” and states that “the traditional notions of codification, standardization, models, and methods” of English need to be reconsidered, noting that the NS-NNS division is no longer meaningful (p. 29) in postcolonial contexts. There are two reasons. First, speakers from Outer and Expanding Circles have outnumbered native speakers; second, English is no longer exclusive to English-speaking countries (Rubdy & Saraceni, 2006). As my literature review reveals, World Englishes have been widely used in numerous contexts (e.g. Asia, Africa, South America, and Europe) all over the world and their utilization has permeated all social levels, ranging from academic, financial, to individual areas (Kachru, 1996a, p. 81). The increased number of non-native English speakers, the wide expansion of World Englishes across cultural and linguistic settings, and the intensive and extensive uses of World Englishes – are all factors that compel linguists and language educators to reassess the authenticity and legitimacy of non-native varieties of English.

Another implication is the use of Critical Race Theory to understand the role of color and race in the teaching of writing. Critical Race Theory holds that racism is not merely about color for the society and the entire system at a macro level and the university on a meso level are all implicated. If we agree that racism is interlocked with color, how can we account for my non-White students' (including Chinese students') discrimination of me? I was hired by the university as their writing instructor, so I seemed above them in terms of my paid teaching position at the Writing Center, but that is "the paradox of power and privilege" (James, 1994, p. 47). Were students' attitudes toward me related merely to my race? Students' biases are derived from social norms, value systems, and stereotypic assumptions, acquired through myriads of educational and personal experiences, messages that are conveyed by the society, textbooks, universities, and media (James, 1994; James, 2001). Under such influences, students' perceptions often align with stereotypic norms concerning the characteristics of teachers who are competent to teach certain subjects and who can assist them most in achieving academic success. Therefore, students' prejudice and construction of an idealized English language teacher are not isolated from the society, culture, and economy in which they are embedded; rather, they are connected to the dominant ideologies. Critical Race Theory looks at and investigates power and hierarchy that have caused racism, discrimination, marginalization, and exclusion. CRT researchers have been making significant contributions through researching into societal and educational systems, policies, and

administration to tackle the entrenched and pervasive “institutional racism,” “structural racism,” and “systemic racism” (James, 2010, p. 220-221).

This dissertation unveils that both international and domestic students are mediated by teacher-student relationships of both conventional racism and neo-racism, a form of racism which goes beyond color to stereotypic foreign cultures, nationalities, employment barriers, and exotic accents, based on cultural distinctions instead of merely skin differences. Framed by political, national, and cultural supremacy, neo-racism justifies integration and adjustments of minorities and it pervades from academic domains (shown as academic writing and class participation in my research) to social interactions (with instructors, classmates, and friends which were investigated in my research). Evaluated against the main stream norm, this deficit model devalues and stigmatizes international teachers and students (Lee, 2007). The irony is that although international students are victims of the deficit model and racial discrimination, they also used the deficit model, cultural stereotypes, and accent barricades by which they were judged by the mainstream to evaluate me—their English writing teacher of the Chinese origin.

Moreover, when referring back to my two conceptual frameworks, my students (both domestic and international) did not deem me equipped with cultural or social capital, or adequate knowledge possessed by the mainstream society, according to Bourdieu-ian notions. However, they ignored the plentiful knowledge that I had based on Yosso’s (2005) understanding. Yet, many of my colleagues and students changed their attitudes toward me over time. This is in line with the literature (Pacek,

2005) discussed in Chapter 4 that time frames have an influence on the evolution of people's perceptions when there is more exposure and more familiarity with the styles and pedagogies of the non-native English-speaking teacher. From this finding, it may be inferred that teaching proficiency rather than language proficiency mattered most in the end with regard to my respondents' perceptions of my competence as an English language teacher.

Applied Implications. There are several applied implications emerging from my dissertation findings. First, universities are implicated in these discriminatory processes. My dissertation implicates the fundamental role of universities in challenging racism and implementing ethical internationalization. There is an imminent need to coordinate the different components of the higher education infrastructure. The fragmented system is clearly at the root of my students' malaise and their sense of being left behind. Policy makers, stakeholders, university administrators, and educators need to have dialogues and exchange ideas; and collaboration should be encouraged between different centers and offices, such as the Writing Center, ESL Open Learning Center, Student Service Center (e.g. Registrar Center), International Students Center, to make students' lives more livable and comfortable.

Secondly, both instructors' and students' awareness needs to be appraised of principles of contrastive rhetoric in cross-cultural education, particularly as concerns written expression. There are large differences between Western and Eastern manners of writing. Consider North American and Chinese writing norms in argumentative

essays, for example. Following Xing, Wang, and Spencer (2008), there are five major differences. In North America, argumentative essays adopt the deductive method, with the thesis statement or central idea provided at the beginning. Conversely, Chinese ESL writers are likely to postpone their research goal until the later part of the essay which seems discrepant to North American educators. In terms of the number of paragraphs, Chinese essays generally consist of four sections, i.e., “qi” (opening) building the theme, “cheng” (continuation) expanding the theme, “zhuan” (turning) shifting to ostensibly irrelevant themes or discuss the theme from a different perspective, and “he” (conclusion) summarizing the main point of the paper (p. 74), an organizational feature that stems from Chinese poems, whereas English essays often contain three major sections: introduction, main body, and conclusion. Another difference is that Western essays adopt a linear style - with a clear topic sentence, and supporting points within the same paragraph - while Chinese essays are circular, without any topic sentence and with many points discussed in a single paragraph. As well, Chinese students are taught to use figures of speech in their compositions in order to make their writing more appealing, while English essays are more direct and terse, using concise language. Another noticeable difference is that English compositions use discourse markers to link sentences and paragraphs whereas Chinese writing concentrates on the unity of meaning more than that of the form. In summation, my research can help writing teachers and student writers to realize the contrasts between the L1 and L2, and between their own cultures and

those of the host society, knowledge that will facilitate their learning and improve their writing skills.

Thirdly, it is imperative to revise and reform curriculum as well as improving services to address students' interests and needs, and to genuinely engage them fully. Learner-centered and culture-oriented curriculum is beneficial to empower students and enrich their perspectives. An internationalized curriculum is a goal in western universities for both domestic and international students. Also, there are a series of questions to think about. How do we provide students with quality and more superior services (e.g. languages, academic writing, communication, transition, integration, student success, and tuition fees)? How do we modify and implement policies and rules to offer services that are student-centered, culturally oriented, international-looking, to satisfy the interests of diverse student groups? How do we represent and fully involve minority students from under-represented and disenfranchised families and groups?

I was fortunate to be hired by the Writing Department as the first non-native teacher in the past ten years. Although my own teaching abilities were affirmed by my colleagues and students in the final analysis, my research results indicate that both native and non-native students need more opportunities to be exposed to the styles and "repertoires of practice" (Gutierrez & Rogoff, 2003, p. 19) that NNS teachers bring to the classroom. Both my native and non-native participants confirmed that they felt very comfortable and beneficial to work with me as their non-native English instructor. However, I was only one tree in a forest. When I

participated in annual national writing centers' conferences, seldom did I see another non-White (especially Asian) face. We need more trees, in the form of hires of non-native English-speaking teachers at the university to diversify the forest and enrich the ecology of the higher education environment. For this to happen, the university would need to value non-native teachers' worth and benefits to students, treat them respectfully, and provide them with equal access to job opportunities.

As well, given my participants' complaints about their teachers' pedagogic styles and strategies, I would emphasize the importance of training university teachers to improve their intercultural competence and helping them to develop responsive cultural pedagogy. My participants reported numerous incidents of discrimination, not only on the part of local students, but also among domestic teachers. Instructors' teaching strategies and attitudes directly influence learning outcomes and student success. Additional care should be taken in engaging interculturally capable, culturally responsive, and empathetic teachers who are able to teach students across borders, communities, cultures, disciplines, and curriculum.

More importantly, students' languages and cultures are to be viewed as resources and assets instead of deficits (Schechter & Cummins, 2003). When universities and schools begin to value the capital and resources that minority students bring to the classroom, when the mainstream society acknowledges and normalizes minority students' strengths and values, students will develop confidence in their own capacities as learners as well, when minority students and teachers are respected and their resources are valued by the mainstream society, and become a normal part of

the system, local Canadian students will start respecting their non-native speaking teachers and classmates, as well as recognizing their strengths and intellectual capital.

In addition, my dissertation reveals the gap between scholarship and practice. Although World Englishes has confirmed the legitimacy of non-native varieties and non-native English-speaking teachers, in reality, it has not been genuinely accepted by either native or non-native English speakers. My students' constant interrogation and inspection of my qualifications, expertise, and professional identities invite the inference that the identity and legitimacy of non-native English-teachers are complex, dependent on the power, race, and ideology of both the students and the instructors.

Lastly, I have gained significant understandings and insights as a result of doing ethnography as a researcher and ethnographer. I experienced the paradox of both empathy and ambivalence during my dissertation writing and revision processes: on the one hand, my ethnographer status enabled me to understand my students' struggles and difficulties. On the other hand, this empathy created some tensions in terms of my own autoethnographic narrative. This concluding chapter represents my best effort to reconcile the two perspectives. Have I fairly represented the emic perspective? Do I have a right to assume that being from the culture of some of my participants automatically makes me empathetic to their predicaments? Were my students truly unreasonable in seeking the assistance of an instructor who could accurately represent the norms of the target culture?

In a critique of the preceding chapter of my dissertation, a member of my committee questioned the fairness of my texts (especially journal entries) representing my students. Specifically, I was asked to rethink about my assumptions regarding their responses to me representing racial and ethnic prejudice. This feedback is in line with Chang's (2008) cautions about conducting autoethnography that fails to link "self" with "others" (p. 54), or self with culture. I have evolved an awareness of the ethnographer's mission which is not only to unveil the truth, but also to discover "multiple versions of the truth" (Denzin, 1996, p. xv).

Limitations of the Study

This study has several possible limitations. The first limitation is that I could only access and interview people (my six participants) with whom I had good working relationships. I could not approach individuals who were resistant or angry with me. Although I tried to contact them for the participation in my research, they declined my request. Thus, there is a bias in my interview data, in favor of a demographic that looked and sounded more sympathetic to my perspective and my distinguishing features.

Second, I chose six participants with both native and non-native English-speaking backgrounds. Except for one informant (Olivia), all others had Asian backgrounds (four came from Asian countries and one was of Asian descent but born in Canada). It may be argued that because of my respondents' relatively homogeneous backgrounds, my data cannot be generalized to students from multiple

cultures and ethnic backgrounds or, for that matter, to other Asian students and other students who reside in English-speaking countries other than Canada.

Third, the number of participants in this study and the research scale were relatively small. Although I used triangulation to validate my research claims – through fieldnotes, reflective journal entries, and autobiographic interviews - I could have considered undertaking follow-up interviews. A focus group strategy could have been considered. However, because most of my students lived far away from campus and had hectic and conflicting time schedules, I was reluctant to suggest focus group interviews or follow-up interviews to them.

Concluding Remarks

This research has left some questions unresolved as well. Based on my data about students' preferences regarding native versus non-native English-speaking teachers and about the two groups of teachers' respective strengths and weaknesses, what norms will we teachers use in English language teaching in contexts where English is a dominant language and in non-English-speaking settings? Should there still be a norm for English for academic purposes and what should it be? Considering my students' linguistic, cultural, and ethnic diversity and the different English varieties used by them at the Writing Center, how can we accommodate our teaching to different varieties of World Englishes in our multilingual classrooms?

In the spirit of equity and social justice, future research needs to address “power, ideology, and politics associated with Englishes and ELT” (Y. Kachru & Nelson, 2006, p. 317) to reshuffle the cards which were not distributed properly and equally

between the center and the periphery. As a member of the language teaching profession, I will strive to incorporate the concepts of “de-elitization” (Joseph & Ramani, 2006, p. 189) and “liberated English” (Kachru, 1998, p. 106) within English language teaching “to destabilize and rework ideologies” (Lin et al., 2005, p. 219) regarding varieties of English. I look forward to a time when English will be situated politically in a manner that embraces its multifaceted role in the world rather than being viewed from a monolingual lens. English can then be used as a tool for linguistic cohesion without sacrificing diversity, or the rich subcultures that would have their voices heard.

References

- American Council on Education (ACE) (2007). *At home in the world: Bridging the gap between internationalization and multicultural education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 290-305.
- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Amin, N. (1997). Race and identity of the non-native ESL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 580-583.
- Amin, N. (1999). Minority women teachers of ESL: Negotiating white English. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp.93-104). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Amin, N. (2004). Nativism, the native speakerconstruct, and minority immigrant women teachers of English as a second language. In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on non-native English-speaking professionals* (pp. 61-80). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Ansre, G. (1979). Four rationalizations for maintaining European languages in education in Africa. *African Languages*, 5(2), 10-17.
- Appadurai, A. (1988). Putting hierarchy in its place. *Cultural Anthropology*, 3(1),

36-49.

Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Arva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System* 28, 355-372.

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) (2014). *Canada universities in the world: AUCC international survey*. Ottawa, ON: Author.

Atkinson, R., & Flint, J. (2004). Snowball sampling. In M. S. Lewis-beck, A. Bryman, & T. F. Liao (Eds.), *The Sage Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods* (pp. 1043-1044). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bamgbose, A. (1971). The English language in Nigeria. In Spencer, J. (Ed.), *The English language in West Africa* (pp. 35-48). London: Longman.

Bamgbose, A. (1992). Standard Nigerian English. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.) (pp. 148-161). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Barratt, L. & Kontra, E. H. (2000). Native-English-speaking teachers in cultures other than their own. *TESOL Journal*, 9(3), 19-23.

Beck, K. (2009). Questioning the emperor's new clothes: Towards ethical practices in internationalization. In R. D. Trilokekar, G. A. Jones, & A. Shubert (Eds.), *Canada universities go global* (pp. 306-336). Toronto, ON: James Lorimer & Company Ltd.

Beck, K. (2013). Making sense of internationalization: A critical analysis. In Y.

- Hebert, & A. A. Abdi (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on international education* (pp. 43-59). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Bell, D. (1980). *Brown and the interest convergence dilemma*. In D. Bell (Ed.), *Shades of Brown: New perspectives on school desegregation* (pp.90-106). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bell, D. (1987). *And we will not be saved: The elusive quest for racial justice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bell, D. (2004). *Silent covenants: Brown vs board of education and the unfulfilled hopes for racial reform*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bellos, D. (2011). *Is that a fish in your ear? Translation and meaning of everything*. New York: Faber & Faber.
- Benke, E., & Medgyes, P. (2005). Differences in teaching behaviour between native and non-native speaker teachers: As seen by the learners. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 195-215). New York, NY: Springer.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Block, D. (2008). Language education and globalization. In S. May, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education. Volume 1: Language policy and political issues in education* (pp. 31-43) (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Springer Science + Business Media LLC.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Bohm, A., Davis, D., & Pearce, D. (2002). *The global student mobility 2025 report: Forecasts of the global demand for international education*. Canberra, Australia: IDP.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977a). Symbolic power. In D. Gleeson (Ed.), *Identity and structure* (pp. 112-119). Driffield: Nafferton Books.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977b). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977c). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information, 16*, 645-663.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). The market of symbolic goods. *Poetics 14*, 13-44.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp.241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1987). What makes a social class? On the theoretical and practical existence of groups. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 32*, 1-18.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of power*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Braine, G. (1999). (Ed.). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*.
Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Braine, G. (1999a). Introduction. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. xiii-xvii). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Braine, G. (1999b). From the periphery to the center: On teacher's journey. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. xiii-xvii). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Braine, G. (2005a). Introduction. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Teaching English to the world: History, curriculum, and practice* (pp. xi-xx). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Braine, G. (2005b). A history of research on non-native speaker English teachers. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 13-23). New York: Springer.
- Brock, G. (2009). *Global justice: A cosmopolitan account*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, G. W., & Held, D. (Eds.). (2010). *The cosmopolitanism reader*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. & Samimy, K. K. (2001). Transcending the nativeness paradigm. *World Englishes*, 20(1), 99-106.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002). *World Englishes: A study of its development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bryman, A. (2009). *Social research methods* (2nd Canadian ed.). Don Mills, ON:

Oxford University Press.

Bryman, A., Bell, E., & Teevan, J. J. (2012). *Social research methods* (3rd Canadian ed.). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Butler, Y. (2007a). How are nonnative-English-speaking teachers perceived by young learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 731-755.

Butler, Y. (2007b). Factors associated with the notion that native speakers are the ideal language teachers: An examination of elementary school teachers in Japan. *JALT Journal*, 29(1), 7-39.

Calmore, J. (1992). Critical race theory, archie shepp, and fire music: Securing an authentic intellectual life in a multicultural world. *Southern California Law Review*, 65, 2129-2231.

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

Canagarajah, A. S. (Ed.). (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006a). Toward a writing pedagogy of shuttling between languages: Learning from multilingual writers. *College English*, 68(6), 589-604.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006b). Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 197-218.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006c). Changing communicative needs, revised assessment

- objectives: Testing English as an international language. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 3(3), 229-242.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 923-938.
- Canagarajah, A. S. & Said, S. B. (2010). *English language teaching in the outer and expanding circles*. In J. Maybin, & J. Swann (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to English language studies* (pp. 157-170). London: Routledge.
- Carson, J. (1992). Becoming biliterate: First language influence. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1, 37-60.
- Caruana, V. (2010). The relevance of the internationalized curriculum to graduate capability: The role of new lecturers' attitudes in shaping the "student voice". In E. Jones (Ed.), *Internationalization and the student voice: Higher education perspectives* (pp. 30-43). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Casanave, P. C. (2002). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE) (2014). *A world of learning Canada's performance and potential in international education*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Chamberlayne, P., Bornat, J., & Wengraf, T. (2000). *The turn to biographical methods in social science: Comparative issues and examples*. London, England: Routledge.

- Chang, H. (2005). Self-narratives for Christian multicultural educator: A pathway to understanding self and others. *A Journal of the International Community of Christians for Teacher Education*. Retrieved from <https://ictejournal.org/issues/v1i1/v1i1-chang/>
- Chang, H. (2007). Autoethnography as method: Raising cultural consciousness of self and others. In G. Walford (Ed.), *Methodological Developments in Ethnography (Studies in Educational Ethnography, Volume 12)* (pp. 207-221). Bingley: Emerald.
- Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as method*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Charles, H. (2008). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Contemporary Justice Review: Issues in Criminal, Social, and Restorative Justice*, 11(1), 63-65.
- Cheng, C. C. (1992). Chinese varieties of English. In B. B. Kachru, (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.) (pp. 162-177). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Cheung, Y. L. (2002). *The attitude of university students in Hong Kong towards native and non-native teachers of English* (Unpublished M. Phil. Thesis). The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hongkong.
- Chimbanda, T. (2014). *Cultural diversity and inclusive education: Being responsive to the schooling needs of marginalized students in Canada* (Unpublished doctoral manuscript). York University, Toronto, ON.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Clark, E., & Paran, A. (2007). The employability of non-native-speaker teachers of EFL: A UK survey. *System*, 35(4), 407-430.
- Clifford, V. (2010). The international curriculum: (Dis)locating students. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Internationalization and the student voice: Higher education perspectives* (pp. 169-180). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cook, V. J. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209.
- Cook, V. (2002). Language teaching methodology and the L2 user perspective. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Portrait of the L2 user* (pp. 325-344). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cook, V. (2005). Basing teaching on the L2 user. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 179-191). New York, NY: Springer.
- Cooke, D. (1988). Ties that constrict: English as a Trojan horse. In A. Cummings, A. Gagne, & J. Dawson (Eds.), *Awarenesses: Proceedings of the 1987 TESL Ontario Conference* (pp. 56-62). Toronto, TESL Ontario.
- Cortes, C. E. (1998). Global education and multicultural education: Toward a 21st century intersection. In L. Swartz, L. Warner, & D. L. Grossman (Eds.), *Professional development project in multicultural education and global education, Asian and American studies* (pp. 114-133). Boston: The Children's

Museum.

Cote-Meek, S. (2014). *Colonized classrooms: Racism, trauma and resistance in post-secondary education*. Halifax & Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., & Thomas, K. (Eds). (1995). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. New York: The New Press.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crystal, D. (1985). How many millions? The statistics of English today. *English Today*, 1(1), 7-9.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2004). *The language revolution*. Cambridge, England: Polity.

Cummins, J., & Schecter, R. S. (2003). Introduction: School-based language policy in culturally diverse contexts. In S. R. Schecter, & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Multilingual Education in Practice: Using diversity as a resource* (pp. 1-16). Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Davis, P. (1989). Law as microaggression. *Yale Law Journal*, 98, 1559-1577.

Davis, A. (1991). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

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

Matters.

- Davis, A. K., Bazzi, S., Cho, H., Ishida, M., & Soria, J. (2005). "It's our Kuleana": A critical participatory approach to language-minority education. In L. Pease-Alvarez, & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Learning, teaching, and community: Contributions of situated and participatory approaches to educational innovation* (pp.3-25). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Davis, A. (2013). *Native speakers and native users: Loss and gain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deardoff, D. K. (2009). *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Dei, G. J. S. (2000). Towards an anti-racism discursive framework. In G. J. S. Dei, & A. Calliste (Eds.), *Power, Knowledge, and Anti-racism education: A critical reader* (pp.23-40). Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Delgado, B. D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the "legitimate" knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 35(2), 169-180.
- Denzin, N. K. (1997). *Interpretative ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2005). *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage*

- handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.) (pp. 1-19). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- de Quincey, T. (1862). *Recollections of the lakes and the lake poets*. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black.
- Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2005). Pragmatic perspectives on the preparation of teachers of English as a second language: Putting the NS/NNS debate in context. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 179-191). New York: Springer.
- De Wit, H., Lauridsen, K. M., & Straight, H. S. (2014, February). *Multicultural, multilingual higher education in the age of Anglophonization* [Presentation slides]. Retrieved from http://www.aieaworld.org/assets/docs/Conference_Materials/2014/docstoupload2/multicultural%20multilingual%20higher%20education%20in%20the%20age%20of%20anglophonization%20-%20presentation.pdf
- Dimitriadis, G., & Kamberelis, G. (2006). *Theory for Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Dixson, A. D., & Rousseau, C. K. (2005). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory in education ten years later. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 7-27.
- Dogancay-Aktuna, S., & Hardman, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Global English teaching and teacher education: Praxis and possibility*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL Publications.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1989). *The souls of Black folks*. New York: Bantam. (Originally published in 1903).

- Dyer, R. (1999). White. In J. Evans, & S. Hall (Eds.), *Visual culture: The reader* (pp. 457-467). London: The Open University.
- Ellis, C. S., & Bochner, A. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 733-768). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ellis, C. (2004). *The Ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Ellis, C. (2009). *Revision: Autoethnographic reflections on life and work*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Eoyang, E. (1999). The worldliness of the English language: A lingua franca past and future. *ADFL Bulletin*, 31(1), 26-32.
- Equality Challenge Unit (ECU) (2010). *Internationalization and equality and diversity in higher education: Merging identities*. Leeds, U.K.: Author.
- Essed, P. (2002). Everyday racism: A new approach to the study of racism. In P. Essed, & D. T. Goldberg (Eds.), *Race critical theories: Text and context* (pp. 176-194). Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Estrada, M. R. G. (2015). *Emergent identities and representations in ELT in minority language contexts in northern Mexico* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). York University, Toronto, ON.
- Evans, J., & Hall, S. (1999). What is visual culture? In J. Evans, & S. Hall (Eds.), *Visual culture: The reader* (pp. 1-7). London: The Open University.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1992). Foreword to the first edition. In B. B. Kachru (Ed), *The other*

- tongue: English across culture* (2nd ed.) (pp. xiv-xvii). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Fernandez, L. (2002). Telling stories about school: Using critical race and Latino critical theories to document Latina/Latino education and resistance. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 45-65.
- Fetner, D. M. (1998). *Ethnography: Step by step* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage.
- Firth, D. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On “lingua franca” English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 237-259.
- Fishman, J. A. (1992). Sociology of English as an additional language. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.) (pp. 19-26). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Flick, U. (2002). *An introduction to qualitative research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Flick, U. (2006). *An introduction to qualitative research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Gareis, E. (2012). Intercultural friendship: Effects of home and host region. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communications*, 5(4), 309-328.
- Gaskell, J. (2010). *Global constructions of multicultural education: Theories and realities*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associations.
- George, J. (1867). *The mission of Great Britain to the world, or some of the lessons which she is now teaching*. Toronto: Dudley & Burns.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gillborn, D. (2015). Intersectionality, critical race theory, and the primacy of racism:

- Race, class, gender, and disability in education. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 21(3), 277-287.
- Giroux, H. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1969). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Gopal, A. (2011a). Internationalization of higher education: Preparing faculty to teach cross-culturally. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23(3), 373-381.
- Gopal, A. (2011b). (2011, April). *The experiences of international racialized graduate students in higher education*. Paper presented at the 55th Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society, Montreal, QC.
- Gorden, R. L. (1980). *Interviewing: Strategy, techniques, and tactics* (3rd ed.). Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press.
- Gorham, B. W. (1999). Stereotypes in the media: So what? *The Howard Journal of Communication*, 10, 229-247.
- Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English?* London: British Council.
- Graddol, D. (1999). The decline of the native speaker. In D. Graddol, & U. H. Meinhof (Eds.), *English in a changing world* (pp. 57-68). *ALLA Review*, 13, International Association of Applied Linguistics.
- Graddol, D. (2001). The future of English as a European language. *The European*

English messenger, X(2), 47-55.

Graddol, (2006). *English next*. London: British Council. Retrieved from <http://www.britishcouncil.org/learning-research-english-next.pdf>

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selection from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (Q. Hoare, & G. N. Smith, Eds. and Trans.). London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Grant, R. A., & Lee, I. (2009). The ideal English speaker: A juxtaposition of globalization and language policy in South Korea and racialized language attitudes in the United States. In R. Kubota, & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education* (pp. 44-63). New York: Routledge.

Greene, M. (2000). The passions of pluralism: Multiculturalism and the expanding community. In J. Noel (Ed.), *Sources: Notable Selection in Multicultural Education* (pp. 38-46). Guilford, CT: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill.

Griffith, A. I., & Smith, D. E. (2005). *Mothering for Schooling*. New York: Routledge/Taylor-Francis.

Gutierrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher*, 32(5), 19-25.

Hall, S. (1997). The spectator of the "other." In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying processes* (pp. 223-290). London: The Open University.

Harris, C. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, 106(8), 1707-1791.

Harris, D., & Herrington, C. D. (2006). Accountability, standards, and the growing achievement gap: Lessons from the past half-century. *American Journal of*

- Education*, 112(2), 209-238.
- Harris, M. (1976). History and significance of the emic/etic distinction. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 5, 329-350.
- Hayano, D. M. (1979). Autoethnography: Paradigms, problems, and prospects. *Human organization*, 38, 113-120.
- Heller, M. (1996). Legitimate language in a multilingual school. *Linguistics and Education*, 8, 139-157.
- Henze, R. C. (2005). Veronica's story: Reflections on the limitations of "support system". In L. Pease-Alvarez, & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Learning, teaching, and community: Contributions of situated and participatory approaches to educational innovation* (pp.257-276). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. A. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York: Free Press.
- Hewings, A., & Tagg, C. (2012). General introduction. In A. Hewings, & C. Tagg (Eds.), *The politics of English: Conflict, competition, co-existence* (pp. 1-3). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Higgins, C. (2003). "Ownership" of English in the outer circle: An alternative to NS-NNS dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 615-644.
- Hiller, G. G., & Wozniak, M. (2009). Developing an intercultural competence program at an international cross-border university. *Intercultural Education*, 20(4), 113-124.
- Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English an international language*. Oxford:

Oxford University Press.

- Holliday, A. (2013). "Native speakers" teachers and cultural belief. In S. A. Houghton, & D. J. Rivers (Eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education* (pp. 17-26). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ibrahim, A. (2009). Operating under erasure: Race/Language/Identity. In R. Kubota, & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education* (pp. 176-194). New York: Routledge.
- Inbar-Lourie, O. (2005). Mind the gap: Self and perceived native speaker identities of EFL teachers. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 265-281). New York, NY: Springer.
- International Association of Universities (IAU) (2014). *Internationalization of higher education: Growing expectations, fundamental values*. Paris, France: UNESCO.
- Institute of International Education (IIE) and Opening Minds to the World (2014). *Open doors 2014: International students in the United States and study abroad by American students are at all-time high*. Washington, DC: Author.
- James, C. E. (1994). The paradox of power and privilege: Race, gender and occupational position. *Canadian woman studies*, 14(2), 47-51.
- James, C. E. (2000). "You're doing it for the students": On the question of role models. In C. E. James (Ed.), *Experiencing difference* (pp.89-112). Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

- James, C. E. (2001). "I've never had a Black teacher before". In C. E. James, & A. Shadd (Eds.), *Talking about identity: Encounters in race, ethnicity and language* (pp. 150-167). Toronto: Between the Lines.
- James, C. E. (2008). "Armed and dangerous"/"known to police": Racializing suspects. In C. Brooks, & B. Schissel (Eds.), *Marginality and condemnation: An introduction to critical criminology* (pp.378-403). Halifax and Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.
- James, C. E. (2010). *Seeing ourselves: Exploring race, ethnicity and culture* (4th ed.). Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.
- James, C. E. (2011). Multicultural education in a color-blind society. In C. A. Grant, & A. Portera (Eds.), *Intercultural and multicultural education: Enhancing global interconnectedness*, (pp. 191-210). New York: Routledge.
- James, C. E. (2012). Students at risk: Stereotyping and the schooling of Black boys. *Urban Education*, 47(2), 464-494.
- Johnson, L. S. (2003). The diversity imperative: Building a culturally responsive school ethos. *Intercultural Education*, 14 (1), 17-30.
- Jones, E., & Caruana, V. (2010). Preface: Nurturing the global graduate for the twenty-first century: Learning from the student voice on internationalization. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Internationalization and the student voice: Higher education perspectives* (pp. xv-xxiii). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Joseph, M., & Ramani, E. (2006). English in the world does not mean English everywhere: The case for multilingualism in the ELT/ESL profession. In R.

- Rubdy, & M. Saraceni (Eds.) *English in the world: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 186-199). London: Continuum.
- Kachru, B. B., & Quirk, R. (1981). Introduction. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), *English for cross-cultural communication* (pp. xiii-xx). London: Macmillan.
- Kachru, B. B. (1983). *The Indianization of English: The English language in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk, & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp.11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1986). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992a). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching*, 25(1), 1-14.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992b). Teaching world Englishes. In Kachru, B. B. (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 355-365). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992c). Introduction: The other side of English and the 1990s. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.) (pp. 1-15). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992d). Models for non-native Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (ed.), *The*

- other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.). (pp. 48-74). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1996). The paradigms of marginality. *World Englishes*, 15, 241-255.
- Kachru, B. B., & Nelson, C. L. (1996a). World Englishes. In S. L. McKay, & N.H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 71-102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. B., & Nelson, C. L. (1996b). World Englishes. In S. L. MaKay, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp.71-102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1997). World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 66-87.
- Kachru, B. B. (1998). English as an Asian language. *Links and Letters*, 5, 89-108.
- Kachru, Y. (1992). *Culture, style, and discourse: Expanding noetics of English*. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.) (pp. 340-352). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press. 查
- Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian contexts*. Hongkong: Hongkong University Press.
- Kim, T. (2007). *The interrelations among accentedness, comprehensibility, intelligibility, and interpretability of nonnative English-speaking teachers from the perspectives of English as a second language* (Unpublished Master's thesis). California State University, Los Angeles, CA.
- Knight, J. (1999). Internationalization of higher education. In J. Knight, & H. de Wit

- (Eds.), *Quality and internationalization in higher education* (pp. 13-23). Paris: OECD.
- Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33(Fall), 2-3.
- Knight, J. (2007). Cross-border tertiary education: An introduction. In *Cross-border tertiary education: A way towards capacity development* (pp. 21-46). Paris: OECD, World Bank, & NUFFIC.
- Knight, J. (2012). Concepts, rationales, and interpretative frameworks in the internationalization of higher education. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of international education* (pp. 27-42). California: Sage.
- Kramersch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramersch, C. (1997). The privilege of the nonnative speakers. *PMLA*, 112, 359-369.
- Kramersch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramersch, C. (1999). Response to Carmen Chaves Tesser and Eugene Eoyang. *ADFL Bulletin*, 31(1), 33-35.
- Kramersch, C. (2009). Third culture and language education. In V. Cook, & L. Wei (Eds.), *Contemporary applied linguistics: language teaching and learning* (pp. 233-254). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Kress, G., & Leeuwen, T. V. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. London & New York: Routledge.

- Kristeva, J. (1982). *Powers of horror*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Kutoba, R., & Lin, A. (2006). Race and TESOL (special topic issue). *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3), 471-660.
- Labov, W. (1972). The logic of non-standard English. In W. Labov (Ed.), *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English vernacular* (pp. 201-240). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Laden, B. V., & Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Job satisfaction among faculty of color in academe: Individual survivors or institutional transformers? In L. S. Hagedorn (Ed.), *What Contributes to Job Satisfaction among Faculty and Staff* (pp. 57-66). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teacher College Record*, 97(1), 47-68.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7-24.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Just what is critical race theory, and what's it doing in a nice field like education? In L. Parker, D. Deyhle, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Race is...race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education*, (pp. 7-30). Boulder: Westview.
- Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2005). What do students think about the pros and

- cons of having a native speaker teacher? In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 217-241). New York, NY: Springer.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawrence, C. (1987). The id, the ego, and equal protection: Reckoning with unconscious racism. *Stanford Law Review*, 39, 317-388.
- Leask, B. (2010). "Beside me is an empty chair": The student experience of internationalization. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Internationalization and the student voice: Higher education perspectives* (pp. 3-17). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lee, I. (2000). Can a nonnative English speaker be a good language English teacher? *TESOL Matters*, 10(1), 19.
- Lee, J. J. (2007). Neo-racism toward international students: A critical need for change. *About Campus*, January-February, 28-30.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Leonardo, Z. (2005). Foreword. In Z. Leonardo (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Race* (pp. xi-xv). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Leonardo, Z., & Broderick, A. A. (2011). Smartness as property: A critical exploration of intersections between whiteness and disabilities studies. *Teachers College Record*, 113 (10), 2206-2232.
- Lin, A. (1999). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social

- world? *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 393-412.
- Lin, A., Wang, W., Akamatsu, N., & Riazi, M. (2005). International TESOL professionals and teaching English for globalized communication (TEGCOM). In A. S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice* (pp. 197-222). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Liu, D. (1999). Training non-native TESOL students: Challenges for TESOL teacher education. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp.197-210). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Liu, J. (1999). From their own perspectives: The impact of non-native ESL professionals on their students. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp.159-176). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Liu, J. (2005). Chinese graduate teaching assistants teaching freshman composition to native English speaking students. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 155-177). New York, NY: Springer.
- Llurd, E. (2004). Non-native-speaker teachers and English as an international language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(3), 314-323.
- Llurda, E. (Ed.) (2005). *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Llurda, E. (2009a). The decline and fall of the native speaker. In V. Cook, & L. Wei (Eds.), *Contemporary applied linguistics: Language teaching and learning* (pp.

- 37-53). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Llurda, E. (2009b). Attitudes toward English as an international language: The pervasiveness of native models among L2 users and teachers. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and issues*, (pp. 119-134). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lorde, A. (1992). Age, race, class and sex: Women redefining difference. In M. Andersen, & P. H. Collins (Eds.), *Race, class and gender: An anthology* (pp.495-502). Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Lowenberg, P. H. (1992). Testing English as a world language: Issues in assessing non-native proficiency? Kachru, B. B. (1992b). Teaching world Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.) (pp. 108-121). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Mackenzie, I. (2014). *English as a lingua franca: Theorizing and teaching English*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Mahboob, A. (2003). *Status of non-native English speaking teachers in the United States* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.
- Mair, C. (2003). *The politics of English as a world language: New Horizons in postcolonial cultural studies*. New York, NY: Rodopi.
- Marckwardt, A. H. (1963). English as a second language and English as a foreign language. *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 78(2), 25-28.
- Marginson, S., & Sawir, E. (2011). *Ideas for intercultural education*. New York,

NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Marginson, S. (2014). Student self-formation in international education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 18(1), 6-22.
- Matsuda, M. (1989). Public response to racist speech: Considering the victim's story. *Michigan Law Review*, 87, 2320-2381.
- Matsuda, M. (1991). Voices of America: Accent, antidiscrimination, law, and a jurisprudence for the last reconstruction. *The Yale Law Journal*, 100, 1329-1407.
- Matsuda, M., Lawrence, C., Delgado, R., & Crenshaw, K. (Eds.) (1993). *Words that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech and the first amendment*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Mayo, P. (1999). *Gramsci, Freire, and adult education*. London: Zed.
- McArthur, T. (1993). The English language or the English languages? In W. F. Bolton, & D. Crystal (Eds.), *The English Language*, (pp. 323-341). London: Penguin Books.
- McCann, E. J. (1999). Race, protest, and public space: Contextualizing Lefebvre in the U.S. City. *Antipode* 31(2), 163-184.
- McKay, S. L. (1992). *Teaching English overseas: An introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, S. L. (2010). English as an international language. In N. H. Hornberger, & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 89-115). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- McKenzie, R. M. (2013). Changing Perceptions? A variationist sociolinguistic perspective on native speaker ideologies and standard English in Japan. In S. A. Houghton, & D. J. Rivers (Eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education* (pp. 89-115). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- McLuhan, M., & Powers, B. R. (1989). *The global village: Transformations in world life and media in the 21st century*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McNeill, A. (2005). Non-native speaker teachers and awareness of lexical difficulty in pedagogical texts. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 107-128). New York: Springer.
- Medgyes, P. (1983). The schizophrenic teacher. *ELT Journal*, 37(1), 2-6.
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who is worth more? *ELT Journal*, 46(4), 340-349.
- Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. Hongkong: Macmillan.
- Medgyes, P. (1999). Language training: A neglected area in teacher education. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 177-196). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Medgyes, P. (2001). When the teacher is a non-native speaker. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.) (pp. 429-442). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

- Mesthrie, R., & Bhatt, R. M. (2008). *World Englishes: The study of new linguistic varieties*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Milner, H. R. (2008). Critical race theory and interest convergences as analytical tools in teacher education policies and practices. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 332-346.
- Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Modiano, M. (1999). International English in the global village. *English Today*, 15(2), 22-28.
- Modiano, M. (2005). Cultural studies, foreign language teaching and lecture practices, and the NNS practitioner. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 25-44). New York, NY: Springer.
- Mohanram, R. (1999). *Black body: Women, colonialism, and space*. Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota University.
- Monture-Angus, P. (1995). *Thunder in my soul: A Mohawk woman speaks out*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood.
- Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(4), 573-603.
- Moussu, L. (2002). *English as a second language students' reactions to nonnative English-speaking teachers*. Master's thesis: Brigham Young University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 468 879.)

- Moussu, L. (2006). *Native and non-native English-speaking English as a second language teachers: Student attitudes, teacher self-perception, and intensive English program administrator beliefs and practices*. Doctoral dissertation: Purdue University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 492 599.)
- Moussu, L., & Braine, G. (2006). The attitudes of ESL students towards nonnative English language teachers. *TESOL Reporter*, 39(1), 33-47.
- Moussu, L., & Llurda, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Lang. Teach*, 41(3), 315-348.
- Mufwene, S. S. (2002). Colonization, globalization, and the future of languages in the twenty-first century. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 4(2), 1-47.
- Muncey, T. (2010). *Creating autoethnographies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nayar, P. B. (1994). Whose English is it? *TESL-EJ*, 1(1). Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume1/ej01/ej01f1/>
- Nelson, C., Treichler, P. A., & Grossberg, L. (1992). Cultural Studies: An introduction. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, & P. A. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural studies* (pp. 1-16). New York: Routledge.
- Nemtchinova, E. (2005). Host teachers' evaluation of nonnative-English-speaking teacher trainees: A perspective from the classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(2), 235-262.
- Ng, R. (1994). Sexism and racism in the university: Analyzing a personal experience. *Canadian Woman Studies*, 14(2), 41-46.

- Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 409-429.
- Nunan, D., & Choi, J. (2010). Language, culture, and identity: Framing the issues. In D. Nunan, & J. Choi (Eds.), *Language and culture: Reflective narratives and the emergence of identity* (pp. 1-13). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (2010). *Education at a glance 2010*. Paris, France: Author.
- Pacek, D. (2005). "Personality not nationality": Foreign students' perceptions of a non-native speaker lecturer of English at British university. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 243-262). New York: Springer.
- Paikeday, T. M. (1985). *The native speaker is dead!* Toronto and New York: Paikeday Publishing Inc.
- Parker, L., & Lynn, M. (2002). What's race got to do with it? Critical race theory's conflicts with and connections to qualitative research methodology and epistemology. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 7-22.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographic narrative as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(2), 163-188.
- Paul, A. M. (1998). Where bias begins: The truth about stereotypes. *Psychology Today*, 52-56.

- Pease-Alvarez, L., & Schechter, S. R. (2005). Preface. In L. Pease-Alvarez, & S. R. Schechter (Eds.), *Learning, teaching, and community: Contributions of situated and participatory approaches to educational innovation* (pp. xv-xix). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.
- Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pennycook, A. (2003). Beyond homogeneity and heterogeneity: English as a global and worldly language. In C. Mair (Ed.), *The politics of English as a world language: New horizons in postcolonial cultural studies* (pp. 3-17). New York, NY: Rodopi.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). English and globalization. In J. Maybin, & J. Swann (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to English language studies* (pp. 113-121). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1996). English only worldwide or language ecology? *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 429-452.
- Phillipson, R. (2000). English in the new world order: Variations on a theme of linguistic imperialism and “world” English. In R. Thomos (Ed.), *Ideology*,

- politics and language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 87-108). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Piller, I., & Takahashi, K. (2006). A passion for English: Desire and the language market. In A. Pavlenko (Ed.), *Bilingual minds: Emotional experience, expression and representation* (pp. 59-83). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Platt, J, Weber, H, & Ho, . L. (1984). *The new Englishes*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Quirk, R. (1985). The English language in a global context. In R. Quirk, & H. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literature* (pp. 1-6). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, R. (1990). Language varieties and standard English. *English Today* 21, 3-10.
- Ragin, C. C. (1987). *The comparative method: Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rajagopalan, K. (2002). National language as flags of allegiance; or the linguistics that failed us: A close look at emerging linguistic chauvinism in Brazil. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 1, 115-147.
- Rajagopalan, K. (2005). Non-native speaker teachers of English and their anxieties: Ingredients for an experiment in action research. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 283-303). New York, NY: Springer.

- Rampton, M. B. H. (1990). *Displacing the "native speaker": Expertise, affiliation, and inherence*. *ELT Journal*, 44(2), 97-101.
- Razack, S. H. (2002). When place becomes race. In S. H. Razack (Ed.), *Race, space, and the law: Unmapping a white settler society* (pp. 1-20). Toronto, ON: Between the Lines.
- Reves, T., & Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teacher's self-image: An international survey. *System*, 22(3), 353-367.
- Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. Harlow: Longman.
- Richardson, J., McBey, K., & McKenna, S. (2009). Internationalizing Canada's universities: Where do international faculty fit in? In R. D. Trilokekar, G. A. Jones, & A. Shubert (Eds.), *Canada universities go global* (pp. 277-296). Toronto, ON: James Lorimer & Company Ltd.
- Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time—space and homogeneity—heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25-44). London: Sage.
- Rockhill, K., & Tomic, P. (1995). Situating ESL between speech and silence. In J. Gaskell, & J. Willinsky (Eds.), *Gender informs curriculum: From enrichment to transformation* (pp. 209-229). New York: Teacher College Press.
- Roithmary, D. (1999). Introduction to critical race theory in educational research and praxis. In L. Parker, D. Deyhle, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Race is...race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education* (pp. 1-6). Boulder:

Westview Press.

Rubdy, R., & Saraceni, M. (2006). An interview with Canagarajah. In R. Rubdy, & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 200-211). New York: Continuum.

Rumbley, L., Altbach, P., & Reisberg, L. (2012). Internationalization within the higher education context. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Heyly, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of international education* (pp. 3-26). California: Sage.

Samimy, K. K., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (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* (pp.127-143). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Saraceni, M. (2009). Relocating English: Towards a new paradigm for English in the world. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 9(3), 175-186.

Sawir, E., Marginson, S., Deumert, A., Nyland, C., & Ramia, G. (2008). Loneliness and international students: An Australian study. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 12(2), 148-180.

Schechter, S. R. (1980) Teaching EFL in a unilingual Quebec. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 36(2), 201-214.

Schechter, S. R., & Bayley, R. (2002). *Language as cultural practice: Mexicanos en el norte*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schechter, S. R., & Cummins, J. (2003). Preface: Situating learning in home, school,

- and community. In S. R. Schecter, & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Multilingual education in practice: Using diversity as a resource* (pp. ix-xi). Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Schecter, R. S., & Ippolito, J. (2008). Parent involvement as education: Activist research in multilingual and multicultural urban school. *Journal of Curriculum and pedagogy*, 5(1), 163-183.
- Schecter, R. S., & Sherri, D. L. (2008). Value added? Teachers' investments in and orientations toward parent involvement in education. *Urban Education*, 44(1), 59-87.
- Schecter, S. R., Parejo, I. G., Ambadiang, T., & James, C. (2014). Schooling transnational speakers of the societal language: Language variation policy-making in Madrid and Toronto. *Language Policy*, 13, 121-144.
- Schecter, S. R. (2015). Language, culture, and identity. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and culture* (pp. 196-208). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schick, C. (2002). Keeping the ivory tower white: Discourse of racial domination. In S. H. Razack (Ed.), *Race, space, and the law: Unmapping a white settler society* (pp. 99-119). Toronto, ON: Between the Lines.
- Seidlhofer, B. (1999). Double standards: Teacher education in the expanding circle. *World Englishes*, 18(2), 233-245.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistic*, 11(2),

133-158.

- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Seargeant, P. (2012). The politics and politics of global English. In A. Hewings, & C. Tagg (Eds.), *The politics of English: Conflict, competition, co-existence* (pp. 1-32). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Shannon, S. M. (1995). The hegemony of English: A case study of one bilingual classroom as a site of resistance. *Linguistics and Education*, 7, 175-200.
- Shaw, W. D. (1981). Asian student attitudes toward English. In L. E. Smith (Ed), *English for cross-cultural communication* (pp.108-122). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Sherman, R. R. & Webb, R. B. (Eds.). (1988). *Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Shubert, A., Jones, G. A., & Trilokekar, R. D. (2009). Introduction. In R. D. Trilokekar, G. A. Jones, & A. Shubert (Eds.), *Canada universities go global* (pp. 7-15). Toronto, ON: James Lorimer & Company Ltd.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1998). Human rights and language wrongs — a future for diversity? *Language Sciences*, 20, 5-28.
- Solorzano, D. G. (1997). Images and words that wound: Critical race theory, racial stereotyping, and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, summer,

1997, 5-19.

- Solorzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2001). From racial stereotyping and deficit discourse toward a critical race theory in teacher education. *Multicultural Education, 9*(1), 2-8
- Steinman, L. (2009a). Contrastive rhetoric and university classroom. In R. D. Trilokekar, G. A. Jones, & A. Shubert (Eds.), *Canada universities go global* (pp. 154-167). Toronto, ON: James Lorimer & Company Ltd.
- Steinman, L. (2009b). Academic writing and the international imperative. *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching, 2*, 33-39.
- Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. O. D. (2016). Cash, competition, or charity: International students and global imaginary. *High Educ, 72*, 225-239.
- Stovall, D. (2006). From community in race and class: Critical race theory and the quest for social justice in education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 9*(3), 243-259.
- Stevens, P. (1992a). Foreword to the second edition. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across culture* (2nd ed.). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Stevens, P. (1992b). English as an international language: Directions in the 1990s. In B. B. Kachru (Ed), *The other tongue: English across culture* (2nd ed.) (pp. 27-47). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Swartz, D. (1997). *Culture and power: The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Tagg, C. (2012). Ideologies of English. In A. Hewings, & C. Tagg (Eds.), *The politics of English: Conflict, competition, co-existence* (pp. 297-338). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tang, C. (1997). The identity of the nonnative ESL teacher: On the power and status of nonnative ESL teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 577-580.
- Tan, J., & Allan, C. (2010). Student voices, internationalization and critical conversations in initial teacher education. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Internationalization and the student voice: Higher education perspectives* (pp. 44-52). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Taylor, D. M. (1981). Stereotypes and intergroup relations. In R. Gardner & R. Kalin (Eds.), *A Canadian social psychology of ethnic relations* (pp. 151-171). Toronto, ON: Methuen.
- Taylor, E. (2000). Critical race theory and interest convergence in the backlash against affirmative action: Washington state and initiative 200. *Teacher College Record*, 102(3), 539-560.
- Tedlock, B. (2009). Writing a storied life: Nomadism and double consciousness in transcultural ethnography. *Etnofoor*, 21(1), 21-38.
- Tedlock, B. (2011). Braiding narrative ethnography with memoir and creative nonfiction. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (4rd ed.) (pp. 311-339). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada*. Toronto, ON: Toronto University Press.

- Thom, V. (2010). Mutual cultures: Engaging with interculturalism in higher education. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Internationalization and the student voice: Higher education perspectives* (pp. 155-165). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Thomas, J. (1999). Voices from the periphery: Non-native teachers and issues of credibility. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp.5-13). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tierney, S. (Ed.). (2007). *Multiculturalism and the Canadian constitution*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Tollefson, J. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community*. London: Longman.
- Trahar, S. (2010). Has anybody seen a swan? Stories from the international classroom. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Internationalization and the student voice: Higher education perspectives* (pp. 143-154). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Trevino, A. J., Harris, M. A., & Wallace, D. (2008). What's so critical about critical race theory? *Contemporary Justice Review: Issues in Criminal, Social, and Restorative Justice*, 11(1), 7-10.
- Trilokekar, R. D. (2009). The department of foreign affairs and international trade (DFAIT), Canada: Providing leadership in the internationalization of Canadian higher education? In R. D. Trilokekar, G. A. Jones, & A. Shubert (Eds.), *Canada universities go global* (pp. 98-118). Toronto, ON: James Lorimer & Company Ltd.
- Trudgill, P. (1995). Linguistic oppression and the non-native speaker. *Journal of*

- Pragmatics*, 24(3), 314-317.
- Trudgill, P. (1999). Standard English: What it isn't. In T. Bex, & R. J. Watts (Eds.), *Standard English: The widening debate* (pp. 117-128). London: Routledge.
- Turner, C. S. V., & Myers, S. L., Jr. (1999). *Faculty of color in Academe: Bittersweet success*. Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.
- Verghese, A. (1997). The cowpath to America. *The New Yorker*, 70-88.
- Vertovec, S., & Cohen, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context, and practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walelign, A. (1986). Non-native speakers need not apply. *English Teaching Forum*, 24(2), 40-41.
- Whyte, W. (1943). *Street Corner Society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377-381.
- Wong, I. F. H. (1981). English in Malaysia. In L. E. Smith (Ed), *English for cross-cultural communication* (pp. 94-107). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Xing, M., Wang, J. H., & Spencer, K. (2008). Raising students' awareness of cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric in English writing via an E-learning course. *Language Learning and Technology*, 12(2), 71-93.
- Xuan, P. T. T. (2014). Speaking out or keeping silent: International students' identity as legitimate speakers and teachers of English. *TESOL in Context*, 24(1), 7-27.
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69-91.

- Zamel, V. (1995). Strangers in academia. *College Composition and Communication*, 46, 506-521.
- Zamel, V. (1998). Questioning academic discourse. In V. Zamel, & R. Spack (Eds.), *Negotiating academic literacies* (pp. 187-197). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Zong, L. (2007). Recent mainland Chinese immigrants and covert racism in Canada. In S. P. Hier, & B. S. Bolaria (Eds.), *Race & Racism in 21st-century Canada: Continuity, complexity, and change* (pp. 111-129). Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.
- Zong, L., & Perry, B. (2011). Chinese immigrants in Canada and social injustice: From overt to covert racial discrimination. In B. Perry (Ed.), *Diversity, Crime, and Justice in Canada* (pp. 106-124). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A

Interview Protocol

1. Background

a. What is your name?

b. How old are you?

c. What program are you in?

d. What is your native language?

Probe: Do you speak, read, and write your native language?

e. What other languages do you speak, read, and write?

f. Do you have brothers or sisters?

g. Where did you grow up?

Probe: Where are your parents now?

Are they still working or have retired?

h. How many years have you resided in Canada?

i. Are there others in your family who have gone to college?

Probe: Who? When? Where?

2. Motivation to Study at University

a. What are your life goals and career interests?

b. For non-native speakers of English: How do you see the role of the English language in your career goals and life aspirations?

Probe: What significance does English hold for you?

c. Why did you choose to study at York University in Canada?

d. What do your parents see you doing after you graduate?

e. Do you want to work in Canada, or in one of other western countries, or go back to your country of origin after graduation?

Probe: What do you think your need for English will be after you graduate and begin working?

3. Academic and Social Life

a. Do you have many friends in Toronto? Who are they?

- b. Do you hang out more with Canadian friends, or international students, or people from your own culture?
- c. Do you like to participate in class discussions?
- d. Do you have any hobbies? What are they?
- e. What are the issues or challenges you encounter with your coursework? Be specific.

Probe: Do you have troubles understanding course texts?

Do you have troubles understanding what is expected in your assignments?

Do you have troubles understanding your lecturers/professors?

- f. What other challenges have you encountered at York?

Probe: Do you have any financial challenges?

How about social challenges?

4. Experiences at the Writing Center

- a. Why did you visit the Writing Center and what kinds of help were you looking for?
- b. What English skills do you deem as most important in helping you with your course assignments?
- c. What do you want to learn from your writing instructor?
- d. How has your time at the Writing Center helped you with your university work?
- e. What was the image you have had of a writing instructor before you first visited the Writing Center?
- f. Do you have both native and non-native English-speaking writing instructors?

Probe: What do you think of them?

Were they useful in helping you fulfill your assignment requirements?

Did you feel more comfortable to work with native or non-native English-speaking instructors?

- g. What are the advantages and disadvantages that you associate with native vs. non-native English-speaking writing instructors?
- h. What about me? What were your first impressions of me as an instructor when we first met?

Probe: Have your perceptions changed about me over time?

What are the changes?

What do you think explains the changes in your perceptions?

5. Coda

Is there anything that I have forgotten to ask that you think is important?

Appendix B

Informed Consent Form

Study name

“You don’t look like a professor”: Experiences of a non-native English-speaking instructor at a Canadian higher education writing center

Researchers

Researcher name	Xiangying Huo
Doctoral	Candidate
Graduate Program in	Education

Purpose of the research

The project focuses on the conversations between the instructor and university students in response to feedback and coaching on their course assignments as well as students’ concerns about the writing process. I examine strategies that are useful in developing students’ linguistic skills and enhancing their conceptual thinking. I also examine with enabling and constraining qualities associated with native and non-native English-speaking instructors.

What you will be asked to do in the research

Answer my interview questions within one hour and a half. The interview will be audio recorded. I will provide you with a draft of my interview questions and I will offer a 25-dollar gift certificate to you in appreciation of your participation.

Risks and discomforts

I do not foresee any risks or discomfort from your participation in the research.

Benefits of the research to you

I expect that your writing skills will be enhanced as a result of participation in this project.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in the study is completely voluntary and you may choose to stop participating at any time. Your decision not to volunteer will not influence the relationship you may have with the researchers or study staff or the nature of your relationship with York University either now, or in the future.

Withdrawal from the study: You can stop participating in the study at any time, for any reason, if you so decide. Your decision to stop participating, or to refuse to answer particular questions, will not affect your relationship with the researchers, York University, or any other group associated with this project. In the event you withdraw from the study, all associated data collected will be immediately destroyed wherever possible.

If you decide to stop participating, you will still receive the promised pay for agreeing to be in the project.

Confidentiality

All information you supply during the research will be held in confidence and unless you specifically agree, your name will not appear in any report or publication of the research. Handwritten and typed notes and electronic data (notes and audio recordings) saved on a password protected memory stick will be safely stored in a locked cabinet only I will have access to for seven years. Confidentiality will be provided to the fullest extent possible by law.

Questions about the research?

If you have questions about the research in general or about your role in this study, you should contact my supervisor Sandra R. Schecter: SSchecter@edu.yorku.ca. The graduate program office may also be contacted: 416-736-5018 or lgreco@edu.yorku.ca. This research has been reviewed and approved by the Human Participants Review Sub-Committee, York University's Ethics Review Board and conforms to the standards of the Canadian Tri-Council Research Ethics guidelines. If you have any questions about this process, or about your rights as a participant in the study, you may contact the Senior Manager and Policy Advisor for the Office of Research Ethics, 5th Floor, York Research Tower, York University, telephone 416-736-5914 or e-mail ore@yorku.ca

Legal Rights and Signatures:

I, _____, consent to participate in “‘You don’t look like a professor’: Experiences of a Non-Native Speaking Instructor at a Higher Education Writing Center” conducted by Xiangying Huo. I have understood the nature of this project and wish to participate. I am not waiving any of my legal rights by signing this form. My signature below indicates my consent

Signature _____
Participant

Date _____

Signature _____
Principal Investigator

Date _____

Optional: Additional consent:

I, _____, consent all my conversations with Xiangying Huo in participating her research “You don’t look like a professor’: Experiences of a non-native English-speaking instructor at a Canadian higher education writing center” to be audiotaped. I am not waiving any of my legal rights by signing this form. My signature below indicates my consent.

Signature _____

Participant

Date _____

Signature _____

Principal Investigator

Date _____