

Myths and Misconceptions about the Non-Native English speakers in TESOL (NNEST) Movement

Ali Fuad Selvi

Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus

Parallel to the growing recognition of the English as an international language, the fundamental premises of the TESOL discipline (e.g. the ownership of the language, native speakers as a goal and model of competence for learning and teaching, linguistic standards and language variety/ies to be taught, monolingual/monocultural approach to teaching) has undergone a serious challenge and reconceptualization for the past several decades. While this trend resulted in an unprecedented recognition of the issues surrounding non-native speakers in the field of TESOL, it also meant the emergence of a series unfounded ideas or false beliefs about the non-native speakers in TESOL (NNEST¹) movement. By discussing and problematizing these commonly held myths and misconceptions about the NNEST movement, the current paper aims to clarify a number of important issues and shed a light onto the past, present and future of the movement. Having a solid grasp of the movement in the context of global dynamics, changing times, and reconfigured fundamental premises of the discipline has a paramount importance for all stakeholders involved in TESOL who long for a professional milieu characterized by democracy, justice, equity and professionalism.

*“He drew a circle that shut me out-
Heretic, rebel, a thing to flout.
But love and I had the wit to win:
We drew a circle and took him in!”*

From the poem “Outwitted” by Edwin Markham

Today, the field of English language teaching is characterized by some unquestionable facts:

Characterized as the fastest growing language in the world (Mahboob, 2005), English is the

¹ Both “non-native speakers in TESOL” and “non-native English-speaking teachers” are denoted by the same acronym (i.e. NNEST) and used interchangeably throughout this article. However, readers should be reminded that the former subsumes the latter, and is more comprehensive in its scope as it encompasses professionals other than classroom teachers (e.g. teacher aides, teacher educators, researchers, professors, material writers, publishers, and administrators). In the same vein, the former denotation has been adopted as the title of the Interest Section in TESOL International Association.

world's first truly global language (Crystal, 2012), often referred to as a lingua franca (Seidlhofer, 2006), or the zeitgeist (Mauranen, 2012) in today's globalized world. Non-native speakers (NNSs) of English are estimated to outnumber their native speaker (NS) counterparts by three to one (Crystal, 2012), the ownership of English is shared by all its speakers, regardless of their 'nativeness' (Widdowson, 1994), and 80% of the English language teachers worldwide are considered to be NNESTs (Canagarajah, 2005). This portrayal has paved the way to the growing realization of issues related to non-native English-speaking professionals, and consequently resulted in skyrocketing of research efforts (books, journal articles, opinion pieces, presentations, workshops and colloquia in conferences, M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations), policy and advocacy initiatives (establishment of the NNEST Caucus, which later restructured as an Interest Section in TESOL International, NNEST-related entities in local TESOL affiliates, white papers and position statements), teaching activities (infusion of NNEST issues into teacher education curriculum through class discussions, activities and assignments), all delineating different facets of the issues surrounding NNESTs in TESOL (Braine, 2010).

This growing trend is now considered to be a movement (Braine, 2010; Mahboob, 2010) operationalized at several different levels: Theoretically, it builds a more inclusive intellectual space defined by a shift from the traditional monolingual, monocultural, native-speakerist approach to teaching, learning and teacher education in TESOL. Practically, it brings together and supports a wide spectrum of threads from research, teaching and advocacy realms together to promote and institutionalize discourses of multilingualism, multiethnicism, and multiculturalism. Professionally, it aims to redefine the fabric of the TESOL profession characterized by qualities such as democracy, justice, collaboration, equity, and professionalism.

Paradoxical it may seem, despite the fact that NNEST movement and literature have been receiving tremendous attention in the field, there is still a wide range of myths and misconceptions emerging about the movement. Using these emergent narrow conceptualizations about the scope, purpose and directions of the NNEST movement and its research and advocacy efforts as a point of departure, the present study aims to clarify a number of important issues and shed a light onto the past, present and future of the movement. Therefore, it rests upon the need that most basic assumptions about the NNEST movement and literature should be re-evaluated and re-negotiated *vis-à-vis* the current sociolinguistic and educational landscape of the English as an international language.

Departing from this realization, the current paper is organized in two main segments: The first segment presents an overview of the emergence of this relatively young area of inquiry with specific reference to its current discussions and future directions. In the second segment, myths and misconceptions about the NNEST literature will be unpacked, deconstructed and problematized with specific examples and implications. It is hoped that this paper will serve as an orientation for TESOLers who might be interested in learning more about the NNEST movement and literature, and generate a discussion platform for those who are interested in moving beyond these myths and misconceptions to embrace ethnic, racial, cultural, religious, and linguistic parameters and diversity in TESOL.

FROM THOUGHT TO MOVEMENT

Theoretical Underpinnings: Problematizing the NS Construct

The first steps that led to the emergence of the NNEST movement can be traced back to the problematization of the Chomskyan (1965, 1986) representation of the “idealized native

speaker-hearer,” a linguistic abstraction in theoretical linguistics whose manifestations affected TESOL profession (Jenkins, 2006; Y. Kachru, 2005) by means of cognitivism-oriented mainstream second language acquisition² (SLA) research. What lies at the heart of this term is the distinction between competence and performance, where the former is defined as the underlying cumulative system of rules governing knowledge whereas the latter is formulated as the actual manifestation of this knowledge by the speaker. This approach to competence as a rule-governed system unaffected by social and situational variations, the ideal and the absolute source of native-speaker intuitions, and constructing it as a psychological or mental property or function was criticized by many researchers (Lyons, 1996, as cited in Llorca, 2000).

The sphere of influence of the “idealized native speaker-hearer” notion transcended theoretical linguistics and penetrated into the mainstream SLA research through Selinker’s (1972) concepts of interlanguage (IL) and fossilization, both of which propagated the native speaker as the benchmark (see Kato, n.d., Llorca, 2005; Mahboob, 2010). He defines IL as the systematic and structurally intermediate knowledge or state between a learner’s L1 and L2, yet which is independent of both the learner’s L1 and the L2 (Selinker, 1972; Tarone, 2006). Fossilization, on the other hand, is defined as “the real phenomenon of the permanent non-learning of TL [target language] structures, of the cessation of IL learning (in most cases) far from expected TL norms” (Selinker, 1992, p. 225). Reading between the lines, Selinker’s concepts of IL and fossilization rest upon the tacit claims that (1) the default

² It needs to be acknowledged here that with the social turn in SLA, there has been a paradigm shift in the field of SLA, which resulted in stretching the traditional boundaries and parameters of the cognitivist-oriented mainstream SLA research. On one hand, this shift spearheaded a wider recognition of the contextual and interactional use of the language in the mainstream SLA research, on the other; it spurred a greater interest in alternative approaches to SLA such as sociocultural approach and conversation analysis. Interested readers may review Block (2003) for a more detailed discussion of the social turn in SLA, Firth and Wagner’s (1997) seminal work on the importance of contextual and interactional dimensions of language use, and Atkinson (2011) for a comprehensive survey of the alternative approaches to SLA.

starting point for L2 learning is their L1, (2) L2 learners are not able to achieve ‘native’ proficiency in L2, and therefore (3) the ultimate goal for L2 learning is to achieve ‘native-like’ proficiency in L2. Along the same lines, Long (1983) proposed Interaction Hypothesis, another pervasive paradigm of SLA which essentially further perpetuated the ongoing idealization of NS by placing a considerable emphasis on NSs. Long argued that “participation in conversation with NSs, made possible through the modification of interaction, is the necessary and sufficient condition for SLA” (Long, 1981, p. 275). Collectively, these paradigms are pushing the mainstream SLA towards monolingual bias (Cook, 1997; Y. Kachru, 1994), and utilization of methodological approaches conducive to comparing learner language with NS norms (e.g. grammaticality judgment tests, error analysis, etc.), a trend described as “comparative fallacy” by Bley-Vroman (1983). Therefore, it further intensifies the deficit discourse (Bhatt, 2002) since learner language is characterized as ‘deficient’ by definition (Kasper & Kellerman, 1997). In conclusion, the “idealized NS model” creates a monolingual bias in SLA theory that “elevates an idealized native speaker above a stereotypical ‘nonnative’ while viewing the latter as a defective communicator, limited by an underdeveloped communicative competence” (Firth & Wagner, 1997, p. 285).

Reconceptualizing the NS-NNS Dichotomy

Questioning the *de facto* authority and the prestige of the NS-as-the-target model for foreign/second language, several scholars attempted to reconceptualize ideologically-fused NS-NNS dichotomy. In his symbolically provocative and powerfully entitled *The native speaker is dead!*, Paikeday (1985) argued that “the native speaker exists only as a figment of linguist’s imagination” (p. 12) and proposed a more encompassing term “proficient user” of a language to refer to all speakers who can successfully use it. Along the same lines, Davies (1991) argued that “the native speaker is a fine myth: we need it as a model, a goal, almost an

inspiration; but it is useless as a measure; it will not help us define our goals” (p.157). In a similar vein, Swales (1993) concluded that “it no longer makes any sense to differentiate between the native speaker and the non-native speaker” (p. 284). However, “even though a dichotomy vision of the NS–NNS discussion does not appear to be linguistically acceptable, it happens to be nonetheless socially present, and therefore, potentially meaningful as an area of research in applied linguistics” (Moussu & Llorca, 2008, p. 316).

The TESOL Profession under the Influence of NS Model

By the time the term ‘native speaker’ arrived in circles of TESOL, it was already a loaded term, blended in issues of linguistics, race, ethnicity, and country of origin, among other issues. Mahboob (2010) acknowledges that these terms and conceptualizations represent “a hidden ideology that privileges the NS... [and] helped give authority to the NS model in SLA and, by extension, in language teaching models” (p. 3). Different facets of the TESOL profession (e.g. theory, research, publishing, instructional materials, assessment, teacher training and hiring practices) have traditionally been under the decisive and destructive influence of the NS construct (Braine, 2010; Canagarajah, 1999). Moussu and Llorca (2008) concluded that “even though a dichotomy vision of the NS–NNS discussion does not appear to be linguistically acceptable, it happens to be nonetheless socially present, and therefore, potentially meaningful as an area of research in applied linguistics” (p.316).

Highlighting the detrimental implications of the NS-model, Phillipson (1992) first used the term the “native speaker fallacy” to refer to unethical treatment of NNESTs by challenging the notion that NESTs make better teachers. Kachru (1992) takes the discussion one step further, and expands the boundaries of the fallacy to an extent which includes teachers, academic administrators and material developers who “provide a serious input in

the global teaching of English, in policy formulation, and in determining the channels for the spread of the language” (p. 359). Finally, Holliday (2005) argued that the field of TESOL has been under the dominance of “native speakerism”, “an established belief that native-speaker teachers represent a ‘Western culture’ from which springs the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology” (p. 6). The presence of native speakerism as the Damocles’s sword hanging over the TESOL profession and its members is detrimental at some many different levels: being the “bedrock of transnationalized ELT” (Leung, 2005, p. 128), leading to ‘unprofessional favoritism’ (Medgyes, 2001) and thus, frequently result in hiring discrimination (Clark & Paran, 2007; Flynn & Gulikers, 2001; Mahboob & Golden, 2013; Selvi, 2010), and diminishing job prospects of NNESTs in ESL settings (Braine, 1999; Mahboob, Uhrig, Newman, & Hartford, 2004). Most importantly, it generates the “I-am-not-a-native-speaker syndrome” (Suarez, 2000) or “the impostor syndrome” (Bernat, 2009), which probably has catastrophic effects on their teacher persona, self-esteem, and thus, on their in-class performance. As a result, some NNESTs may question their professional qualifications, inadvertently subscribe to a deficit model and even feel that they are not respected by their colleagues, students and administrators (Amin, 1997; Liu, 1999).

The expanded fallacy has spurred the interest in reconceptualization of the native speaker construct in applied linguistics. For instance, Kramersch (1997) argued that native speakership is neither a privilege of birth nor of education but “acceptance by the group that created the distinction between native and non-native speakers” (p. 363). The dichotomy of (in)competence results in defining the non-native speaker (NNS) as a deficient or as less-than-a-native (“near-native”, Valdes, 1998). As a result, several scholars offered alternatives to move beyond the perennial nomenclature of NS such as ‘language expert’ (Rampton,

1990), ‘English-using fellowships’ (Kachru, 1992), ‘multicompetent speaker’ (Cook, 1999), and ‘competent language user’ (Lee, 2005). Later on, this trend was echoed for the non-native construct. Analyzing the listserv discussions on the appropriate alternative of the term on NNEST, Brady (2009) compiled such alternatives as ‘Anglophone teachers of English’, ‘BEST (Bilingual English-Speaking Teacher)’, ‘legitimate teacher of English (adapted from legitimate user of English)’, ‘transnational English teacher’ (Menard-Warwick, 2008), ‘translinguistic/transcultural English teachers’ (Motha, Jain & Teclé, 2012), MEST – ‘Multilingual/Multicultural English-Speaking Teachers’, and ‘DEST – Diverse English-Speaking Teachers’.

In conclusion, the operation of the TESOL enterprise has historically been under the influence of White, modernist, male-oriented, Western, value-laden, discourses of TESOL. However, thanks to the critical approaches in TESOL and applied linguistics, and the transformative nature of the NNEST movement, the diverse uses and users of Englishes (World Englishes), the reconceptualization of English as an international language (EIL) and English as a lingua franca (ELF) have been widely embraced. Consequently, today the foundational principles of the TESOL³ have been re-assessed, re-defined, and re-envisioned (Burns, 2005; Matsuda, 2012; McKay, 2002; Selvi & Yazan, 2013).

The Birth and Rise of the NNEST Movement

From a more practical standpoint, the emergence of a new paradigm in circles of TESOL necessitated the establishment of institutionalized structures and responses with a

³ As a pedagogical response to the changing landscape of the TESOL profession, McKay (2002) argues that “the teaching and learning of an international language must be based on an entirely different set of assumptions than the teaching and learning of any other second and foreign language” (p. 1). Resting upon this simple yet profound statement, scholars generate a series of questions about the foundational pillars of the TESOL profession: Whose language are we now talking about? Which speakers are we modeling our instruction upon? Which language variety/ies should we be teaching to our learners? Which teachers are qualified to teach the English language? Which approaches are the best in teaching?

transformative motive (including awareness, advocacy and activism, Selvi, 2009). In order to sustain and increase the momentum of this trend, a group of scholars including George Braine (chair), Jun Liu (chair-elect), Lia Kamhi-Stein (newsletter editor), and Aya Matsuda (webmaster) established the NNEST Caucus in TESOL International Association in 1998, which later transformed itself into an Interest Section status in 2008. The foundational motivation of the NNEST Caucus/Interest Section is to (1) create a nondiscriminatory professional environment for all TESOL members regardless of native language and place of birth, (2) encourage the formal and informal gatherings of NNS at TESOL and affiliate conferences, (3) encourage research and publications on the role of nonnative speaker teachers in ESL and EFL contexts, and (4) promote the role of nonnative speaker members in TESOL and affiliate leadership positions. The establishment of an NNEST-related entity was echoed in local TESOL affiliates through the foundation of the WATESOL's (Washington Area TESOL) NNEST Caucus, and CATESOL (California TESOL) NNLEI – Non-native Language Educators Interest Group.

A highly important milestone in this process was a series of institutionalized responses against the unfair treatment of the non-native English-speaking professionals in the TESOL profession. TESOL International Association, the world's biggest international organization for English language teachers to speakers of other languages (with more than 12,000 members in more than 100 international affiliates), passed two resolutions entitled "A TESOL Statement on Nonnative Speakers of English and Hiring Practices" (TESOL, 1992), and "Position Statement against Discrimination of Nonnative Speakers of English in the Field of TESOL" (TESOL, 2006). Following the traces of professionalism, South-East Asian countries agreed to establish "Centers for English Language Training" in 2005 (Graddol, 2006). More recently, CATESOL (California TESOL Affiliate) issued a white

paper opposing the discrimination against NNESTs and teachers with “non-standard” varieties of English (CATESOL, 2013). Despite these institutionalized initiatives and responses, discriminatory hiring and workplace practices continue to exist across the world, which highlights not only the sustainability of the NNEST movement but also necessitates the diversification of trajectories towards a more democratic, participatory, professional and egalitarian future for the TESOL profession.

COMMON MYTHS AND MISCONCEPTIONS

While this transformative trend resulted in an unprecedented recognition of the issues surrounding non-native speakers in the field of TESOL, it also meant emergence of a series unfounded ideas or false beliefs about the NNEST movement. Thus, in this segment of the paper, I intend to discuss and problematize these commonly held myths and misconceptions about the NNEST movement, and clarify a number of important issues related to the past, present and future of the movement.

Myth 1 – NNEST movement is for NNESTs (‘I am a NS, and I do not belong here!’)

As part of the TESOL Convention, Interest Sections (ISs) are provided individual time and space during the Convention, during which they set up their individual booths to interact with TESOLers about the roles and activities of their ISs. In the 2013 Convention in Dallas, I was responsible for organizing the booth for the NNEST IS and used an idea pad to attract the visitors’ attention: On a white board, I placed two questions: (1) How do you envision the future of TESOL? (2) What can NNEST IS do about it?, and asked visitors to use sticky notes, and board markers to write down their responses. Below was a conversation between a TESOLer and myself:

TESOLer: (looking at the idea pad)

Ali Fuad: Would you like to write something down to our idea pad about the future of our profession and what we can do about it?

TESOLer: No thanks, I am a native speaker!

Ali Fuad: But the future belongs to all of us, right?

TESOLer: (Walks away with a smile in her face).

My professional roles and responsibilities as a teacher educator and the former chair of the WATESOL NNEST Caucus and the current chair of the NNEST IS in TESOL International Association entail meeting and interacting with (both face-to-face and online) TESOLers from diverse backgrounds. Often times, graduate students and colleagues who describe themselves as native speakers often approach me with a supportive attitude of the awareness, advocacy and activism generated through our collective efforts. However, they may not be informed about the all-inclusive nature of the NNEST movement. Thus, they sometimes raise questions such as “I am a NS, can I join?” or offer their support followed up by comments like “...but this comes from a native speaker”. Online discussions on listservs and social media platforms reflect a similar hesitant attitude of self-described NSs, who may refrain from making comments, taking volunteer roles or even participating in related activities for the same purpose: being a NS. Part of the misconception may stem from the fact that the movement as well as the entities in local TESOL affiliates uses the term NNEST (see Myth #6). This may inadvertently signal that the NNEST movement is stuck between being an exclusive NNEST club and preaching to the choir.

It should be noted that the TESOL profession has long suffered from subscribing to the dominant ‘either/or discourse’ (i.e. NEST or NNEST). Therefore, one of the overarching aims of the NNEST movement is to establish a more encompassing ‘both/and discourse’ (i.e. NEST and NNEST) (Selvi, 2011). While it should be acknowledged that raising awareness, engaging in advocacy, and demonstrating activism about the issues related to NNESTs have been among integral motivations of the NNEST movement (Selvi, 2009), its broadening scope encompasses the establishment of co-operation, collaboration, and legitimate participation for a more participatory future of our profession. This understanding enables cooperation and collaboration that can foster more educationally, contextually, and socially appropriate English language learning opportunities (Mahboob, 2010) through English language learners will gain a wider sociolinguistic and intercultural repertoire (McKay, 2002). Consequently, it lends further support to the establishment of a professional milieu that ‘welcome[s] ethnic, racial, cultural, religious, and linguistic diversity’ (Selvi, 2009, p. 51).

Myth 2 – Native speakers are from Venus, non-native speakers from Mars. (‘We are two different species’⁴)

While the critical approaches to TESOL has been around for several decades, the emergence of the studies within the context of TESOL with specific emphasis on issues related to NESTs and NNESTs dates back to the pioneering work of Péter Medgyes (1992, 1994). In his early work, Medgyes’s scholarship focused on the idea that both NS and NNS of English could be and become successful teachers. However, Medgyes (1992) argued that

⁴ While Cook (1999) and others argue that there is a “qualitative difference” between the cognitive processing and language competence of monolingual and bilingual speakers, and NNESTs are, by proxy, are (at least) bilingual speakers, using this perspective to support a “different species” argument would not only be narrow way to approach the term NEST but also be unfair to bilingual/multilingual NEST colleagues.

each group is equipped with a distinct set of characteristics since “NESTs and non-NESTs use English differently and, therefore, teach English differently” (p. 346). In other words, many of the differences in teaching practices between NESTs and NNESTs can be attributed to the discrepancy in language proficiency (Medgyes, 1999). Medgyes (1994) lists 6 unique assets that NNESTs have and that NESTs cannot offer:

1. Only NNESTs can serve as imitable models of the successful learner of English.
2. NNESTs can teach learning strategies more effectively.
3. NNESTs can provide learners with more information about the English language.
4. NNESTs are more able to anticipate language difficulties.
5. NNESTs can be more empathetic to the needs and problems of their learners.
6. Only NNESTs can benefit from sharing the learners' mother tongue.

While Medgyes’s efforts spurred a great interest in the circles of TESOL and pushed the field towards taking a more critical stance towards the contested concepts of NEST/NNEST, it needs to be acknowledged that his aforementioned characterization is an inadvertent byproduct of the pervasive dichotomy that he has been working against. While he may have been genuinely interested in foregrounding the professional values that NESTs and NNESTs bring to the teaching situation, he becomes a victim of the false dichotomy. Despite his warnings that this false dichotomy “may be conducive to forming wrong judgments about the differences” (Medgyes, 1992, p. 347) between NNESTs and NESTs, in another paper, Reves and Medgyes (1994) characterized NNESTs with “language deficiencies”:

Because of their relative English language *deficiencies*, non-NESTs are in a difficult situation: *by definition they are not on a par* with NESTs in terms of language proficiency. Their *deficit* is greater if they work in *less privileged teaching situations, cut off from NESTs or any native speakers*. (p. 364) [emphasis added]

As Mahboob (2005) contends, this shows that they “not only buy in to the ‘comparative fallacy’, but they also believe that NESTs provide a better teaching and learning model and the NNESTs may not perform well if they are not in contact with NESTs.” (p. 72). This approach is in line with the view that NESTs and NNESTs were categorically considered “two different species” (Medgyes, 1994), and NNESTs are believed to be in a constant struggle with their own language deficiencies (Medgyes, 1986) and therefore need to adopt the teaching practices and methods of NESTs (Sheorey, 1986).

This view resonates with typical forms of division of labor in many institutions: NNESTs are designated teachers for reading and grammar whereas NESTs are reserved for the teaching of speaking, listening and writing skills. NNESTs are considered to be ‘insiders’ with absolute authority on the local, whereas NESTs are always ‘outsiders’ and will remain so for the rest of their professional lives. While these scenarios may not necessarily be fully representative of the diversity in workforce designation in many educational institutions, the existence of such or similar patterns is quite significant in attesting and perpetuating the divide between NESTs/NNESTs. More importantly, these constructs are positioned in such a fixed, rigid and mutually exclusive manner that leave no room for contextualized negotiations of borders of linguistic, cultural and professional identity. As a result, these oversimplified and essentialized categories become regimes of truth defining what a teacher can and should do (i.e. professional legitimacy) without any consideration of their

professional histories and/or negotiations of their professional identities (Menard-Warwick, 2008; Park, 2008, 2012; Rudolph, 2012). Thus, the next generation of studies propagating moving beyond the NS-model is expected to embrace teachers' sociohistorically-situated negotiations of translinguistic and transcultural identity in their quest of negotiating, challenging, reconceptualizing and crossing borders in glocalized representations of TESOL (Rudolph, 2012).

Myth 3 – NESTs are better teachers than NNESTs (or NNESTs are better teachers than NESTs)

With the emergence of the scholarship on NNEST as a *bona fide* area of inquiry as an extension of the professional movement in TESOL, researchers examined different facets of the issues pertinent NESTs and NNESTs. In their quest of unpacking the notion of “legitimacy”, a considerable emphasis was placed on teacher, student and administrators’ perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs (D. Liu, 1999; Llorca & Huguet, 2003; Mahboob, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2010; Medgyes, 1992, 1994; Moussu, 2006; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). Below you can find a compilation of the literature on the advantages of NESTs and NNESTs.

Table 1. Advantages of NESTs and NNESTs – A compilation of the literature⁵

Advantages of NESTs	Advantages of NNESTs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedural knowledge (Lasagabaster & Manuel-Sierra, 2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declarative knowledge (Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Medgyes, 1994)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facility with the teaching of vocabulary and knowledge of idioms, colloquialisms and slang (Lasagabaster & Manuel-Sierra, 2005, Reves & Medgyes, 1994). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful in identifying areas of potential difficulty; thus fostering a better teacher-student rapport (Braine, 2004; Ellis, 2002; Maum, 2002; McNeill, 2005)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaks English clearly & fluently and possess “the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share and use students’ L1 (Mahboob, 2004;

⁵ It should be acknowledged upfront that the literature is not conclusive about the advantages and challenges of these teacher populations, and thus it should not be surprising to find counter-evidence in the literature. While readers are advised to treat the table for summary purposes, they should be reminded that these constructs are often quite complex, messy, and socially-situated.

original English accent” (Lasagabaster & Manuel-Sierra, 2005)	Medgyes, 1994; Tatar & Yildiz, 2010)
• Thorough understanding of the English language and culture	• Teach reading and grammar more effectively (Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Mahboob, 2004; McNeill, 2005; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999)
• Teaching listening and speaking, and interaction in class (Pacek, 2005)	• Provide appropriate learning strategies (Lasagabaster & Manuel-Sierra, 2005; Mahboob, 2004)
• No apparent language difficulties (Reve & Medgyes, 1994)	• Provide a thorough exam preparation (Benke & Medgyes 2005; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999)
• Provide linguistic authenticity (Barratt & Kontra, 2000) and ‘real language’ (Medgyes, 1994)	• Able to make cross-linguistic and cross-cultural comparisons and contrasts thanks to their multilingual and multicultural experience (Ding, 2000; Hansen, 2004; Liu, 2001).
• More relaxed attitudes towards grading and error correction (Barratt & Kontra, 2000)	• Empathize with the learner since they are L2 learners (McNeill, 2005; Tatar & Yildiz, 2010)
• Not relying heavily on the course book (Benke & Medgyes, 2005)	• Willingness to work hard (Mahboob, 2004)

Despite the fact that Medgyes (1992) argued that the question of “Who’s worth more, the native or the non-native?” is pointless” (p. 440), the traditional asymmetrical power relations between NESTs and NNESTs and the employment landscape suffering from the discriminatory workplace and hiring practices are bitter manifestations of the unspoken premise that NESTs are better teachers than NNESTs. The exponential growth of the research endeavors as part of the NNEST movement placed a considerable emphasis on the advantages and challenges faced by these populations. Although there might be some inherent benefit in focusing on these matters (e.g. construing the legitimacy, making a better case for collaboration, etc.), it may inadvertently lead us to generalize what a teacher can or should do. In other words, using a causal relationship between these titles and the associated teacher skills and competencies would essentialize the NEST and NNEST constructs, and thereby bolster the existing dichotomy between NESTs and NNESTs. To be more specific, associating teaching practices and competencies with contested and isolated concepts such as

NEST or NNEST would be reductionist and simplistic ways to construe teaching competencies with little or no consideration of the situated, historical, glocal and transformative facets of their identities. As a result, this may result in broadening the divide, making the professional borders even more salient. Also, it may prevent teachers from crossing these borders since certain skills and practices are exclusively associated with certain groups.

Instead of juxtaposing teaching practices in relation to these contested terms, we could acknowledge that perhaps “which one is better?” is not the most useful question to pose and devote our time and energy to spend on skills and competencies necessary for a glocalized approach to teaching in such a way to conducive to the negotiations of teachers’ professional identities. We problematize the NS fallacy due to its “automatic extrapolation from competent speaker to competent teacher based on linguistic grounds alone” (Seidlhofer, 1999, p. 236). However, we should not fall to the trap of NNS fallacy, an automatic extrapolation from competent learner to competent teacher based on language learning histories alone. In other words, while one side of the debate argues that “people do not become qualified to teach English merely because it is their mother tongue” (Maum, 2002, p. 1), the other should also argue that people do not become qualified to teach English merely because it is their second language.

Myth 4 – Learners prefer NESTs over NNESTs (Supply-demand debate)

One of the most common reasons used as a ‘justification’ for the NEST/NNEST discrimination in the field of TESOL is that students, in general, tend to prefer NESTs over NNESTs. While this supply-demand approach to the TESOL enterprise is criticized for being a manifestation of a business approach in the age of neoliberal, it may not be far from

reality. Both anecdotal and empirical evidence (Lasagabaster & Manuel-Sierra, 2005, Pacek, 2005) provide accounts that language learners may have tendency towards NESTs⁶. Often times, the typical justification would be that “while it seems more acceptable for students to have a NNEST in their home country, when they go abroad they expect to be taught by NSs” (Pacek, 2005, p. 260). Other scholarship examined the experiences of NNESTs when they return to their home country and seek employment. All types of evidence suggests that 1.5 or 2nd generation immigrants with ‘native’-level proficiency in English may receive unfavorable attitudes by students (Hsu, 2005 as cited in Braine, 2010; Shao, 2005), a finding which testaments that the NS construct is not only related to language but also to the race and appearance.

Leaving the discussion here and not presenting counter-evidence that problematize, if not completely dispel, this myth would be unfair in depicting a comprehensive picture of the “preference” debate. The scholarship generated as part of the NNEST movement provided numerous accounts to contradict this standpoint (Mahboob, 2003, 2004; Moussu, 2002, 2006; Mullock, 2010). In several studies, students demonstrated no clear preference of NESTs over NNEST, however highlighted the salient characteristics that every teacher should have: strong pedagogical skills and high levels of declarative and procedural knowledge of English language (Mullock, 2010), the importance of clear pronunciation and/or accent (Kelch & Santana-Willamson 2002, Liang, 2002). Other researchers examined the influence of time in students’ attitudes. Cheung (2002) identified that positive attitude

⁶ Critical readers may rightfully question this line of research by problematizing the students’ perceptions and definitions of NS and NNS. Anecdotal evidence suggests that some employers recruit Caucasians (Germans, Russians, or Swedes) or Africans with an intention invoke the NS stereotypes of the students and their parents. The multifaceted, complex and messy nature of the NS/NNS constructs as well as narrow conceptualization in the minds of students and their parents may bring lucrative benefits to these employers.

towards NNESTs tend to increase with longer stay at an educational institution. In the same vein, Moussu (2006) found out students who were taught by NNESTs displayed a growing positive attitude towards their teachers at the end of the semester. Moussu also found out that students at a higher level of English proficiency showed a more positive attitude towards NNESTs. Another group of researchers emphasized the combination of both NESTs and NNESTs. For example, respondents in Lasagabaster and Manuel-Sierra's (2005) study called for a combination of NNESTs (at lower educational levels) and NESTs (at higher educational levels). This finding was further corroborated by Benke and Medgyes (2005) in the Hungarian context. Along the same lines, Lipovsky & Mahboob (2010) argued that students do not necessarily prefer being taught by NESTs or NNESTs but rather value the combination of their qualities. In conclusion, it would be fair to argue that "students do not necessarily buy into the 'native speaker fallacy'" (Mahboob, 2005, p. 66) since they often do not have a clear preference for either NESTs or NNESTs (Mahboob, 2005).

Myth 4 – Why NNEST movement? The field of TESOL is discrimination-free

Well, it is not! The field of TESOL is not discrimination-free. Unfortunately, constructs such as nativeness, accent, race, gender, religion, country of origin/schooling, age, sexual orientation, physical appearance or even the passport you carry (or a combination of these constructs) may be blatant or subtle ways TESOLers are treated in their workplace or in the hiring processes. Despite fact that the notion of discrimination is a multifaceted phenomenon, it would not be far-fetched to argue that NNESTs suffer the most from such practices due to native speakerism (Holliday, 2005) and native speaker fallacy (Phillipson, 1992).

Program administrators and other gatekeeping stakeholders unfortunately often accept and operate under the native speakerism/native speaker fallacy paradigm, which, by definition, categorizes NNESTs to be less instructionally qualified and less linguistically competent than their NEST counterparts. (Lippi-Green, 1997; Maum, 2002). The market value of native speakerism in TESOL also manifests itself in the discriminatory job advertisements (Clark & Paran, 2007; Mahboob & Golden, 2013; Selvi, 2010). If and when necessary, these stakeholders play the supply-demand card to justify their discriminatory practices: They argue that it is the students who prefer to be taught by a NEST (Mahboob, Uhrig, Newman, & Hartford, 2004; Medgyes, 1994). Sometimes, this favoritism goes to so extreme levels even NESTs from non-Center countries like India and Singapore are often perceived as less credible and competent than their counterparts from the Center, which “legitimize[s] this dominance of Center professionals/scholars” (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 85). Ironically, NNESTs who return to their home countries after obtaining degrees, experience and qualifications in the West may not always be able to find jobs (Hsu, 2005 as cited in Braine, 2010; Shao, 2005) and find themselves competing with unqualified NSs.

The emergence of the NNEST movement generated a substantial intellectual leap forward and provided a more coherent and powerful response towards the understanding of teacher qualifications and credibility. Such efforts were backed up institutionalized responses towards hiring and workplace discrimination (TESOL, 1992, 2006). Nevertheless, as the past-president of TESOL, Deena Boraie (2013) argues, there is still a very long way to go in terms of having people “change their thinking and understanding” about what makes a good teacher. Whether characterized ‘Machiavellian’ (proselytizing existing prejudices by packaging native speakerism as a marketing tool to meet the needs of the ‘customer’) or ‘dramatic’ (become institutionalized routines in different contexts) (Selvi, 2010), the

discriminatory landscape in TESOL has been and is and will be a driving impetus for the NNEST movement.

Myth 5 – Nevertheless we need ‘NS’ as a benchmark to define our goals in TESOL

English is now the world’s international language. While this statement is neither new nor revolutionary, the interesting implications commence with the way interpret this understanding into our everyday practices as language teachers, teacher educators, assessment specialists and researchers. For some it may be one of the trending buzzwords of our times, for others it is the driving force of a paradigm shift in the teaching of English. It is the latter standpoint that shapes the roadmap for a pedagogy that is sensitive to diverse uses, users, functions and contexts of English (McKay, 2002, Matsuda, 2012; Selvi & Yazan, 2013). To put it differently and more eloquently, McKay (2002) argues that “the teaching and learning of an international language must be based on an entirely different set of assumptions than the teaching and learning of any other second and foreign language” (p. 1).

The transformation towards a language pedagogy conducive to present-day realities of the diversity, contexts, uses and users of the English language necessitates a critical interrogation of the idealized NS model that runs as a common thread through employment practices (Braine, 2010; Clark & Paran, 2007; Mahboob & Golden, 2013; Selvi, 2010), language assessment (Firth, 2009; Lowenberg, 2002), teacher education (Leung, 2005; Selvi, 2013) and linguistic and cultural targets for instruction (Canagarajah, 2007). Here I would like to utilize 3-level analysis of Smolder (2009) who argued how the subscription to the idealized NS benchmark⁷ can be impractical, inappropriate and unfair in many EIL teaching

⁷ Kachru (1994, 1995) noted other problematic myths besides the native speaker fallacy: (a) the “interlocutor myth,” i.e., that people learn English mainly to interact with native English speakers from Center countries; (b) the “monoculture myth,” i.e., that English-learning occurs primarily for the purpose of learning British or American culture; (c) the “model-dependency myth,” i.e., that American or British models are the ones that are

contexts.

To begin with, relying solely on NS norms is not a **practical** endeavor. As reviewed earlier in this paper, statistics describing the speakers of English(es) around the world attest to the reconceptualization of the ownership (Widdowson, 1994) of the English language. Seen in tandem with the understanding that a great majority of interaction is among NNSs (i.e. English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) situations), it basically posits a practical re-evaluation of deeply-ingrained NS-oriented attitudes, policies and practices in TESOL. More importantly, it serves as a rationale for a departure from introducing a single variety to a more glocal approach—exposing and embracing multiple varieties determined by learners’ contextualized needs and goals in learning the language. As an alternative to a standard variety in a decontextualized fashion, we might consider the centrality of such concepts as “intelligibility (recognizing an expression), comprehensibility (knowing the meaning of the expression) and interpretability (knowing what the expression signifies in a particular sociocultural context)” (McKay, 2002, p. 52).

In addition, relying solely on NS norms (‘NS-as-target framework’ (Kachru, 2005), the ‘Standard English’ (Canagarajah, 2006; Davies, 2003) framework) is not an **appropriate** approach for the most EIL contexts (Alptekin, 2002; Smolder, 2009; Widdowson, 1994). Traditionally, the terms such as “authentic”, “target”, and “appropriateness” used as euphemisms or codes so as to exclusively define them from an Anglo-American angle, using NS as a yardstick by which all users the yardstick by which the users of English might be measured against, irrespective of local contextual dynamics and parameters (Canagarajah, 2007; Leung, 2005; Medgyes, 1994). Imposing a single ENL standard has several drawbacks:

taught and learned globally (in reality, local models provide the main input); and (d) the “Cassandra myth,” i.e., that diversification of English is a sign of linguistic decay. These myths support the ideal of the NES from Center countries and implicitly stigmatize many groups, such as NNEs, NNESTs, and non-Center NESs.

(1) conceptualizes language as a static construct, (2) prioritizes imitation over communication as the ultimate reason in learning the language (Burns, 2005), and (3) “place it [standard variety] in a privileged, and thereby all others in an underprivileged, nonstandard, and marginalized position” (Selvi & Yazan, 2013, p. 5). Therefore, the ultimate goal for language teaching should be establishing a socioculturally appropriate language use (Alptekin, 2002; McKay & Bokhorst-Heng, 2008). Such an approach will be better aligned with sociocultural histories and realities of the local teaching context, conducive to local culture of learning, and recognize and promote individual agency, identities, and imagined goals.

Finally, relying solely on NS norms is not a **fair** practice. There has been an ongoing trend in the applied linguistics circle (re-)defining and problematizing the contested nature of the idealized native speaker. Scholars approached the debate from several perspectives (e.g. biodevelopmental features, identity matters, implications on language teaching, benchmarks for language learning and teaching), offered their operational definitions and portrayal of these terms (Cook, 1999; Davies, 1991; 2003; Kachru, 1992; Mahboob, 2005; Paikeday, 1985; Rampton, 1990). While these discussions have not lead to a satisfactory definition of these terms, the general consensus in the field is to view it on a three dimensional axis language expertise, language (self-) affiliation (self-perception (Inbar, 1999) and positioning Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (2001)), and language inheritance (Davies, 1991; Rampton, 1990). In any rate, it should be used as a reference or standard to guide language learning (Davies, 2003) as a temporary measure (Cook, 1999), but certainly not for the ‘final’ achievement. The greatest peril behind the utilization of NS benchmark begins when NNS (or “**non-native speakers**”) are defined “in terms of what they are not” (Kramsch, 1998), often portrayed as perpetually incompetent, imitating or “less-than-a-native” or “near-native” (Valdes, 1998). Ultimately, a natural byproduct of this frame of reference is to view and treat

NNESTs as second class citizens in the TESOL profession (Rajagopalan, 2005).

Consequently, the utilization of NS benchmark creates a dubious, problematic, and damaging psyche among many NNESTs who are unable to see themselves as legitimate users of English (Alptekin, 2002; Cook, 1999; Widdowson, 1994). As a response, some scholars re-positioned the dichotomous treatment of these constructs by offering a more dynamic approach of placing them along a continuum (Liu, 1999).

Myth/Reality⁸ 6 – As long as NNESTs call themselves “NNESTs,” they will perpetuate their marginalization (The nomenclature debate – What’s in a name?)

Acknowledging the problems that accompany the terms, NS and NNS teachers I use them in this paper for the lack of better ones, but my intention is to interrogate the NS-NNS dichotomy and the supremacy of or the sole use of the NS model in language pedagogy. (Ishihara, 2010, p. 75)

When you read a piece that deals with some aspect of the issues related to NNEST movement, it is not surprising to encounter a footnote or endnote by the authors reminding the readers that the terms ‘NS’ and ‘NNS’ (or NEST/NNEST) are used in the paper for practical purposes or for the lack of better ones (see the example above). The comment is usually followed up with a self-justification that the ultimate aim is to push the field towards overcoming these binaries. While I acknowledge the sincere efforts of these authors, I argue that such commentaries are powerful snippets manifesting the most controversial debate within the NNEST movement: Why is it called “NNEST” movement? Why do we use “an acronym by any other name would be a confusing?” (Brady, 2009). If we are aiming to move

⁸ The nomenclature debate and whether the term ‘NNEST’ actually propagates the marginalization is a very delicate and sensitive matter with no easy solution. The complicated nature of the issue was the motivation behind referring to this as both a myth and a reality, and acknowledging the valid perspectives from both schools of thought.

beyond the problematic and mutually exclusive constructs such as NS-NNS, why are we insisting on calling ourselves NNESTs? If we are advocating for NNESTs whose professional qualities, competencies and personas confined into the “non-” prefix, and defined in terms of NESTs, why do we still insist on the term? If we seek for a greater participation, collaboration and inclusivity with our NEST colleagues, would not we be limiting our scope and efforts (i.e. othering NESTs) by calling the Interest Section and the movement after the term NNEST (cf. myth #1 and the idea pad anecdote)? So, are we preaching to the choir? Or shooting ourselves in the foot? Or locking ourselves in a prison of our device? These are all valid questions to raise, but difficult questions to answer. Let’s explicate on this double-edged sword (see Table 2 below).

Table 2. Advantages and disadvantages of the NNEST label (adapted from Brady, 2009)

Disadvantages of the NNEST label	Advantages of the NNEST label
• Demeaning (Comparing to the expression ‘non-White’)	• Stressing ability and expertise over accidents of birth
• Othering NNESTs	• Making a presumed “disadvantage” an advantage
• Referring to a false standard (i.e. NS fallacy)	• Encouraging a more global perspective
• Being a specialist acronym (Not transparent to others)	• Valuing/acknowledging the periphery
• Leading others to assume that only NNESTs care about NNEST issues,	• Making it easy to organize against discrimination
• Perpetuating the link between accent and professional competencies	• Can “own” the term like the other “N” word for African Americans or “Queer” for gays
• Self-destructing (Fighting against discrimination, while discriminating ourselves)	• Leadership models and development (More stakes to showing one’s ability and involvement)
	• Using the identification already present in the research field
	• Benefitting the profession (Valuing education and expertise)

The nomenclature debate within the NNEST movement is a very valid and interesting one with plausible justifications from each streams of thought. It should be noted that the emergence of the NNEST movement rests primarily upon an advocacy agenda.

Therefore, the NNEST label has enabled us to put our finger on the problem— using the term as a problem and encourage TESOLers to explore their biases and misconceptions. By deconstructing the notion of teacher skills and competencies using the term NNEST, we were able to advocate for professionalism for all. The recruitment of an uncredentialed NS means marginalization of not only NNESTs but also credentialed NSs. This call for establishing professionalism, teacher education and equity in hiring and workplace settings has been the prime objective of the NNEST movement in establishing our professional legitimacy (Brady, 2009).

With a metamorphosis from an advocacy initiative to a *bona fide* area of inquiry, the roles, responsibilities, and influence (as well as the expectations from it) has grown exponentially. While the advocacy nature has always remained in place, today, the accumulation of scholarship necessitates and validates a move on the next level: re-consideration of ideas and ideals of the movement in the light of the past achievements, present-day realities, and future directions. Therefore, the discussions on problematizing the NNEST construct to further advance the scope of the movement will be here to stay and be quite instrumental in defining a roadmap for the movement.

In conclusion, as the current chair of the NNEST Interest Section, I am personally very pleased with such questions being raised in different circles, by wide range of individuals, and for different reasons. In fact, this gives us the pride with the movement and the momentum it has generated for the past couple of decades. It boosts our courage and hope for collectively building a better professional landscape in TESOL. Most importantly, it enriches the intellectual foundation of the movement, diversifies the voices within, and provides us with an impetus to define the possible future trajectories of the movement.

CONCLUSION

The fields of TESOL and applied linguistics have witnessed a remarkable phenomenon over the last couple of decades: the NNEST movement. The movement rests upon a theoretical foundation underpinning the problematization and deconstruction of the traditional pillars of the TESOL enterprise:

1. The depth and breadth of the NS construct (Davies, 1991; 2003; Mahboob, 2005; Paikeday, 1985; Rampton, 1990) beyond a pure linguistic phenomenon (accounting for other factors such as accent, race, gender, religion, personal affiliation, self-positioning, country of origin/schooling, age, sexual orientation, physical appearance or even the passport you carry (or a combination of these constructs))
2. Conceptually (Kramersch, 1997; Rampton, 1990), politically (Maum, 2002) and professionally (Braine, 1999, 2010; Canagarajah, 1999; Kamhi-Stein, 2004) problematic nature of the NSism (Holliday, 2005) infused into different spheres of the TESOL activity (e.g. benchmark for learning, teaching, assessment, teacher education, material development and hiring)
3. The deconstruction of NS fallacy (Phillipson, 1992) defining teaching skills, competencies, efficacy and legitimacy

On more practical levels, it promotes empowerment and legitimacy, and advocates for a wider acknowledgement of such values as equity, justice, egalitarianism, and professionalism in the workplace settings and hiring processes. The ultimate goal of the movement is to utilize the unique characteristics of the TESOL profession, that is the all-encompassing boundaries that welcome ethnic, racial, cultural, religious, and linguistic diversity (Selvi, 2009). Borrowing the words of Edwin Markham presented in the epigraph, the ultimate goal

of the movement is to replace the circle of native speakerism that shut many TESOLers out with an all-encompassing one, which takes everybody in and welcomes diverse uses, users, functions and contexts of the English(es) around the world. As a result, this will equip us with “contextualized accounts of English teachers’ and users’ ongoing negotiations of translinguistic and transcultural identities” (Rudolph, 2012) as opposed to decontextualized, unidirectional and universal regimes of truth of NSism.

The transformation in TESOL catalyzed by the NNEST movement is relatively recent, fairly well-documented, and yet still in progress. While members and supporters of the NNEST movement should be very proud about the progress that has been made, the paradigm shift is far from complete. The “invisible and axiomatic” nature of the NS mindset (Mahboob, 2010) is still deeply rooted in different strata of the TESOL enterprise.

Therefore, the movement has reached to a stage where it is now ultimately necessary to revisit its overarching goals, and (re-)define its future agenda in forging new pathways to move beyond the power-driven, value-laden, identity-shaping and confidence-affecting NS-dependent model.

In conclusion, the prime impetus behind this paper was an imperative call of duty at a time characterized by a necessity to move the next stage in the NNEST movement. While the attention and importance that the NNEST movement has generated over the last couple of decades cannot be overlooked, there is a great necessity that exists to delineate myths and misconceptions about the movement. Therefore, being aware of these issues embedded in the NNEST movement will have critical importance in not only understanding the scope of the movement but also be instrumental in shaping its future.

References

- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 56(1), 57-64.
- Amin, N. (1997). Race and the identity of the nonnative ESL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 580-583.
- Arva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System*, 28(3), 355-372.
- Atkinson, D. (2011). *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*. London: Routledge.
- Barratt, L., & Kontra, E. H. (2000). Native-English-speaking teachers in cultures other than their own. *TESOL Journal*, 9(3), 19-23.
- Benke, E., & Medgyes, P. (2005). Differences in teaching 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. 195-216). New York: Springer.
- Bernat, E. (2009). Towards a pedagogy of empowerment: The case of 'Impostor Syndrome' among pre-service non-native speaker teachers (NNSTs) of TESOL. *English Language Teacher Education and Development Journal*, 11.
- Bhatt, R. M. (2002). Experts, dialects, and discourse. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 74-109.
- Bley-Vroman, R. (1983). The comparative fallacy in interlanguage studies: The case of systematicity. *Language Learning*, 33(1), 1-17.
- Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

- Boraie, D. (2013). Native English-speaking teachers and trainers still idealized. *TESOL President's blog*. Retrieved from <http://blog.tesol.org/bridging-the-gap-between-research-and-classroom-practice/>
- Brady, B. (2009). *What's in a name? An acronym by any other name would be as confusing*. NNEST EVO 2009. Retrieved from http://www.slideboom.com/presentations/38883/Brock_ppt
- Braine, G. (1999). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Braine, G. (2004). The nonnative English speaking professionals' movement and its research foundation. In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals* (pp. 9-25). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Braine, G. (2010). *Nonnative speaker English teachers: Research, pedagogy, and professional growth*. New York: Routledge.
- Brutt-Griffler, J., & Samimy, K. (1999). Revisiting the colonial in the post-colonial: Critical praxis for nonnative English speaking teachers in a TESOL program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 413-431.
- Burns, A. (2005). Interrogating new worlds of ELT. In A. Burns (Ed.), *Teaching English from a global perspective. Case studies in TESOL series* (pp. 1-18). Alexandria: TESOL.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). Interrogating the "native speaker fallacy": Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Nonnative educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77-92). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Canagarajah, A. S. (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 197-218.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(5), 923-939.
- CATESOL (2013). *CATESOL position paper opposing discrimination against Non-Native English Speaking Teachers (NNESTs) and teachers with "non-standard" varieties of English*. Retrieved from <http://catesol.org/nnest.pdf>
- Cheung, Y. L. (2002). *The attitude of university students in Hong Kong towards native and nonnative teachers of English*. Unpublished master's thesis, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin and use*. New York: Praeger.
- Clark, E., & Paran, A. (2007). The employability of non-native-speaker teachers of EFL: A UK survey. *System*, 35(4), 407-430.
- Cook, V. (1997). Monolingual bias in second language acquisition research. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 34, 35-50.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 185-209.
- Crystal, D. (2012). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, A. (1991). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.
- Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: Myth and reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Ding, D. (2000). Another multicultural classroom: Non-native teachers of native students. In T. L. Good, & L. B. Warschauer (Eds.), *In our own voice: Graduate students teach writing* (pp. 146-152). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Firth, A. (2009). The lingua franca factor. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(2), 147-170.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285-300.
- Flynn, K., & Gulikers, G. (2001). Issues in hiring nonnative English-speaking professionals to teach English as a second language. *CATESOL Journal*, 13(1), 151-161.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next: Why global English may mean the end of 'English as a foreign language'*. London: British Council.
- Hansen, J. (2004). Invisible minorities and the nonnative English-Speaking professional. In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals* (pp. 40-57). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Hsu, H. (2005). Mainland bias against Chinese from the west. *South China Morning Post*, November 28, A16.
- Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Inbar, O. (1999). *Native and non-native English teachers: Investigation of construct and perceptions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Tel-Aviv University, Israel.
- Ishihara, N. (2010). Maintaining an optimal distance: Nonnative speakers' pragmatic choice. In A. Mahboob (Ed.), *The NNEST lens: Non native English speakers in TESOL* (pp. 32-48). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 137-162.

- Kachru, B. (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, Y. (1994). Monolingual bias in SLA research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 795–800.
- Kachru, Y. (2005). Teaching and learning of world Englishes. In E. Hinkel. (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 155-173). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kamhi-Stein, L. (2004). *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Kasper, G. & Kellerman, E. (1997). *Communication strategies*. Harlow: Longman.
- Kato, (n.d.). *Beyond the native speaker: World Englishes and the NEST/NNEST dichotomy*. Retrieved from https://kinjo.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository_uri&item_id=533&file_id=22&file_no=1
- Kelch, K., & Santana-Williamson, E. (2002). ESL students' attitudes toward native- and nonnative-speaking instructors' accents. *CATESOL Journal*, 14(1), 57-72.
- Kramsch, C. (1997). The privilege of the nonnative speaker. *PMLA*, 112, 359–369.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Manuel Sierra, J. (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. 217-242). New York: Springer.
- Lee, J. (2005). The Native Speaker: An Achievable Model? *Asian EFL Journal*, 7(2). Retrieved from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/June_05_jl.php
- Leung, C. (2005). Convivial communication: Recontextualizing communicative competence. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(2), 119–144.

- Liang, K. Y. (2002). *English as a second language (ESL) students' attitudes toward non-native English-speaking teachers' (NNESTs') accentedness*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Los Angeles.
- Lipovsky, C., Mahboob, A. (2010). Appraisal of native and non-native English speaking teachers. In A. Mahboob, (Ed.), *The NNEST lens: Non native English speakers in TESOL*, (pp. 154-179). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent. Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- Liu, D. (1999). Training non-native TESOL students: Challenges for TESOL teacher education in the West. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Nonnative educators in English language teaching* (pp. 197-210). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Liu, J. (2001). Confessions of a nonnative English-speaking professional. *CATESOL Journal* 13, 53-67.
- Llurda, E. (2000). On competence, proficiency and communicative language ability. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 85-96.
- Llurda, E. (2005). *Non-native language teachers. Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession*. New York: Springer.
- Llurda, E. & Huguet, A. (2003). Self-awareness in NNS EFL primary and secondary school teachers. *Language Awareness*, 12(3&4), 220-235.
- Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *Native language and foreign acquisition. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 379, 259-278.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native-speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input, *Applied Linguistics* 4, 126-141.

- Lowenberg, P. H. (2002). Assessing English proficiency in the expanding circle. *World Englishes*, 21(3), 431-435.
- Lyons, J. 1996. On competence and performance and related notions. In G. Brown, K. Malmkjaer and J. Williams (Eds.), *Performance and competence in second language acquisition* (pp. 11-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahboob, A. (2003). *Status of nonnative English speaking teachers in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Mahboob, A. (2004). Native or nonnative: What do the students think? In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals* (pp. 121-147). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Mahboob, A. (2005). Beyond the native speaker in TESOL. In S. Zafar (Ed.), *Culture, Context, and Communication* (pp. 60-93). Abu Dhabi: Center of Excellence for Applied Research and Training & The Military Language Institute.
- Mahboob, A. (2010). *The NNEST lens: Non native English speakers in TESOL*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Mahboob, A., Uhrig, K., Newman, K. L., & Hartford, B. S. (2004). Children of lesser English: Status of nonnative English speakers as college-level English as a Second Language teachers in the United States. In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals* (pp. 100-120). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Mahboob, A., Golden, R. (2013). Looking for native speakers of English: Discrimination in English language teaching job advertisements. *Voices in Asia Journal*, 1(1), 72-81.
- Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an International Language*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

- Mauranen, A. (2012). Introduction. In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.) *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and findings* (pp. 1-7). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, S. L., & Bokhorst-Heng, W. D. (2008). *International English in its sociolinguistic context: Towards a socially sensitive EIL pedagogy*. London: Routledge.
- 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. (1986). Queries from a communicative teacher. *ELT Journal*, 40(2), 107-112.
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, 46(4), 340-349.
- Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. London: Macmillan.
- Medgyes, P. (1999). Language training: A neglected area in teacher education. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 177-195). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Medgyes, P. (2001). When the teacher is a non-native speaker. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. (pp. 429-442). London: Heinle & Heinle.
- Menard-Warwick, J. (2008). The cultural and intercultural identities of transnational English teachers: Two case studies from the Americas. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(4), 617-640.
- Motha, S., Jain, R., & Teclé, T. (2012). Translinguistic identity-as-pedagogy: Implications for language teacher education. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 13-27.

- Moussu, L. (2006). *Native and nonnative English speaking English as a second language teachers: Student attitudes, teacher self perceptions, and intensive English program administrator beliefs and practices*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University.
- Moussu, L., & Llorca, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching*, 41(3), 315–348.
- Mullock, B. (2010). Does a good language teacher have to be a native speaker? In A. Mahboob, (Ed.), *The NNEST lens: Non native English speakers in TESOL* (pp. 87-113). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Pacek, D. (2005). ‘Personality not nationality’: Foreign students’ perceptions of a nonnative speaker lecturer of English at a British university. In E. Llorca (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers. Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 243-262). New York: Springer.
- Paikeday, T. (1985). *The native speaker is dead!* Toronto: Paikeday Publishing Inc.
- Park, G. (2008). Lived pedagogies: Becoming a multicompetent ESOL teacher. In J. A. Carmona (Ed.), *Perspectives on community college ESL, Volume 3: Faculty, administration, and the working environment* (pp. 17-30). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Park, G. (2012). “I Am Never Afraid of Being Recognized as an NNES”: One teacher’s journey in claiming and embracing her nonnative-speaker identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(1), 127–151.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rajagopalan, K. (2005). Non-native speaker teachers of English and their anxieties: Ingredients for an experiment in action research. In E. Llorca (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 inheritance. *ELT Journal*, 44(2), 97-101.
- Reves, T., & Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teacher's self-image: An international survey. *System*, 22(3), 353-367.
- Rudolph, N. (2012). *Borderlands and border crossing: Japanese professors of English and the negotiation of translinguistic and transcultural identity*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Samimy, K., & Brutt-Giffler, J. (1999). To be a native or non-native speaker: Perceptions of "non-native" students in a graduates TESOL program. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 127-144). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Seidlhofer, B. (1999). Double standards: Teacher education in the expanding circle. *World Englishes*, 18(2), 233-245.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209-231.
- Selinker, L. (1992) *Rediscovering interlanguage*. London: Longman.
- Selvi, A. F. (2009). A call to graduate students to reshape the field of English language teaching. *Essential Teacher*, 6(3-4), 49-51.
- Selvi, A. F. (2010). 'All teachers are equal, but some teachers are more equal than others': Trend analysis of job advertisements in English language teaching. *WATESOL NNEST Caucus Annual Review*, 1, 156-181. Retrieved at <http://sites.google.com/site/watesolnnestcaucus/caucus-annual-review>
- Selvi, A. F. (2011). The non-native speaker teacher. *ELT Journal*, 65(2), 187-189.
- Selvi, A. F., & Yazan, B. (2013). *Teaching English as an international language*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL Press.

- Shao, T. (2005). Teaching English in China: NNESTs need not apply? *NNEST Newsletter*, 7(2).
- Sheorey, R. (1986). Error perceptions of native-speaking and non-native-speaking teachers of ESL. *ELT Journal*, 40(4), 306-312.
- Smolder (2009). ELT and the native speaker ideal: Some food for thought. *International House Journal of Education and Development*, 26(22). Retrieved from <http://ihjournal.com/elt-and-the-native-speaker-ideal-some-food-for-thought>
- Suarez, J. (November, 2000). 'Native' and 'non-Native': Not only a question of terminology. *Humanizing Language Teaching*, 2(6). Retrieved from <http://www.hltnmag.co.uk/nov00/mart1.htm>
- Swales, J. (1993). The English language and its teachers: thoughts past, present and future. *ELT Journal*, 47(4), 283-291.
- Tarone, E. (2006). Interlanguage. In K. Brown, (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (pp. 747–752). Boston, MA: Elsevier.
- Tatar, S., & Yıldız, S. (2010). Empowering nonnative-English speaking teachers in the classroom. In A. Mahboob (Ed.), *The NNEST lens: Non native English speakers in TESOL* (pp. 114–128). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- TESOL (1992). A TESOL statement of non-native speakers of English and hiring practices. *TESOL Quarterly*, 2(4), 23.
- TESOL (2006). *Position statement against discrimination of nonnative speakers of English in the field of TESOL*. Retrieved from <http://www.tesol.org/docs/pdf/5889.pdf?sfvrsn=2>
- Valdes, G. (1998). The construct of the near-native speaker in the foreign language profession: Perspectives on ideologies about language. *ADFL Bulletin*, 29(3), 4-8.
- Widdowson, H. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377-389.

Ali Fuad Selvi, PhD

Visiting Assistant Professor | Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus
Chair, NNEST Interest Section | TESOL International Association

Teaching English as a Foreign Language Program

Middle East Technical University

Northern Cyprus Campus

Academic Hall 3, TZ-30

Kalkanli, Guzelyurt

via Mersin 10, Turkey

Tel. +90.392.661.3423 | selvi@metu.edu.tr | <http://www.metu.edu.tr/~selvi>

Teaching English as an International Language (2013)

<http://tesol.org/BookLanding?productID=097>

Biographical Statement:

Ali Fuad Selvi is a Visiting Assistant Professor in the Teaching English as a Foreign Language program at Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus and the current chair of the NNEST Interest Section in TESOL International. He is the co-author of *Teaching English as an International Language* (2013) published by TESOL Press.