

Nonnative-English-Speaking Teachers in TESOL

齊 藤 隆 春

論文要旨

英語のグローバル化に伴い、英語圏の国々においても、ノンネイティブの英語教師の活躍は目覚ましい。ノンネイティブとしての英語教師の役割をさらに理解していくために、応用言語学的見地からのネイティブ・ノンネイティブの区別に関する議論、英語圏で活躍するノンネイティブの英語教師のアイデンティティ形成、そしてノンネイティブのための英語教育プログラムのあり方を考察した。ネイティブ・ノンネイティブの区別以上に、英語教師としてのプロフェッショナリズムが、英語グローバル化の時代に問われている。

Introduction

When I began graduate studies in second language education in the United States as an international student, my biggest surprise was to find nonnative English teachers from foreign countries teaching English to American or ESL students at a U.S. university. I wondered how

such nonnative teachers could teach English since they might have limited English proficiency compared to native speakers of English. I wondered how they could establish confidence and credibility among their colleagues and students. I wondered why they could teach English in the United States, because I believed, at that time, that the “ownership” of English belonged to native speakers born and raised in English speaking countries.

While I kept thinking about the existence of nonnative English teachers in a U.S higher educational setting, I began to notice a significant and increasing number of nonnative speakers of English who are assuming the role of English teachers in the U.S. and other countries. Through journal articles and web sites in the field of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and of Standard English as a Second Dialect (TESOL), a number of nonnative English teachers are beginning to express their concerns and visions as TESOL professionals, such as their personal experiences in establishing credibility as nonnative English teachers (Amin, 1999, 2004; Braine 1999, 2004) .

At the same time, a number of scholarly debates over the native/nonnative dichotomy have been generated in the field of applied linguistics. This work acknowledges that determining the native/nonnative construct is a very difficult task which is not clear-cut (Davies, 1991, 2003; Kachru & Nelson, 1996; Rampton, 1990). For example, Kachru and Nelson (1996) point out that with the global spread of English and the notion of World Englishes that accepts a variety of English uses, the stereotypical concept of the nonnative English teacher who learned English as a foreign language and lacks native-like proficiency should be challenged.

In order to further understand the issues of nonnative English teachers in TESOL, the following literature review explores controversies on the native/nonnative dichotomy, voices of nonnative English teachers in TESOL, and implications for teacher education. In the era of global spread of English that has created proficient nonnative English speaking professionals from many countries, this study could be of great importance for understanding theoretical discussions of native/nonnative dichotomies as well as pedagogical implications for teaching English as nonnative English teachers.

Literature review

1. Controversies on the native/nonnative dichotomy

Brutt-Griffler and Saminy (1999) state that the scholarly debate over the question of the native/non-native dichotomy has generated a number of controversial issues in applied linguistics. Some of the debates are examined in this section.

Regarding the characteristics of the native speaker, Cook (1999) presents the following characteristics, by consolidating several researchers' definitions: (1) a subconscious knowledge of rules, (2) an intuitive grasp of meanings, (3) the ability to communicate within social settings, (4) a range of language skills, (5) creativity of language use, (6) identification with a language community, (7) the ability to produce fluent discourse, (8) knowledge of differences between their own speech and that of the standard form of the language, (9) the ability to interpret and translate into the L1 of which he or she is a native speaker. However, Cook emphasizes that these characteristics are variable and not a

necessary part of the definition of a native speaker. For example, a monk sworn to silence is still a native speaker. Some native speakers, such as physicist Stephen Hawking and the deaf educator and writer Helen Keller, must communicate with alternative means other than these characteristics (p. 186). On the other hand, Cook insists that nonnative speakers can share many of these characteristics in spite of their level of proficiency in the language.

Davies (2003) also delineates characteristics of the native speaker as follows:

1. The native speaker acquires the L1 of which s/he is a native speaker in childhood.
2. The native speaker has intuitions (in terms of acceptability and productiveness) about his/her Grammar 1.
3. The native speaker has intuitions about those features of Grammar 2, which are distinct from his/her Grammar 1.
4. The native speaker has a unique capacity to produce fluent spontaneous discourse, which exhibits pauses mainly at clause boundaries (the 'one clause at a time' facility) and which is facilitated by a huge memory stock of complete lexical items (Pawley & Syder, 1983). In both production and comprehension the native speaker exhibits a wide range of communicative competence.
5. The native speaker has a unique capacity to write creatively (and this includes, of course, literature at all levels from jokes to epics, metaphor to novels).
6. The native speaker has a unique capacity to interpret and translate into the L1 of which s/he is a native speaker. Disagreements about an individual's capacity are likely to stem from a dispute about the

Standard or (standard) Language (p. 210).

Davies posits that “all except (1) are contingent issues” (p. 212), and concludes that “it is difficult for an adult non-native speaker to become a native speaker of a second language because I define a native speaker as a person who has early acquired the language” (p. 213). However, he maintains that the adult nonnative speaker can acquire the communicative competence of the native speaker and the confidence necessary to membership.

Kachru and Nelson (1996) state that the term “native speaker” is usually used to refer to someone who learned a language in a natural setting from childhood as their first or sole language (p. 81). They caution that the casual labeling of “native speaker” must now be called into serious question with the globalization of English and recognition of world Englishes, because this labeling tends to be used comfortably as a demarcation line between this and that type or group of users of English. They also maintain that being labeled as a native speaker is “of no particular a priori significance, in terms of measuring facility with the language” (p. 79). They insist that deciding who will be labeled an English user is not so straightforward as might be imagined. In fact, attitudinal problems seem to exist behind the label of nonnative ESL speakers of English:

When we say “English as a second (or even third or fourth) language,” we must do so with reference to something, and that standard of measure must, given the nature of the label, be English as someone’s first language. This automatically creates attitudinal problems, for it is almost unavoidable that anyone would take “second” as less worthy,

in the sense, for example, that coming in second in a race is not as good as coming in first (p. 79).

By offering the examples of the great variety of English users in the world today, Kachru and Nelson caution that TESOL professionals should carefully reexamine the tight dichotomy of native versus nonnative, that is, “us versus them” (p. 79). Edge (1988) makes the following point in order to caution the tight nationalistic native/nonnative distinction:

As far as the teaching of English is concerned, it seems more and more important that ...training and development should help us escape from the essentially nationalistic view of native speaker/non-native speaker and get us involved in furthering an internationalist perspective in which users of English are simply more or less accomplished communicators (p. 156)

Kresovich (1988) investigated the difference in the acceptability of specific sentence error types between the native-English-speaking teacher and the non-native-English-teacher whose first language was Japanese. The native speakers of English were one British and 16 Americans. The non-native group was comprised of 26 Japanese English teachers who were from a variety of school types. The results of this study showed little difference in the error perceptions between the native and non-native English speakers. The findings also support the idea that the more an error obscures meaning, the less it is tolerated.

McNeil (1994) compared the performances of four groups of Hong

Kong teachers of English as a Second Language on a language task. Subjects were two groups of native-English-speaking teachers, one of expert teachers and one of novices, and two groups of nonnative-English-speaking teachers, one of experts and one of novices. All were asked to preview an English text and select 12 words they thought would be unfamiliar to a specific student level. A group of 200 students from Hong Kong secondary schools took vocabulary tests on the same test. The comparison of the results suggests that nonnative-English-speaking teachers whose L1 is Chinese are at a distinct advantage in identifying their learners' vocabulary needs in connection with reading texts. It also suggests that while teaching expertise can improve nonnative-English-speaking teachers' ability, it can actually obscure the judgments of non-native speakers by interfering with their more intuitive judgments about vocabulary difficulty. Both Kresovich's and McNeil's studies are experimental and have many additional factors to take into consideration. However, these studies present the unique perspectives that the nonnative-English-speaking professionals have on their students. Their perspectives should not be ignored. Both the native and nonnative educator's knowledge of the English language can function equally in their fields.

Davies (1991) argues that the differences between the native and nonnative speaker are far from clear-cut and that there is the possibility of mobility from non-native to native speakers. Davies (2003) also maintains that the native/nonnative division is, like all majority-minority relations, power driven, identity laden, and confidence affecting:

For the distinction native speaker-nonnative speaker, like all

majority-minority power relations, is at bottom one of confidence and identity. What this means, as Tajfel (1981) points out, is that we define minorities negatively against majorities which themselves we may not be able to define. To be a native speaker means not being a non-native speaker. Even if I cannot define a native speaker I can define a nonnative speaker negatively as someone who is not regarded by him/herself or by native speakers as a native speaker (p. 213).

Davies points out that the native speaker is not a myth only in the sense that gives reality to feelings of confidence and identity.

By exploring the labeling of native speakers and nonnative speakers in terms of precedence in learning languages and social identities, Liu (1999a) posits that the native/nonnative dichotomy is as complex as the literacy/illiteracy dichotomy, and concludes that the native/nonnative labels, like the terms literacy/illiteracy, are too simplistic and reductionist. He cited the definition of literacy by McKay (1996) and applied it to the definition of native/nonnative dichotomies. McKay insists that “The terms *literate* and *illiterate* are clearly the most highly charged labels in terms of providing one with the social identity. Whereas use of these terms suggests that one is either literate or not, such a view of literacy is a tremendous oversimplification” (p. 423). Furthermore, Liu referred to Crandall (1992), who also asserts that “Dichotomies such as literacy-illiteracy or functional literacy or functional illiteracy are simplistic and reductionist. The complex notion of literacy cannot be captured by any one definition of skills, functions, or practices” (p. 88).

On the other hand, Medgyes (1992) maintains a distinctive position

between the native and nonnative English speaker. Although he admits the trend that attempts to get rid of the native/nonnative division, acknowledging the problems of this division, he clearly sees the difference between native and near native proficiency. He maintains that nonnative speakers can move toward near-native speakers but soon or later are halted by a glass wall. Medgyes posits that “the main reason why non-native cannot turn into natives lies in the fact that they are, by their very nature, norm-dependent.” He continues that “their use of English is but an imitation of some form of native use” (p. 343). Furthermore, he captures the native/nonnative division as follows:

However, the native/nonnative distinction only makes sense if people with comparable variables, such as age, sex, education, intelligence, profession, and experience are examined. For example, non-native-speaking English teachers should not match themselves against Scottish shepherds or twelve-year-old Australian schoolchildren but against their native counterparts, that is, against native-speaking English teachers (p. 343).

Medgyes, therefore, focuses on English teaching professions, and argues that native and nonnative English speaking teachers reveal considerable differences in their teaching behavior, and that most of the discrepancies are language-related. He also contends that such a difference has hidden advantages in that nonnative-English-speaking teachers can work toward becoming native-like English speaking educators. His position sounds persuasive in linguistic and pedagogical aspects. However, he emphasizes too much the difference of linguistic

competence between the native and nonnative English speaker. Thus, Medgyes' position seems to lack communicative competence aspects, which require the involvement of culture in language use in socially appropriate contexts.

As the number of users of English worldwide surges toward a probable two billion (Crystal 1985), Strevens (1992) posits that the functions and uses of English by native speakers and nonnative speakers become more numerous and unrelated to the nationality of the speaker. He states that one of the consequences relates to profound perceptions of identity and to major differences in such perceptions between native speakers of English and non-native speakers. Furthermore, in his discussion of the ownership of English, Widdowson (1994) notes:

The question is which community, and which culture, have a rightful claim to ownership of standard English? For standard English is no longer the preserve of a group of people living in an offshore European island, or even of larger groups living in continents elsewhere. It is an international language. As such it serves a whole range of different community and their institutional purposes and these transcend traditional communal and cultural boundaries (p. 382).

Widdowson asserts that English develops in the world regardless of the intervention of native speakers, and points out that no nation can have "custody" over English. Furthermore, in her discussion of identity and the ownership of English internationally, Norton (1997) points out that the issues of the native/nonnative distinction in terms of the

ownership of English have a direct bearing on the relationship between language and identity. Norton concludes that “if English belongs to the people who speak it, whether native or nonnative, whether ESL or EFL, whether standard or nonstandard, then the expansion of English in this era of rapid globalization may possibly be for the better rather than for the worse” (p. 427).

Thus, some researchers have created alternative concepts in order to replace the native/nonnative division. As an alternative concept, Edge (1988) suggests “more or less accomplished users of English.” Rampton (1990) introduces the concepts of “expert speakers” and “affiliation.” A somewhat outdated, but persistent concept is “educated English speakers.” The issues of the native/nonnative division show this division is unquestionably elusive and not clear-cut. However, the native/nonnative distinction matters because it speaks to the questions of power and identity. Davies (2003) asks, “Whose English is it anyway? Who owns my English? Who decides whether the English I deploy is correct? Whose norms do I appeal to?” (p. 167).

2. Voices of nonnative English teachers in TESOL

Facing challenges in their teaching practices, nonnative English teachers reflect on who they are as professionals, and need to construct their own identities against the influence of a social world that might have inequitable structures. Nonnative English teachers also move their focus from the personal to a broader perspective.

Thomas (1999) explores the fundamental issues of credibility that nonnative English speaking professionals face in ESL contexts. She investigated the challenges to credibility in various contexts and

perspectives, such as credibility in hiring practices and perspectives from colleagues and students. She explored the effects of these challenges to credibility by reflecting on her personal experiences and by citing the experiences of her colleagues as well. She insists that nonnative-English-speaking teachers have to work twice as hard as their native-English-speaking colleagues, and need to provide themselves as effective users of English before being accepted as professionals. She confesses her distress when she is judged by who she is, not by what she can do for her students. However, Thomas believes that nonnative English teachers can bring something unique to their profession, such as nonnative English speaking professionals as role models, success stories, and real images of what students can aspire to be.

Braine (1999) argues that some native-English-speaking professionals from the so-called “Center” countries, where the dominant groups are native speakers of English, are not aware of the background of their nonnative-English-speaking colleagues from the “Periphery.” He recalls his journey from the “Periphery,” as a teacher at a village school in Sri Lanka, to the “Center,” as a graduate student in the United States, as a teacher at international universities in the United States and in Asia, and as the coeditor of the *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*. He describes how he first became aware of his non-nativeness:

Nevertheless, I experienced the full impact of the term non-native speaker, and all the accompanying social, psychological, and economic baggage, only when I arrived in the United States to enroll in a Master’s program in TESOL in the mid-1980s. By then, I had 14 years experience teaching English. Needing to

supplement my partial scholarship, I applied for a tutor position at the university's language center and was turned down almost instantly. Instead, some NS classmates who had no teaching experience were employed. Although not stated explicitly, the message was clear: NNSs need not apply... I was soon to learn that prejudice toward NNS teachers came from some ESL students as well. I was assigned to teach two courses, the first NNS to be given this responsibility in the program. About 2 weeks after class began, I was informed that two students had complained about my accent and requested transfers to classes taught by native speakers. This rejection was more hurtful than the objections of my colleagues (p. 22).

Drawing on his experiences, Braine describes how the challenges for NNS "Periphery" scholars continue even when they leave the "Center," because the need to publish internationally continues in some parts of the "Periphery," such as in Hong Kong and Singapore, but not in the West. Both Thomas and Braine reflected on their personal experiences as nonnative English educators, exploring the issue of credibility and a journey from the "Periphery" to the "Center." Their experiences as nonnative English educators eventually seem to reach the sociopolitical concerns, such as discrimination in employment, doubts on credentials from the "Periphery," and marginalization in the profession.

Canagarajah (1999) explains the causes and consequences of the native speaker fallacy in order to understand it from a larger social perspective. He traces the marginalization of speakers of other Englishes in the TESOL professions to the fallacy, and first examines

the linguistic basis fallacy by critiquing Chomskyan origins and arguing for the new terminology to reflect the linguistic competence of postcolonial English speakers. He also questions the application of the fallacy to ESL pedagogy, and points out that the knowledge of other languages by nonnative English teachers can enhance more effective language teaching. He then explores the political implications of the fallacy in the context of “English only” ideologies and “Standard English,” and examines the difficulties faced by Periphery educators in finding employment in the Center. Furthermore, he shows how the fallacy prevents Periphery teachers from developing their expertise in accordance with local needs because expertise in English language teaching is closely associated with native English speakers. In conclusion, Canagarajah presents a reconfiguration of the relationship between Periphery and Center ELT professionals, and exposes the hidden economic, ideological, and political reasons that come from the native/nonnative division.

Amin (1999) insists that little attention has been paid to how the race, ethnicity, culture, and gender of teachers have an impact on the classroom. She claims that critical theories in ESL are written from the viewpoint of White teachers. Positioning herself as an immigrant woman from a minority group, Amin insists that the native speaker construct produces sexism and racism to disempower minority female teachers in Canada. Based on the interviews with minority female ESL teachers who immigrated to Canada, she states that ESL students in Canada make two assumptions of the ideal ESL teacher. One is that only Whites can be native speakers of English. The other is that only the native English speaker knows proper Canadian English. In addition,

she introduces the Canadian media that shows little neutral coverage of minorities, and argues that this fact is an indication of the dominant White groups' negative perceptions of minorities, which have been passed on to ESL students. Amin concludes that TESOL in Canada and the U.S. should clearly define the terms "native" and "nonnative" by emphasizing that no intrinsic connection exists between race and ability in English.

By reflecting on her teaching experiences in North American institutions of higher education, Kubota (2002) also analyzes how the race, culture, and gender of teachers have an impact on the classroom. She draws on Bourdieu's (1986)'s concept of capital, which presents various forms of capital, such as economic capital, cultural capital, social capital, symbolic capital, and others forms of capital. Kubota states that her cultural and linguistic capital she brings to her class as a minority Asian woman, who speaks English with accent, has been valued by students taking Japanese language and language minority classes. On the other hand, her cultural and linguistic capital has not been valued by students preparing to become Spanish and French teachers. Thus, Kubota suggests creating a counter discourse that can clarify a minority position, appropriate marginality, and turn the marginality into a tool for advocating racial, ethnic, and linguistic diversity.

Oda (1999) changes the focus of the discussion from the Center to the Periphery. He investigated how native English speakers from the Center extend their influence to ELT professional organizations in the Periphery. He explores how ELT organizations and affiliates in non-English speaking countries, such as JALT (the Japan Association for Language Teaching), retain the dominant role of native English speakers

in the profession, and points out that such English-speaking monolinguals are more highly valued than local bilingual professionals. He takes a closer look at JALT's officers' duties and their decision-making in order to show how the discourse is dominated by monolingual native speakers of English, with the prevailing assumptions of linguistic and cultural imperialism within the EFL communities. He claims that the unequal power relationship between the native and nonnative English speaker is intact. Oda emphasizes that proficiency in the local language is indispensable for those at the leadership of TESOL affiliates because nonnative-English-speaking professionals' individual language rights are being violated.

Along the same lines, Medgyes (1999) claims that native-English-speaking teachers in Hungary must not only learn about local educational traditions and culture, but they also need to examine the preconceptions behind their own educational beliefs. Medgyes concludes that this process should be reinforced by a growth in nonnative-English-speaking teachers' self-confidence, a more cautious attitude toward imported products, and a willingness to assume full responsibility for their own affairs.

The aforementioned studies clearly show that the native/nonnative division produces numerous challenges that nonnative-English-speaking professionals have to confront. Discrimination in employment seems to be intact. Their credentials as nonnative-English-speaking educators might be questioned from the Central. Their accents might be derided in the dominant ideology of Standard English. They might be often marginalized in the profession. One of the solutions to overcome nonnative-ness in the profession seems to be teacher education that aims at improving the nonnative-English-speaking educator's credibility and

self-image.

3. Implications for teacher education

Just as in the aforementioned sociopolitical issues, the native/nonnative division seems to have created a strong and lasting impact on teacher education. Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (1999) discuss a graduate TESOL course titled “Issues and Concerns Related to NNS Professionals.” This study presents the process of interrogating the nativeness paradigm among nonnative-English-speaking teachers themselves through their own experiences and self-representation. It explores the validity of conceptual tools designed to overcome disempowering discourses that may exist in TESOL programs, and focuses on the construction of identity among nonnative-English-speaking teachers, which does not specify definite boundaries to their capacities. Brutt-Griffler and Samimy state that it is indispensable to raise consciousness about the role of international teachers of English in the field and validate the tools for their empowerment through critical praxis. They conclude that new critical approaches that empower TESOL professionals need to become part of teacher education and research within a TESOL curriculum.

Kubota (2002) suggests a counter-hegemonic pedagogy that affirms diversity. She admits that instructional fields are sites of struggle over power. However, she relies on Foucault (1978) that states that power is not exercised unidirectionally and that the relations of power can be transformed, and believes that this can open up a possibility for counter-hegemonic pedagogy for nonnative English teachers as well as women teachers of color. Thus, she discloses her cultural and linguist background as a tool for raising students’ awareness of the otherness:

One of the strategies I began to use in order to confront these challenges was to communicate explicitly to the students on the first day of class that I am different from white professors. I would ask whether the students had ever had an instructor from Asian with an accent. Then I would stress the fact that I have a different cultural and linguistic background compared to my teaching partner or other white professors and that being in my class is a great opportunity for them to learn firsthand intercultural communication as they interact with me (p. 298).

With this powerful strategy in mind, Kubota (2002) insists that “by giving a positive value to our own uniqueness and using it strategically to advocate diversity in our teaching, we not only empower ourselves but also provide our students with precious opportunities to critically understand and negotiate differences” (p. 304). She also maintains that the counter-hegemonic pedagogy becomes effective when it is supported by colleagues and administrators.

While Brutt-Griffler and Samimy centered on one teacher preparation course in a TESOL curriculum, Kamhi-Stein (1999) insists on the need to modify the entire curriculum that relates to the issues of nonnative-English-speaking teachers (NNES) in TESOL, with the increase in the numbers of NNES teachers enrolled in the MA/TESOL program. She explains how the powerful influence of a role model can be used in order to improve the self-image of NNES teachers. Then, she details how issues of NNES teachers are integrated to the curriculum through classroom activities, such as analyzing the language histories of the teacher trainees and conducting classroom-centered research on NNES

teachers, as well as through out-of-class activities, such as providing teacher trainees with opportunities for professional growth and engaging in advocacy activities for themselves. Kamhi-Stein's practice shows the powerful influence that NNES teacher educators can exert on NNES teacher trainees.

Liu (1999) explores the impact nonnative-English-speaking teachers have on their ESL students from the teacher's viewpoint. He investigated seven nonnative English teachers from a variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and places them on a native/nonnative speaker (NS-NNS) continuum rather than a dichotomy. By using direct quotes from the seven participants, he provides insights to the teachers' expectations and their responses to their influence on students. He claims that when the self-expectations of the teachers on the NS-NNS continuum match those of their students, students tend to appreciate their teachers' competence and achievement as ESL learners. He also states that students are influenced by the teachers' ethnic background, skin color, and physical appearance on the NS-NNS continuum. For example, a White may be categorized as an NS, while an Asian with a longer exposure to English may not. Liu concludes that social context cues, such as skin color and physical characteristics will become less meaningful in the profession by accepting the NS-NNS continuum with multi-dimensions and multi-layers.

Medgyes (1999) takes a different view and argues for the maintenance of the native/nonnative distinction. He acknowledges that nonnative-English-speaking teachers can (1) provide a good learner model for imitation, (2) teach language learning strategies more effectively, (3) supply learners with more information about the English language,

(4) anticipate and prevent language difficulties better, (5) be more empathetic to the needs and problems of learners, and (6) make use of the learners' mother tongue. However, he insists that native English speakers have a better knowledge of English. He claims that nonnative English teachers need to become near-natives in order to be effective, self-confident, and satisfied professionals. Thus, he maintains that language training is of importance during their training. He also states that the obvious choice of English varieties would be between the British and the U.S. varieties, in the absence of a clearly defined International English in reality. Furthermore, he claims that bilinguals are the best ambassadors between peoples and cultures. As a leading teacher-educator in Hungary, Medgyes concludes that teacher educators have the responsibility of transforming nonnative-English-speaking teachers to ambassadors of English.

Dilin Liu (1999) exerts his background as a nonnative teacher educator in the United States, and claims that teacher preparation ESL programs in North America, the United Kingdom, and Australia do not meet the needs of nonnative English speaking teacher trainees. He maintains that although about 40 percent of the teacher trainees in these countries are nonnative-English-speaking international students, they are basically given the same training that native English speakers receive. He argues that an ethnocentrism on the part of native-English-speaking TESOL educators create a methodological dogmatism. This dogmatism promotes Western new methodologies, particularly called "communicative," while disregarding traditional methods that are popular in many other parts of the world. For example, he claims that methods and teaching styles developed for process-oriented, student-centered classrooms are

not suitable for Asia, where English teaching is still product-oriented and teacher-centered. Furthermore, he points out that although many nonnative-English-speaking international students feel the need to improve their practical English for the classroom, they are instead taught grammar courses that improve their explicit knowledge of language rules instead of enhancing their practical language ability. Thus, he proposes programs that enhance an appropriate command of the target language in the classroom for nonnative English speaking professionals, and programs that promote the cultural awareness of the second language acquisition. Dilin Liu concluded that teacher educators in the West are able to meet the needs of nonnative-English-speaking teacher trainees, with their increased cultural sensitivity and effort.

Conclusion

Three important native-nonnative distinctions are revealed in this literature review. First, the native-nonnative distinction is still more or less maintained in the English language teaching profession. Second, the native-nonnative distinction is a sociolinguistic construct that can be overcome in certain circumstances. Third, with the globalization of English and the recognition of World Englishes, the native-nonnative dichotomy has been challenged. However, these theoretical stances also seem to acknowledge that determining the native/nonnative speaker construct is a difficult task that is not clear cut. They eventually conclude that the perceptions of identity are central to the issues of the nonnative English teachers' profession. In addition, the nonnative English teachers' voices and their pedagogical considerations

demonstrate that they need to reconstruct their own identities, improving their self-images and self-perceptions in order to gain confidence and credibility. Rather than reducing the rich and complex role of nonnative English teachers in TESOL to a native-nonnative dichotomy, nonnative TESOL professionals might want to shift their focus to their professionalism, underlining the fact that the global spread of English has created highly proficient speakers in English studies and second language education.

References

- 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, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Amin, N. (2004). Nativism, the Native Speaker Construct, and Minority Immigrant Women Teachers of English as a Second Language. In L. D. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and Teaching from Experience* (pp. 61-80). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Braine, G. (1999). From the Periphery to ther Center: One Teacher's Journey. In G. Braine (Ed), *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching* (pp.15-27). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Braine, G. (2004). The Nonnative English-Speaking Professionals' Movement and Its Research Foundations. In L. D. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and Teaching from Experience* (pp. 9-24). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Brutt-Griffler, J., & Samimy, K.K. (1999). Revisiting the Colonial in the Postcolonial: Critical Praxis for Nonnative-English-Speaking Teachers in a TESOL program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33 (3), 413-431.
- Canagarjah, 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.

- Cook, V. (1999). Going Beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33 (2), 185-209.
- Crandall, J. (1992). Adult literacy development. In W. Grabe (Ed.), *Annual review of applied linguistics* (pp. 86-104). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1985). How many millions? The statistics of English today. *English Today*, 1(1), 7-9.
- Davies, A. (1991). *The Native Speaker in Applied Linguistics*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Davies, A. (2003). *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality*. New York: Multilingual Matters.
- Edge, J. (1988). 'Natives, Speakers, and Models.' *JALT Journal* 9/2: 153-157.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, volume I: An introduction*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Kachru, B. B., & Nelson, C. L. (1996). World Englishes. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching* (pp. 71-102). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kamhi-Stein, L. D. (1999). Preparing Non-Native Professionals in TESOL: Implications for Teacher Education Programs. In G. Braine (Ed), *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching* (pp.145-158). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kresovich, B. M. (1988). *Error gravity: Perceptions of native-speaking and non-native-speaking faculty in EFL*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 311732)
- Kubota, R. (2002). Marginality as an asset: Toward a counter-hegemonic pedagogy for diversity. In L. Vargas (Ed.), *Women faculty of color in the white classroom* (pp. 293-307). New York: Peter Lang.
- Liu, D. (1999). Training Non-Native TESOL Students: Challenges for TESOL Teacher Education in the West. In G. Braine (Ed), *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching* (pp.197-210). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Liu, J. (1999a). Nonnative-English-Speaking Professionals in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33 (1), 85-102.
- Liu, J. (1999b). 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, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- McKay, S. L. (1996). Literacy and literacies. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 421-445). Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

- McNeill, A. (1994). *Some characteristics of native and non-native speaker teachers of English*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 386067)
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: who's worth more? *ELT journal*, 46 (4), 340-349.
- 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: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Norton, B. (1997). Language, Identity, and the Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31 (3), 409-429.
- Oda, M. (1999). English Only or English Plus? The Language(s) of EFL Organizations. In G. Braine (Ed), *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching* (pp. 105-121). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pawley, A., & Syder, F. H. (1983). The two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nature-like selection and nature-like fluency. In J. C. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication*. Harlow: London
- Rampton, M. B. H. (1990). Displacing the 'native speaker': expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT journal*, 44, 97-101.
- Stevens, P. (1992). English as an international language: Directions in the 1990s. In B.B.Kachru (Ed), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed., pp.27-47).
- 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, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 (2), 377-389.