

1

Introduction

Mariya Tseptsura
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Todd Ruecker
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO

The issues of linguistic diversity and linguistic justice have generated a lot of discussion, research, and debate in writing studies over the last half century, and the last two decades have seen a stronger interest in addressing linguistic prejudices with the wider impact of translingual approaches and anti-racist movements. But while this shift is timely and necessary, writing studies as a field has largely ignored the growing diversity of teachers of writing just as it has been attracting increasing numbers of graduate students and international scholars and expanding its reach around the world. For instance, all the chapters in Shirley Rose and Irwin Weiser's (2018) excellent collection *The Internationalization of US Writing Programs* focused on serving students, and references to instructors were limited to how to prepare them to support international student writers. Elsewhere, work on translingualism has overwhelmingly focused on supporting students through curricular and pedagogical changes (e.g., Canagarajah, 2013; Horner et al., 2011; Horner & Tetreault, 2017; Lee & Jenks, 2016). This collection offers a deeper insight into the experiences of nonnative English speaking teachers (NNESTs) at a variety of postsecondary institutions in different U.S. geographical contexts and suggests ways that writing programs can support the success of not only increasingly diverse students but also increasingly diverse teachers of writing.

While the fields of TESOL and applied linguistics have seen a substantial number of studies addressing and challenging the native speaker fallacy as it relates to nonnative English-speaking professionals in these fields (we offer a more detailed overview of this work in the next section), the field of writing studies has not fully acknowledged the extent of linguistic diversity among writing instructors, nor has it fully explored how writing pedagogies can draw on this diversity as our field strives towards greater linguistic inclusivity and justice. This collection brings together a number of voices, most of whom are nonnative English speakers, that represent a great multiplicity in terms of the authors' nationalities, genders, career stages, and cultural, religious, and racial backgrounds. Many of the authors draw on their unique positionality within writing studies to explore their own and their students' experiences through

an intersectional lens. The accounts presented in these chapters aim to move our field towards a greater understanding of linguistic diversity of our instructor population while also promoting greater inclusivity in our research and pedagogical practices.

A Note on Terminology

Before we continue, it is important to note that the terms native English speaker (NES) and nonnative English speaker (NNES) have seen a considerable amount of debate within TESOL, applied linguistics, and writing studies alike. Vivian Cook (1999) and Claire Kramsch (1997) argued that the NES/NNES dichotomy is unclear. While native speaker is often conflated with fluency in a language, it only really refers to the language a speaker learned first (Cook, 1999); as we have learned in our own work, defining one's first language is often complicated for those growing up in multilingual contexts. More importantly, it is an unattainable status for someone not born learning a particular language, and scholars have found it more productive to focus on the unique competencies of L2 users such as their ability to code switch. George Braine, in his introduction to his 1999 collection *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching*, acknowledged the problematic history and implications of the "NNES" term, admitting that it provided legitimacy to the very native-nonnative dichotomy that the collection strove to prove as false or misconstrued. Braine also cited a list of suggested alternatives, among which were "second language speaking professionals" and "non-native teachers of English," yet the collection retained both "NES" and "NNES" terms while simultaneously pointing, like Cook (1999) and Alan Davies (1991), to the difficulties in defining what either a native or a nonnative speaker actually is or difficulties in assigning either one label to multilingual speakers of English in some cases (e.g., Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001; Liu, 2005). The NNES/NES terms then became widely used in the publications appearing after Braine's volume, and it is our intent in using them in this collection to connect and expand on this existing body of literature. As Lucie Moussu and Enric Llurda (2008) also pointed out, many language users who consider themselves either native or nonnative speakers self-align with either linguistic group as "a way of positioning themselves as members or as aliens in a particular social community" (p. 318).

NNES Teachers of English in TESOL

The NNEST movement in professional TESOL circles started gaining recognition in the 1990s (e.g., Medgyes's *The Non-Native Teacher* published in

1994) and grew exponentially in the late 1990s throughout the 2010s. The first colloquium on NNES professionals in TESOL organized by Braine at the 1996 TESOL Convention featured a number of prominent NNES scholars, including Ulla Connor, Suresh Canagarajah, and Jacinta Thomas. Two years later, the NNESs in TESOL Caucus was formed (headed by Braine), which evolved in 2008 into the NNES Interest Section with the goal to promote wider awareness of and research into NNES issues as well as fight discriminatory practices in the profession (Kamhi-Stein, 2016; also see Brady, 2018, for more on this history). Numerous publications have contributed to the movement, with a number of books and edited collections including Braine's 1999 *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching*, Lia D. Kamhi-Stein's 2004 *Learning and Teaching from Experience* and Llorca's 2005 *Non-Native Language Teachers*, Ahmar Mahboob's 2010 *NNES Lens*, and Bedrettin Yazan and Nathaniel Rudolph's (2018) *Criticality, Teacher Identity, and (In)Equity in English Language Teaching*—bringing together an impressive number of NNES and NES voices. As of 2015, Kamhi-Stein counted 356 publications on the topic, a number that had accelerated in recent years, with 32% of those appearing since 2010—she also noted that the *TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, published in 2018, would include an entire volume with 45 entries on NNEST issues.

Some of the earlier studies, like Péter Medgyes's (1994) *The Non-Native Teacher* or his earlier articles, focused on comparisons between NNES and NES teachers of English. Medgyes viewed NES and NNES as fundamentally different teachers, mostly on the basis of the differences in language proficiency, and investigated how these linguistic differences translated into differences in teaching practices and self-perceptions. However, an important strand of NNES research focused not on the perceived differences between NES and NNES teachers but rather on dismantling the artificially constructed divides between the two groups. Publications like Robert Phillipson's (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism*, Alastair Pennycook's (1994) *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*, Henry G. Widdowson's (1994) "The Ownership of English" (1994) and Cook's (1999) "Going Beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching" paved the way for many researchers to question the privileged status of English varieties from what Braj Kachru (1986) called the "inner circle" or "center" English speaking countries (the UK, the US, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada) and the privileged status of the teachers who claim these varieties of English as their native language.

Phillipson (1992) coined the term "native speaker fallacy" and traced its origins to a 1961 conference on TESOL held in Uganda where the status of NESs as superior teachers of English was widely legitimized. He also

demonstrated how upholding the native speaker teacher status helped the “center” countries to maintain control over the TESOL industry, as well as how native speaker fallacy was tied in with racial discrimination and the history of colonialism for languages such as English, French, Spanish, Russian, and Portuguese.

As touched on earlier, Cook (1999) demonstrated how various definitions of a native speaker contain a number of incidental characteristics such as complete knowledge of the language (far from all native speakers are completely competent in it) or belonging to a speech community (native speakers might want to disassociate themselves from the community of native speakers). The only unquestionable characteristic of a native speaker is that they speak the language learned first in childhood. Thus, the native speaker competence is by definition an unattainable goal for second language learners: “Adults could never become native speakers without being reborn” (Cook, 1999, p. 187). They can, however, attain native-like levels of proficiency in their second language and become indistinguishable from native speakers in their language use. Furthermore, Cook argued that a “native speaker” in traditional understanding is a monolingual speaker of that language; thus, comparisons between bilingual speakers or L2 learners and monolingual native speakers are inherently fallacious because the minds of these speakers are “qualitatively different” in a number of ways, including language and thought processing (1999, p. 191). Nonetheless, comparisons between NS and NNS persist in language learning pedagogy and have a negative effect on both students and NNS teachers as these comparisons are drawn not from the perspective of difference, as Cook argued, but from the viewpoint of deficit, whereby NNS are by default inferior to their NS counterparts. Multiple studies have pointed out that this deficit view is widespread in contexts across the globe and among English language learners, educational administrators and employers, and NNESTs themselves.

A number of studies looked into the ways prejudices against NNESTs teachers present employment challenges for these teachers. For instance, in Mahboob’s studies (2003 and 2004), the majority of Intensive English Program administrators in the US considered NES status to be an important factor in hiring ESL teachers. In EFL contexts, it has not been uncommon for many countries to hire ESL teachers on condition of holding an “inner circle” country citizenship or directly requiring native speaker status or native-like proficiency in teacher job ads (Lengeling & Pablo, 2012; Ramjattan, 2015; Ruecker & Ives, 2014; Selvi, 2010). Thanks to advocacy by NNESTs within TESOL, TESOL released the “Position Statement Against Discrimination of Nonnative Speakers of English in the Field of TESOL” in 2006,

which has led to a number of practices by the organization, including prohibiting native speaker requirements in hiring practices on its jobs listings and at its national convention. Members of the NNEST movement have also raised awareness of these issues via social media, encouraging members to contact employers practicing discriminatory practices in order to educate them about the problem of focusing on nativeness over other, more relevant qualifications (Ruecker & Ives, 2014).

Equally important, deficit discourses and native speakerism affect NNES teachers' self-perception and self-positioning. NNES teachers' self-perception became the central focus of a number of studies looking at teachers' perceived language skills and these perceptions' effect on teaching strategies and teachers' self-positioning in the classroom and in the ideological and political debates (e.g., Huang, 2018; Llorca & Huguet, 2003; Matsumoto, 2018; Reves & Medgyes, 1994; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). Medgyes (1994) was one of the first to point out that NNESTs suffer from a kind of inferiority complex as they often feel they cannot attain the same level of proficiency in English or have a native-like accent. Some publications presented NNESTs' autobiographical accounts of navigating academic writing in English and professionalization in the TESOL field, and some presented case studies of effective collaboration (e.g., Connor, 1999; de Oliveira & Lan, 2012; Liu, 2005). Other studies documented NNESTs' evolving identities and self-perception through a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods. For instance, participants in Keiko Samimy and Janina Brutt-Griffler's study (1999), NNES TESOL students, thought that NESs were more proficient users of the English language, but the participants also saw benefits in their knowledge of students' L1 and appreciated EFL contexts more than ESL ones where their competence was more likely to be questioned. Participants in Sibel Tatar and Senem Yildiz's (2010) study in Turkey recognized a variety of strengths of NNESTs, including their ability to draw on shared culture and language, their experiences as a language learner, and their ability to manage the classroom better. Overall, investigations of NNESTs' self-perceptions have painted a complicated picture where NNESTs' sense of confidence is shaped by a number of factors including previous education and exposure to the U.S. higher education, their race, and their students' backgrounds.

Some scholars have documented student perceptions of NNESTs (Amin, 1997; Aslan & Bailey, 1983; Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Lipovsky & Mahboob, 2010; Ma, 2012; Pacek, 2005; Rubin, 1992; Timmis, 2002; Thompson, 2017). Donald Rubin (1992) found that race/ethnicity and language are often conflated by listeners when they played a recording for undergraduate students accompanied by a picture of an Asian instructor and a Caucasian instructor—

comprehension levels dropped when the recording was accompanied by the picture of the Asian instructor. While earlier work (e.g., Timmis, 2002) found that students generally held negative attitudes towards NNESTs, more recent work has indicated more balanced attitudes. Lai Ping Florence Ma (2012) found that the 30 secondary students she interviewed in Hong Kong saw unique advantages to having both NNES and NES teachers. For instance, a number of students said that NNES teachers benefited from knowing and using students' L1, better understood student needs and challenges as language learners, and were more easily understood. On the other hand, NES teachers were praised for having good English proficiency, having a more relaxed classroom, and motivating presence which facilitated learning. Studies in English as a second language (ESL) contexts (as opposed to English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts) have also found more balanced student attitudes. In a study of 19 Japanese students in the US, Caroline Lipovsky and Mahboob (2010) found that students appreciated the complementary knowledge and abilities of their NNESTs and NESTs. Elsewhere in the US, Erhan Aslan and Amy Thompson (2017) found in a survey of 76 ESL students that what respondents "seem to be paying attention to the most is the professional and personal qualities of their teachers rather than their native/nonnative status" (p. 289).

Linguistic Diversity in Writing Studies

Despite this robust body of literature on the experiences and challenges of NNES teachers of English in TESOL and applied linguistics, writing studies overall has yet to recognize and explore the full scale of implications of linguistic diversity among writing instructors in the US, partly due to the complicated history of linguistic pluralism in the field. Bruce Horner and John Trimbur (2002) argued that postsecondary writing instruction in the US has been historically shaped by a "tacit language policy of unidirectional English monolingualism" (p. 594) as writing instruction in English came to replace, in the late nineteenth century, the classical curriculum of Latin and Greek. While other historians of composition (e.g., Crowley, 1998; Miller, 1991) pointed to the policing and elitist motives that facilitated the establishment of college composition, Horner and Trimbur showed how at the birth of composition, English was severed from other modern languages into its own entity, assuming the role of the only language of writing. The special place assigned to English also helped solidify the "social identity of U.S. Americans as English speakers" (Horner & Trimbur, 2002, p. 607). While the United States today is no less multilingual and multicultural than it was in the late nineteenth and early

twentieth centuries, the same reified notions of language and nationality and monolingual culture are evident today in many English-only policies and arguments and, as Horner and Trimbur maintained, in writing studies at large when language learning is commonly portrayed as moving unidirectionally towards a monolingual native speaker ideal.

Writing studies' attempts to acknowledge and account for the linguistic diversity in composition classrooms and in the wider U.S. social landscape are most visible in the publication of the CCCC 1974 resolution "Students' Rights to Their Own Language" (*SRTOL*). The resolution was developed in response to the changing student demographics, growing Civil Rights and other political movements in and outside of academia, and the efforts of researchers like James Sledd (1969) or Geneva Smitherman (1977; 1995) who strove for acknowledgement of the legitimacy of English dialects commonly deemed substandard. *SRTOL* maintained that all students, regardless of their socioeconomic or racial background, had the right to "their own patterns and varieties of language—the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style."

Perhaps in response to visible changes in student demographics and also in the field's growing embrace of anti-racism, issues of language diversity have been more prominent in the composition circles for the last decade with the advent of translingual approach. Following earlier work by Canagarajah (2006), Horner and his co-authors (2011) published their influential opinion piece "Language Difference in Writing: Towards a Translingual Approach," which was signed by fifty composition and second language writing scholars. Drawing on *SRTOL* among other resources, "Language Difference in Writing" called for a paradigm shift in writing studies, urging its researchers and practitioners to see "difference in language not as a barrier or as a problem to manage, but as a resource for producing meaning in writing, speaking, reading, and listening" (2011, p. 303). Rejecting the myth of a fixed, universally accepted entity called "standard English," the authors offered a number of propositions focused on accepting and promoting multiple languages and dialects in the composition classroom and beyond—propositions that have been explored and expanded in numerous publications since then, including Horner and Tetreault's more recent edited collection (2017) on translingual pedagogies and writing programs.

Working from a different perspective, Shawna Shapiro proposed another framework for approaching language differences in the writing classroom in her more recent book on critical language awareness (2022), calling for more explicit attention to the "power dynamics in and around language variation and use" (Shapiro & Leonard, 2023, p. 3). Shapiro's work actively seeks to offer

concrete and practical ways for enacting linguistic justice in the language or writing classroom; similarly, more pedagogy-oriented suggestions appeared in another recent collection (Losey & Shuck, 2021) that brought together scholars working at the intersection of writing and second language acquisition studies.

Nonetheless, as scholars have increasingly turned their attention to supporting linguistically diverse students, the “disciplinary division of labor” (Matsuda, 1999), a gap between writing studies and TESOL, has largely remained (Atkinson et al., 2015). Scholars such as Christine Tardy (2017) continue to call for truer inter/transdisciplinary scholarship, arguing that much of the work on language diversity in writing studies ignores decades of work in other fields. Because of this persisting divide and the predominantly white English L1 speaking field’s traditional aversion to discussing issues of difference (Garcia de Müller & Ruiz, 2017), it is unsurprising that writing studies’ focus on language diversity has remained narrowly focused on students and that the dominant image of composition instructor as a white, monolingual English speaker has also remained widely unchallenged. As we will discuss in the next section, scholars in applied linguistics and TESOL have long explored and challenged the prejudice, linguistic and otherwise, faced by teachers in their profession. Within writing studies, the history of this work is comparatively brief. A number of writing studies scholars have explored the prejudices scholars of color have faced during their graduate studies and advancing in their career (e.g., Martinez, 2014; Royster & Williams, 1999; Villanueva, 1993). We have found the use of counterstory and counterspaces (Martinez, 2014; Yosso et al., 2009) especially productive in addressing the marginalized status of NNESTs in writing studies, arguing the importance of creating a “community of people with shared experiences and thus a greater opportunity to create counterspaces where they can safely share each other’s experiences and create counterstories in marginalizing environments” (Ruecker et al., 2018, p. 636). Also, as evident from the recommendations of many authors in the present collection, NNESTs in writing studies have found the implementation of translanguaging approaches in writing programs as a way to promote discussions about linguistic difference that challenge student beliefs of NESTs as ideal writing teachers.

In one of the earliest publications focused specifically on NNES teachers of writing, Liu (2005) explored the challenges and coping strategies of four international TAs from China teaching first-year writing (FYW) at a Southwestern U.S. university. He described the surprise and self-doubt the TAs experienced upon learning about their teaching assignments and the challenges they faced in their classrooms that stemmed from NES students’ resistance towards instructors “who are not even American” as well as “such factors as

different sets of cultural expectations for teachers and learners, intercultural miscommunication and misunderstanding, and disjuncture in teaching and learning styles” (2005, p. 173). Around the same time, Kevin DePew (2006) shared a single case study of a Chinese international teaching assistant (ITA) of FYW—while a large number of students in the class faulted the teacher’s spoken accent, they valued the teacher’s ability to convey instructions clearly via writing. DePew (2006) concluded the chapter by pointing to the outdated focus on oral training for ITAs, calling for more robust training in writing. In our more recent study (Ruecker et al., 2018), we surveyed and interviewed a much larger sample of NNES writing instructors and found that while NNES instructors tended to feel more confident compared to the participants in Liu’s (2005) study, many of them still faced microaggressions and negative bias from students and sometimes colleagues. We urged writing programs to provide sufficient support for their NNES instructors in the form of pedagogical and community support as well as a stronger focus on language diversity at the programmatic level.

With the increased attention to linguistic pluralism within writing studies in the last decade, the field can benefit from engaging the multiple resources and literacies brought by the NNES members of the profession. As Jun Liu phrased it in his 2005 piece, having NNES teachers of writing in North America “is encouraging as it creates opportunities for intercultural communication, and enhancement of the globalization of English” (p. 173). Yet, some NNES professionals, like Monika Shehi (2017), pointed out that while these writing instructors are uniquely positioned to advocate for marginalized varieties of English and challenge the privileged positioning of Standardized U.S. English (commonly referred to as Standard American English, SAE), in doing so they risk losing their hard-earned positions as language and writing experts in front of their NES students. As Shehi (2017) put it,

students can be frustrated in a class where SAE is not privileged, particularly if they believe that the reason the privilege of SAE is challenged is to accommodate “foreign” instructors whose language skills they believe to be inferior to their own and a sign that the instructors have not succeeded in achieving native-like proficiency. (p. 267)

As this passage confirms, the problem of students’ negative attitudes towards language diversity and NNESTs remains one of the central challenges in NNESTs’ professional lives. This collection draws attention to these attitudes and explores strategies NNESTs and writing programs can adopt to address them.

Across different fields, there have been multiple efforts to mitigate the challenges NNESTs face. One major shift, building on related work in world Englishes and English as a lingua franca scholarship, has been increased scholarship on English as an international language (EIL). EIL recognizes that English has become a global language that is not linked to a particular culture or social context, unlike a language such as Czech or Korean. Along those lines, any student of English should work on building intercultural competence so that they can use English in a variety of social contexts (McKay, 2018). Similarly, English teachers should be prepared to teach EIL, which has been the subject of another edited collection (Matsuda, 2017). One possibility is the development of a Global English course for teachers in training as described by Ali Faud Selvi (2017). This course helps future teachers recognize the diversity of English users, challenges native speaker privilege in ELT, and “problematizes the ownership of English” (p. 118). While not all programs may have a separate course in this area, they can also infuse these ideas and topics throughout teacher training programs.

Elsewhere, scholars have stressed the importance of helping students recognize the unique linguistic, cultural, and societal knowledge and contributions that NNESTs bring while also taking steps to boost students’ ability to understand speakers of EIL (Aslan & Thompson, 2017; Bailey, 1983; Kang & Rubin, 2012; Timmis, 2002). For instance, in a very early study of student perceptions of ITAs at U.S. universities, Kathleen Bailey (1983) suggested student training in the form of “programs designed to help underclassmen deal with the diversity of people to be encountered in higher education” (310). Similarly, Aslan and Thompson (2017) emphasized the importance of raising students’ awareness about the processes involved in language learning and the need to deemphasize and problematize labels like “native” and “nonnative” for students. Some, like Okim Kang and Donald Rubin (2012), have developed programs to boost students’ comprehension of NNESTs.

Several scholars have provided focused recommendations to support NNEST ITAs that are particularly relevant to the discussions in the present collection—these were especially present in a special 2012 issue of the *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* focused on supporting NNEST ITAs. A number of scholars in this issue and elsewhere have emphasized the importance of group or individualized mentoring opportunities for new ITAs (de Oliveira & Lan, 2012; DePew, 2006; Liu, 2005; Reis, 2012). For instance, Davi S. Reis (2012) has argued for the need of “meditational means and spaces both to externalize [NNESTs] everyday conceptualizations and, potentially, to internalize the available scientific knowledge and discourses about these concepts,” noting that it is “essential that NNESTs working in various higher education

institutions have a space where linguistic and cultural legitimacy issues can be acknowledged, expressed, and deconstructed by peers and supervisors” (p. 52). In a different form of mentoring, Liu (2005) suggested that new GTAs spend their first semester taking a teaching seminar and observing the classes they are to teach but hold off on teaching until at least their second semester.

Limited research into the experiences of NNES professionals teaching writing has begun to explore the multiple challenges these instructors face due to their NNES status, but this research has remained scant compared to the robust body of publications on NNEST issues in other fields. This may stem in part due to writing studies’ history of being a U.S.-based field dominated by monolingual White scholars, compared to a field like TESOL, which has long been international and, by its very nature, included a large number of multilingual professionals. This separation means that a growing population of NNES writing teachers continue to face challenges and discrimination that remain largely unacknowledged in their workplaces and underexplored in research, even as the field has increasingly turned its eye to creating inclusive learning environments for multilingual students. Indeed, some of the chapters in this collection report on prejudices and challenges the authors faced that are dishearteningly similar to the ones described in much earlier literature within the NNEST movement in TESOL. Recently, there have been attempts to change the status quo with a few publications in well-known venues (e.g., Ruecker et al., 2018; Shehi, 2017; Youssef, 2023) and the establishment of the NNES Writing Instructors standing group at the 2015 Conference on College Composition and Communication. This growing group of NNES educators seeks to increase awareness of NNES writing instructors’ presence and challenges across U.S. institutions and advocates for these instructors’ rights in the face of possible bias and discrimination. However, more efforts are necessary to shift the discipline’s attention towards its NNES members and support further research into the challenges they face and the resources they bring to the profession. This collection provides a better understanding of the experiences of NNESTs of writing and suggests multiple ways to promote programmatic and institutional change towards more equitable working conditions.

Collection Overview

This collection is the first publication of its kind situated within writing studies. Just as writing studies as a field has been historically U.S.-based, this collection focuses on the experiences of NNES teachers of writing working in the United States, where the majority of the authors of this collection teach and conduct research.

The themes of the chapters that follow often overlap and support each other; the thematic trajectory of the volume overall shifts the focus from the level of the individual to the communal and institutional issues. While the first few chapters explore NNES teacher identity in relation to issues of professionalization and growth, chapters in the middle of the collection focus more on student perceptions and teacher-student interactions. The last few chapters explore programmatic and institutional contexts and suggest ways writing programs can build support for NNES instructors' professional development. The chapters in this volume represent a variety of voices—from NNESs of diverse backgrounds to NESs and from established professors to relative newcomers in the profession, as well as a variety of methodological approaches ranging from mixed-methods research to autobiographical narratives and narrative inquiries.

In Chapter 2, Marcela Hebbard offers a look at teacher identity as she traces the professional identity construction of five NNES writing instructors over the course of two years. Drawing on Martha Pennington's (2002) identity framework as well as notions of subjectivity (Alsup, 2006), Hebbard's exploration focuses on three areas: the impact of previous educational experiences, the importance of social support when integrating into a new academic community, and the impact of rank and disciplinary divisions. In concluding comments, she makes recommendations for WPAs and the field more broadly, such as the importance of integrating the perspectives of NNESTs in mainstream research literature and recognizing NNESTs' potential as transnational literacy brokers in writing programs and classrooms.

Next, in Chapter 3, Su Yin Khor, Cristina Sánchez-Martín, Lisy Seloni, Mijan Rahman, and Demet Yigitbilek use collaborative narrative inquiry to demonstrate how the institutional ecologies influence NNES instructors' multilayered identities. The five authors, who are at different stages in their academic careers, use identities-as-pedagogy framework (Motha et al., 2012) to demonstrate how writing programs can use NNES instructors' identities as resources in building translanguaging spaces at their institutions. The chapter also contributes to the studies on language learner identity that interrogate the interconnections between identity formation and institutional ecologies.

In the next chapter, "Nonnative Teacher of Writing Navigating Multiple Forms of Student Resistance," Nabila Hijazi, a Muslim NNES female instructor, describes her experiences as a "double minority" in U.S. academic culture. While some researchers have argued that NNES instructors are uniquely positioned to facilitate the recent turn towards "translingual dispositions" in writing studies as they possess heightened metalinguistic awareness and multifaceted rhetorical competence (Canagarajah, 2011; Horner et al.,

2011; Lee & Jenks, 2016; Lu & Horner, 2013), Hijazi's reflective study provides a useful, practice-oriented look at how NNEST instructors can make their identity central in a pedagogy that seeks to question many of our students' preconceived notions about language, identity, and related power dynamics. In closing, she makes a strong argument for the increased use of reflective practice in writing studies as a teacher development tool while also describing ways that NNESTs can claim their authority as writing teachers.

In Chapter 5, Mariya Tseptsura reports the results of a year-long auto-ethnographic study that followed critical reflective inquiry approach and used a combination of classroom video recordings and reflective teaching journals. Tseptsura argues for the benefits of adopting this method for professional development for NNESTs on a wider scale. In her case, the results of the study highlight the challenges NNESTs face in constructing a legitimate professional authority (Pace & Hemmings, 2007) in the classroom and draw attention to how the limited types of authority available to NNESTs might exacerbate already existing conflicts between different cultural and ideological stances international teachers have to navigate.

The next chapter also addresses the question of teacher authority: the authors, Aleksandra Kasztalska and Michael Maune, apply Karl Maton's (2014) legitimation code theory to analyze professionalization paths of fifteen international NNEST TAs teaching composition. Kasztalska and Maune's data suggest that within composition community, legitimation is often based on members' attributes (like being born a NES) and not on specialized knowledge. The authors also argue that to support ITAs and successfully challenge the native speaker fallacy, writing programs need to reframe composition as a knowledge code in which legitimacy and authority are based on learned skills and knowledge.

Chapter 7 shifts focus onto students' perceptions of their NNEST instructors. Lan Wang-Hiles opens by describing the biases she faced as a foreign-born NNEST when taking over writing classes full of NESs mid-semester. This experience led to a mixed-methods study in which Wang-Hiles surveyed 71 of her students over the course of three semesters to investigate their acceptance levels of her linguistic and rhetorical skills, teaching styles and methods, and personal and cultural factors (following the design in Mahboob, 2004). Wang-Hiles explores the range of student attitudes towards her status as an NNEST, from skepticism to appreciation. In addition to pedagogical recommendations for NNESTs, she calls for a joint effort by institutions, writing programs, and writing instructors to help make students aware that English is not the sole exclusive domain of native English speakers.

While a number of studies discussed above focused on students' perceptions of their NNES instructors, Wen Xin adopts a different angle in Chapter 8 and uses corpus analysis to explore NNES and NES instructors' perceptions of their students. Following Ken Hyland's (2005) conceptualization of metadiscourse, Xin analyzes instructors' written comments on their students' papers to shed light on instructors' relationships with students, their self-positioning in the classroom, and how NESTs and NNESTs may comment differently on their students' writing. In discussing the differences between NES and NNES instructors' comments, Xin offers suggestions for training and professional development programs, such as workshops that help NNES teachers comment more effectively on student writing while also developing strategies to deal with student resistance to their feedback.

In Chapter 9, Tamara Mae Roose, Min-Seok Choi, and Christopher E. Manion seek to reframe the familiar narratives of international teaching assistants (ITAs) struggling with teaching at U.S. universities. Drawing on interviews with three ITAs of writing, the authors analyzed how their participants responded to instances of uncertainty (defined as value-neutral moments where the lack of prior knowledge makes it difficult to predict the outcomes of a situation) and constructed them as opportunities for growth rather than obstacles to their professional success. In closing, they argue that WPAs should work to create spaces in which ITAs and TAs can share their lived experiences of teaching rather than rely on formal training; they also make recommendations for how ITAs can draw on their experience living and working in different cultures as an asset in their programs and classrooms.

In Chapter 10, Xin Chen explores the relationship between identity and professional development as she traces the evolution of teacher identity of six NNES teaching assistants who were teaching ESL academic writing and courses on their first language at the same time. Chen shows how teaching their first language and forming multiple peer support groups facilitated the NNES instructors' introduction into the new discourse community and profession. Chen concludes by emphasizing the importance of a focus on critical pedagogy and cross-cultural competence in classes and programs focused on writing teacher development for both NNESTs and NESTs while joining other authors in calling for increased collaboration among teachers.

In Chapter 11, Melinda Reichelt shares her perspective and expertise as a NES WPA who has trained both NES and NNES novice teachers to teach ESL writing for more than 17 years. Reichelt makes a number of recommendations to writing programs, including expanding TA preparation curriculum to focus explicitly on teaching L2 writing, fostering equality between NES and NNES teachers, and providing in-depth training on issues of language diver-

sity. The chapter offers a detailed account of successful teacher training course designs and mentorship programs that followed such recommendations.

In Chapter 12, Anastasiia Kryzhanivska and Tetyana Bychkovska draw on their experiences developing their teacher identities during graduate studies and in their subsequent experiences teaching at different universities. In the form of a reflective narrative, they detail the experiences that contributed to their sense of confidence and preparedness for teaching academic writing, focusing in particular on the following: pre-service training, tutoring writing and training tutors, observing other teachers, collaboration and mentoring, gaining experience in the classroom, and additional professional development.

Finally, in the Afterword, we offer some reflections on the labor that went into the publication of this collection and what this long process has taught us about the current state of our field.

References

- Alsop, J. (2005). *Teacher identity discourses: Negotiating personal and professional spaces*. Routledge.
- Amin, N. (1997). Race and the identity of the nonnative ESL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 580-583. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587841>
- Aslan, E., & Thompson, A. S. (2017). Are they really “two different species”? Implicitly elicited student perceptions about NESTs and NNESTs. *TESOL Journal*, 8(2), 277-294. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.268>
- Atkinson, D., Crusan, D., Matsuda, P. K., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., Ruecker, T., Simpson, S., & Tardy, C. (2015). Clarifying the relationship between L2 writing and translanguaging writing: An open letter to writing studies editors and organization leaders. *College English*, 77(4), 383-386.
- Bailey, K. (1983). Foreign teaching assistants at U.S. universities: Problems in interaction and communication. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 308-310. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586658>
- Benke, E., & Medgyes, P. (2005). Differences in teaching behaviour between native and non-native speaker teachers: As seen by the learners. In E. Llorca (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers* (pp. 195-215). Springer.
- Brady, B. (2018). NNEST Caucus/Interest Section of the TESOL International Association. *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0036>
- Braine, G. (1999). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brutt-Griffler, J., & Samimy, K. K. (2001). Transcending the nativeness paradigm. *World Englishes*, 20(1), 99-106. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00199>
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). The place of World Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, 57(4), 586-619. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20456910>

- Canagarajah, A. S. (Ed.). (2013). *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms*. Routledge.
- Connor, U. (1999). Learning to write academic prose in a second language: A literacy autobiography. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 29-42). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587717>
- Crowley, S. (1998). *Composition in the university: Historical and polemical essays*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Davies, A. (1991). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- de Oliveira, L., & Lan, S. (2012). Preparing nonnative English-speaking (NNES) graduate students for teaching in higher education: A mentoring case study. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 23(3), 59-76.
- DePew, K. E. (2006). Different writers, different writing: Preparing international teaching assistants for instructional literacy. In P. K. Matsuda, C. Ortmeier-Hooper, & X. You (Eds.), *The politics of second language writing* (pp. 168-187). Parlor Press.
- Garcia de Müeller, G. I., & Ruiz, I. D. (2017). Race, silence, and writing program administration: A qualitative study of U.S. college writing programs. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 40(3), 19-39.
- Horner, B., Lu, M., Royster, J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English*, 73(3), 303-321. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25790477>
- Horner, B., & Tetreault, L. (Eds.). (2017). *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs*. University Press of Colorado.
- Horner, B., & Trimbur, J. (2002). English only and U.S. college composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 53(4), 594-630. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1512118>
- Huang, I. (2018). Power and ownership within the NS/NNS dichotomy. In B. Yazan & N. Rudolph (Eds.), *Criticality, teacher identity, and (in) equity in English language teaching* (pp. 41-56). Springer.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Continuum.
- Kachru, B. (1986). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes*. Pergamon.
- Kamhi-Stein, L. (2004). *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals*. University of Michigan Press.
- Kamhi-Stein, L. D. (2016). The non-native English speaker teachers in TESOL movement. *ELT Journal*, 70(2), 180-189. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv076>
- Kang, O., & Rubin, D. L. (2012). Intergroup contact exercises as a tool for mitigating undergraduates' attitudes toward nonnative English-speaking teaching assistants. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 23(3), 159-166.
- Kramsch, C. (1997). The privilege of the nonnative speaker. *PMLA*, 112(3), 359-369.
- Lee, J., & Jenks, C. (2016). Doing translingual dispositions. *College Composition and Communication*, 68(2), 317-344. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44783564>

- Lengeling, M., & Pablo, I. M. (2012). A critical discourse analysis of advertisements: Inconsistencies of our EFL profession. In R. Roux (Ed.), *Research in English language teaching: Mexican perspectives* (pp. 91-105). West Bow Press.
- 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). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Liu, J. (2005). Chinese graduate teaching assistants teaching freshman composition to native English-speaking students. In Llorca, E. (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 155-177). Springer.
- Llorca, E., & Huguet, N. (2003). Self-awareness in NNS EFL primary and secondary school teachers. *Language Awareness*, 12(3-4), 220-233.
- Losey, K., & Shuck, G. (Eds.). (2021). *Plurilingual pedagogies for multilingual writing classrooms*. Taylor and Francis.
- Lu, M.-Z., & Horner, B. (2013). Translingual literacy, language difference, and matters of agency. *College English*, 75(6), 582-607.
- Ma, L.P. F. (2012). Advantages and disadvantages of native- and nonnative-English-speaking teachers: Student perceptions in Hong Kong. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(2), 280-305. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.21>
- Mahboob, A. (2003). *Status of nonnative English-speaking teachers in the United States* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Mahboob, A. (2004). Native or non-native? What do students enrolled in an intensive English program think? In Kamhi-Stein, L. (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals* (pp. 121-148). University of Michigan Press.
- Mahboob, A. (2010). *The NNEST lens: Non-native English speakers in TESOL*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Martinez, A, Y. (2014). A plea for critical race theory counterstory: Stock story versus counterstory dialogues concerning Alejandra's "fit" in the academy. *Composition Studies*, 42(2), 33-55. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43501855>
- Matsuda, A. (Ed.). (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language*. Multilingual Matters.
- Matsuda, P. K. (1999). Composition studies and ESL writing: A disciplinary division of labor. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(4), 699-721. <https://doi.org/10.2307/358488>
- Matsumoto Y. (2018). Teachers' identities as "non-native" speakers: Do they matter in English as a lingua franca interactions?. In B. Yazan & N. Rudolph (Eds.), *Criticality, teacher identity, and (in) equity in English language teaching* (pp. 57-79). Springer https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72920-6_4
- McKay, S. L. (2018). English as an international language: What it is and what it means for pedagogy. *RELC Journal*, 49(1), 9-23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217738817>
- Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. Macmillan.
- Miller, S. (1991). *Textual carnivals: The politics of composition*. Southern Illinois University Press.

- Motha, S., Jain, R., & Teclé, T. (2012). Translinguistic identity-as-pedagogy: Implications for language teacher education. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language Teaching and Research*, 1(1), 13-28.
- Moussu, L., & Llorca, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching*, 41(3), 315-348. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005028>
- Pace, J. L., & Hemmings, A. (2007). Understanding authority in classrooms: A review of theory, ideology, and research. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 4-27. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298489>
- Pacek, D. (2005). "Personality not nationality": Foreign students' perceptions of a non-native 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). Springer.
- Pennington, M. C. (2002, October 18). *Teacher identity in TESOL* [Paper presented]. Quality in Teacher Education Seminar, London, UK.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Longman.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Ramjattan, V. A. (2015). Lacking the right aesthetic: Everyday employment discrimination in Toronto private language schools. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 34(8), 692-704. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-03-2015-0018>
- Reis, D. S. (2012). "Being underdog": Supporting nonnative English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) in claiming and asserting professional legitimacy. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 23(3).
- Reves, T., & Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teacher's self image: An international survey. *System*, 22(3), 353-357.
- Rose, S., & Weiser, I. (Eds.). (2018). *The internationalization of U.S. writing programs*. Utah State University Press.
- Royster, J., & Williams, J. (1999). History in the spaces left: African American presence and narratives of composition studies. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(4), 563-584. <https://doi.org/10.2307/358481>
- Rubin, D. L. (1992). Nonlanguage factors affecting undergraduates' judgments of nonnative English-speaking teaching assistants. *Research in Higher Education*, 33(4), 511-531. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00973770>
- Ruecker, T., Frazier, S., & Tseptsura, M. (2018). "Language difference can be an asset": Exploring the experiences of nonnative English-speaking teachers of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 69(4), 612-641. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44870978>
- Ruecker, T., & Ives, L. (2014). White native English speakers needed: The rhetorical construction of privilege in online teacher recruitment spaces. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(4), 733-756. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.195>
- Samimy, R., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). To be a native or nonnative speaker: Perceptions of "nonnative" students in a graduate TESOL program. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Nonnative educators in English language teaching* (pp. 127-144). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- 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.
- Selvi, A. F. (2017). Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language: Effections from northern Cyprus. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language* (pp. 114-128). Multilingual Matters.
- Shapiro, S. (2022). *Cultivating critical language awareness in the writing classroom*. Routledge.
- Shapiro, S., & Leonard, R. L. (2023). Introduction to the special issue: Critical Language Awareness (CLA) as a lens for looking backward, outward, and forward in Second Language Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 60.
- Shehi, M. (2017). Why is my English teacher a foreigner? Re-authoring the story of international composition teachers. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 44(3), 260-275.
- Sledd, J. (1969). Bi-dialectalism: The linguistics of White supremacy. *English Journal*, 58(9), 1307-1315. <https://doi.org/10.2307/811913>
- Smitherman, G. (1977). *Talkin and testifyin: The language of Black America*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Smitherman, G. (1995). "Students' right to their own language": A retrospective. *The English Journal*, 84(1), 21-27. <https://doi.org/10.2307/820470>
- Tardy, C. M. (2017). Crossing, or creating divides? A plea for transdisciplinary scholarship. In B. Horner & L. Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing divides: Exploring translanguaging pedagogies and programs* (pp. 181-189). Utah State University Press.
- Tatar, S., & Yildiz, 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). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- TESOL (2006). Position statement against discrimination of Nonnative speakers of English in the field of TESOL. <https://www.tesol.org/media/d2gfeisk/position-statement-against-nnest-discrimination-march-2006-1.pdf>
- 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. 5-14). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and international English: A classroom view. *ELT Journal*, 56(3), 240-249.
- Villanueva Jr., V. (1993). *Bootstraps: From an American academic of color*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Widdowson, H. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377-389. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587438>
- Yazan, B., & Rudolph, N. (Eds.). (2018). *Criticality, teacher identity, and (in)equality in English language teaching*. Springer.
- Yosso, T., Smith, W., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. (2009). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate for Latina/o undergraduates. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(4), 659-691. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.79.4.m6867014157m7071>

Youssef, S. (2023). International teaching assistants' needs and undergraduate native English-speaking students' expectations: Meaning negotiation as a rhetorical strategy. In W. J. Macauley, Jr., L. R. Anglesey, B. Edwards, K. M. Lambrecht, & P. K. Lovas (Eds.), *Threshold conscripts: Rhetoric and composition teaching assistantships* (pp. 239-266). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2023.1626>