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About twenty years ago when I left China for the US to pursue my doctorate in foreign and second language education at the Ohio State University, there was no doubt in my mind that I was a nonnative speaker of English, as I spoke quite differently from American people around me, and I knew that I needed to brush up my English at full speed in order to be accepted as an in-group member in the mainstream society. About ten years ago when I returned to China for the first time after a decade of living in the US, my former colleagues complimented me for my fluency in English, though they considered me as an advanced nonnative English speaker with obvious Chinese accent. When I was invited to lead an English Program in a university in China six years ago, I was asked to hire many foreign teachers in order to create an English speaking environment on campus, which I did. But some English teachers I hired were from Romania, Malaysia, Russia and Austria. Observations were made that some of these teachers I hired were not native English speakers, but their presence as foreign teachers with their diverse cultural backgrounds and varieties of English contributed immensely to the richness of the campus culture, and motivated many Chinese students to enhance their English skills and overall communicative competence. About three years ago, I expanded my research to the area of teaching Chinese as a second/foreign language, which allowed me opportunities to observe and reflect on learning and teaching experiences from the perspective of a native speaker. Many Chinese teachers I observed were vulnerable and insecure when they taught Chinese to foreigners, as they did not have the meta-language to explain to their students whenever “why” questions were asked. They were exhausted in using the excuses such as “That’s the way we say it”, or “This is an idiomatic expression”. Deep in my mind was I aware that being a native speaker of Chinese does not give a person any guarantee of being a competent Chinese teacher. Credibility needs to be earned, whether you are a native speaker or nonnative speaker of the language. Everyone is a native speaker of some language/s, but not everyone is a nonnative speaker of a language other than their mother tongue. Those who speak more than one language clearly have advantages over those monolinguals in teaching a second or foreign language because of the very experience of learning additional language/s. But the common
perception of native speaker superiority is still prevailing. Rather than breaking the divide, which will eventually happen as more and more people speak more than one language in the world, it is strategically right for us to dig deeper into this issue to bring more awareness to ourselves, being native or nonnative English-speaking teachers in TESOL. Because of this very reason, I am, with immense joy and pride as the first nonnative English speaking TESOL President in 2006, and co-founder of the NNEST Caucus in TESOL in 1998, pleased to recommend the volume “The NNEST Lens” put together by one of the pioneers in NNEST movement and past chair of NNEST Caucus, Dr. Ahmar Mahboob. In this volume, contributions range from the theoretical negotiation of identity, politics, and perceptions, to pedagogical discussion of teaching, teacher education, and strategies from both native and nonnative professionals’ perspectives. I commend Ahmar for his great effort in putting these pieces together, and more importantly, I congratulate him for bringing both native and nonnative English teaching professionals together in dialoguing on these issues. Such a collaborative effort marks the new beginning of the necessary discussion on the unnecessary divide in our profession.

—Jun Liu
Jan. 6, 2010
Tucson, Arizona, US
This book is not really about the non-native speakers of English or about the native speakers of English in TESOL. Discerning readers might find this an odd thing to write given the title and the contributions to the volume; but it is true. This book is not simply about NNESTs or NESTs; rather it is a step that moves the applied linguistics and TESOL profession in a direction where one’s mother tongue, culture, nationality, and race do not define one’s professional identity and position. This book takes this step by including chapters that discuss various strategies and approaches that can be adopted in diverse contexts to create a more equitable professional environment, and by inviting authors to reflect on the state of applied linguistics research and theory. These chapters raise important questions about the state of the field and make suggestions that challenge the underlying monolingual bias in the field that (invisibly) restrain new ideas, directions, and perspectives from blossoming. This book is therefore an invitation for us to imagine how the field can develop if we take the multilingual, multicultural, and multinational perspectives of an NNEST lens and reexamine our theories and practices.

In order to take this step, this book has flouted many conventions of academic publishing in applied linguistics and TESOL. While the quality of the papers included here was monitored and maintained through a rigorous double blind review process, this volume takes a different approach to editing. Given our belief in diversity and in World Englishes, the contributors to this volume were encouraged to maintain their unique linguistic identities. While I made some edits to enhance the clarity of the text at times, I refrained from making any changes that would neutralize the identity that the author(s) chose to project through their linguistic choices. Therefore, I have not edited the text for variation in spelling conventions or for the lexico-grammatical choices made by the authors. One other reason for not editing the contributions for language and style is that language, as I understand it, both represents and construes reality. The linguistic choices that authors make are important in how they view and construct an understanding of the field and of the world around them. Different language choices create different meanings and this diversity in our published work is part of the step that we are taking in examining our discipline through an NNEST lens. This has resulted in some shifts in style.
(and length) across the chapters included in the volume. These variations are consciously encouraged and I hope that they will add flavor to this volume and symbolize the value that NNESTs place in diversity.

—Ahmar Mahboob
January 10, 2010
City University of Hong Kong
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CHAPTER ONE

THE NNEST LENS

AHMAR MAHBOOB

Introduction

NNEST studies, as the chapters included in this book demonstrate, are not simply studies that look at issues of identity and politics of non-native English speakers in TESOL, but rather provide a powerful lens that can be used to study diverse topics of interest in applied linguistics and TESOL. The NNEST lens is a lens of multilingualism, multinationalism, and multiculturalism through which NNESTs — as classroom practitioners, researchers, and teacher educators — take diversity as a starting point, rather than as a result. The NNEST lens is multilingual because, by definition, NNESTs speak at least one language in addition to English. The NNEST lens is multinational because NNESTs come from different parts of the world and represent diverse ethnic, national, and racial origins. And, finally, the NNEST lens is multicultural because NNESTs coming from different national and geographic regions represent different ways of construing reality (through language). As a result of this, NNESTs cast a fresh gaze at issues of theoretical, professional, and practical interest in TESOL and applied linguistics, which have traditionally been plagued with a monolingual bias (Kachru, 1994).

The monolingual bias in TESOL and applied linguistics research resulted in practices of discrimination where non-native speakers of English were seen as life-long language learners, who fossilized at various stages of language learning as individuals and as communities (Selinker & Lakshmanan, 1992). The NNEST lens, on the other hand, takes language as a functional entity where successful use of language in context determines the proficiency of the speaker and where the English language reflects and construes different cultural perspectives and realities in different settings. As a result of this, NNESTs interpret and question language and language learning and teaching in new ways. The chapters
included in this volume illustrate this in different degrees and in different ways.

**Questioning the Privileging of Native Speakers**

Studies that focus on NNESTs have now been around for a while (e.g., Medgyes, 1986). However, early work on NNESTs compared NESTs and NNESTs and privileged the native speakers by noting that NNESTs lacked in comparison with them. For example, Medgyes (1986), in one of his earlier papers in which he discusses the problems with the communicative approach in an EFL setting, states:

> For all their goodwill, native speakers are basically unaware of the whole complexity of difficulties that non-native speakers have to tackle. Native-speaking teachers tend to ignore, among other things, the fact that a great proportion of the energy of their non-native colleagues is inevitably used up in the constant struggle with their own language deficiencies, leaving only a small fraction attending to their students’ problems. (p. 112)

Medgyes’ use of the term “language deficiencies” shows that he had fallen into the trap of the “comparative fallacy” (Bley-Vroman, 1983) or what has elsewhere been called the “deficit discourse” (Bhatt, 2002) or the “native speaker fallacy” (Phillipson, 1992). Furthermore, he is suggesting that one reason why the communicative approach fails in an EFL setting is that NNESTs have limited language proficiency and “struggle with their own language deficiencies”. This is a problematic critique of the communicative approach because it lays the responsibility of failing to use the approach on the teachers, and not on the approach itself. The problem with the communicative approach is not that the teachers in EFL contexts can’t use it (because of their language proficiency), but that the approach was not developed in or for EFL contexts and is therefore not inherently applicable there. The communicative approach was developed in an ESL context where the “expected” teachers were (monolingual?) native speakers of English and the goal of language teaching was for the learners to speak English like native speakers in English speaking contexts (for a more recent critique of the communicative approach, see Burns 2008). The literature on NNESTs has, over time, questioned this privileging of the native speakers and started to point out the unique contributions that NNESTs make to the profession (e.g., see Braine, 1999; Medgyes, 1992). This metamorphosis of work on NNESTs from being *native-speaker model dependent* to being *native-speaker model independent* is relatively recent, and the shift is far from complete.
The shift away from a “comparative fallacy”, a “deficit discourse”, or “the native speaker fallacy” has been a slow one for a number of reasons. One key factor contributing to the slowness of the move is that the privileging of native speakers is deeply seated in applied linguistics and TESOL literature and has become “invisible” and “axiomised” in the field. This invisibility is partly due to the borrowing of the notion of “ideal native speaker” from theoretical and descriptive linguistics and then using it uncritically in applied linguistics and TESOL research. While the notion of a native speaker intuition is relevant in descriptive linguistics where linguists are engaged in getting data from native speakers of a particular language in order to write a description (grammar) of that language, its use in applied linguistics and TESOL is counter-productive. The notion of a native speaker competency/intuition is counter-productive in TESOL and applied linguistics because it sets up abstract grammatical models derived from native-speaker informants as “real” non-varying models of language that all learners of the language need to use as the target of acquisition. This use of a “native speaker model” in applied linguistics can be examined by reviewing literature in Second Language Acquisition (SLA). One example of such use of native speaker model in early, but influential, research in SLA can be seen in Larry Selinker’s (1972, 1992) work that established theoretical concepts of “interlanguage” and “fossilization” in applied linguistics and which have had a continuing impact on the development of the field. Selinker’s theory of fossilization is grounded in the assumption that learners of a second language are unable to achieve “native” proficiency in a second language (as an example of current research using this terminology, see Kang, 2008). Implied in this theory is a journey in which second language learners begin with their L1, with an ultimate goal to achieve native-like proficiency in L2. At any given stage during this process of language learning, a learner’s language is labelled “interlanguage”. Selinker (1969) defines interlanguage as,

An 'interlanguage' may be linguistically described using as data the observable output resulting from a speaker's attempt to produce a foreign norm, i.e., both his errors and non-errors.

In addition to “interlanguage”, Selinker (1992) also introduces and defines the term “fossilization” as,

… the real phenomenon of the permanent non-learning of TL [target language] structures, of the cessation of IL [interlanguage] learning (in most cases) far from expected TL norms.
This definition of “fossilization” defines learners’ language in terms of their shortcomings in relation to native speaker (target language) norms. Selinker states that “fossilization” is the end result for most of the learners—implying that most language learners are unable to achieve “native proficiency” in their second language. This examination of the terms “interlanguage” and “fossilization” reveals a hidden ideology that privileges the native speaker. “Interlanguage” and “fossilization” imply that the goal of a second language learner is to be just like a native speaker and that if one does not achieve this goal then s/he has “fossilized” (see Bhatt, 2002 for a more extensive critique of Selinker). Kachru and Nelson (1996) also elaborate on the ideological loading of these terms, as well as on the terms “native” and “second language”. They state,

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)

Regardless of the ideological and attitudinal loading of these terms, they have gained currency not only in applied linguistics and TESOL but in other contexts as well. This can be measured by their inclusion in dictionaries such as the “Unabridged Random House Dictionary”, where these terms are defined as follows:

Interlanguage: “… the linguistic system characterizing the output of a nonnative speaker at any stage prior to full acquisition of the target language.” (p. 995)

Fossilization: “… to become permanently established in the interlanguage of a second-language learner in a form that is deviant from the target-language norm and that continues to appear in performance regardless of further exposure to the target language.” (p. 775)

As can be seen, these definitions also refer to the “acquisition of the target language” and “deviance from the target language” as measures of language proficiency and performance. The inclusion of these terms in reference dictionaries legitimizes a particular view of understanding language acquisition and adds authority to it. Selinker’s focus on the “target language” norm in the operational definitions of “interlanguage” and “fossilization” helped give authority to the native-speaker model in SLA and, by extension, in language teaching models. As a result of this, a
large proportion of research in second language acquisition evaluates learners in terms of how well they have acquired “native-speaker” norms. For example, in his the first edition of *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*, Ellis (1994) writes: “learners often failed initially to produce correct sentences and instead displayed language that was markedly deviant from target language norms” (p. 15). This description of learner language reflects Selinker’s position. Long’s (1981) stress on the role of native speakers in their ability to provide ideal language input is another example of the influence of the native speaker model in SLA. Long states, “participation in conversation with NS... is the necessary and sufficient condition for SLA” (p. 275). It needs to be acknowledged here that some of the current research in SLA has moved away from the comparative approach. For example, work using the socio-cultural approach, conversation analysis, and critical approaches to SLA focus more on language use than on achieving target-like competence. However, these approaches are not yet considered mainstream in SLA (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005).

Cook (1999), in his evaluation of the use of native speaker norms in SLA, argues that the native speaker model may have some use as a “temporary” measure but must not be used to measure final achievement.

An unknown object is often described in terms of one that is already known (Poulisse, 1996); someone who has never seen a tomato before might describe it as a rather soft apple with a large number of pips. But this description is no more than a temporary expedient until the individual has understood the unique properties of the object itself. The learner’s language is an unknown object, so SLA research can justifiably use native speakers’ language as one perspective on the language of L2 learners, provided it does not make native speakers’ language the measure of final achievement in the L2. (p. 190)

In addition to the description of learner language in terms of native norms, SLA research methodologies themselves seem to be influenced by this “comparative fallacy” (Bley-Vroman, 1983). A number of research methods used in early (and some current) second language acquisition studies, including grammaticality judgments, contrastive analysis, and error analysis, by definition, require a comparison of learner language to native speaker norms.

This importance of native speaker as being the model and native-like language being the goal of a language learner was not only restricted to theoretical research in SLA and applied linguistics, but was also carried
over into early research on teacher educators. In one such work, Stern (1983) states,

The native speaker’s ‘competence’ or ‘proficiency’ or ‘knowledge of the language’ is a necessary point of reference for the second language proficiency concept used in language teaching. (p. 341)

Taking this one step further, Sheorey (1986) argues that NNESTs also need to adopt the teaching practices and methods of NESTs. Sheorey writes,

… the study gives an indication of which errors are most irritating to native ESL teachers, a finding which we can use to bring our own error-evaluation practices in line with those of native teachers. I am assuming here that acquiring a native-like sensitivity to errors is a proper goal (however elusive it might be) for non-native ESL teachers, and that we should seek to adjust our error-evaluation practices accordingly. (p. 310)

The discussion in this section aims to show how assumptions related to native speaker competence contribute to a discourse that gives higher status to native speakers and portrays other speakers of English as lifelong learners. And, it is such discourses and associated myths that can be questioned and reassessed through an NNEST lens as demonstrated in the chapters included in this book.

**The NNEST Movement in Context**

The NNEST movement that created the space for questioning monolingual myths in TESOL and applied linguistics is relatively recent. The movement can be traced back to the 1996 TESOL Convention where George Braine organized a colloquium “In their own voices: Nonnative speaker professionals in TESOL” which resulted in a drive to set up the NNEST Caucus in the TESOL association. The NNEST Caucus was established in 1998 and in 2008 the NNEST Caucus became the NNEST Interest Section. The specific goals of the NNEST Caucus/Interest Section are:

- to create a non-discriminatory professional environment for all TESOL members regardless of native language and place of birth,
- to encourage the formal and informal gatherings of nonnative speakers at TESOL and affiliate conferences,
to encourage research and publications on the role of nonnative speaker teachers in ESL and EFL contexts, and
to promote the role of non-native speaker members in TESOL and affiliate leadership positions.

Two of these goals are related to the status and position of NNESTs within the field, and the other two have to do with issues of advocacy. Since its establishment, the Caucus/Interest Section has made significant contributions to achieve these goals, however, all is not yet well. There is ample evidence of discriminatory hiring and advertising practices against NNESTs around the world and more needs to be done to make TESOL an equitable profession. It is in this context that this book was conceptualized and edited: to question the monolingual bias in applied linguistics and TESOL by highlighting and demonstrating the importance of applying an NNEST lens to our current work and practices.

The NNEST movement is not an isolated movement. It evolved after, and in some ways in tandem with, other similar movements in applied linguistics. Two areas of scholarship that are most relevant here are “critical” applied linguistics and World Englishes. Work in critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1995) and critical applied linguistics (Pennycook, 1994, 2001) focused on issues of power, access, and equality and therefore were central to developing an awareness of issues of equality between NESTs and NNESTs. The critical turn in applied linguistics research showed how both the creation of knowledge in applied linguistics and the application of that knowledge in classrooms and other contexts privileges native speakers of English – as discussed earlier. This awareness led to a call for change within the field and supported research and scholarship on NNESTs.

The relationship between research on World Englishes and NNESTs is perhaps less direct, but equally important. One key aspect that reflects the complementary goals and ideas of the two movements is that both research on World Englishes and NNEST aim to legitimize and empower non-Anglo users of English: World Englishes by describing and legitimizing different dialects/varieties of English, and the NNEST by recognizing the contributions of NNESTs to the field. There are at least three areas in which the two academic communities share a common purpose: a) they point out that there is no one “standard” English language, b) they argue that being a native speaker of a standard “inner circle” variety of English is not sufficient to be a successful English language teacher, and c) they suggest that language learning and teaching are culturally situated practices and there is no single language
teaching/learning approach that is appropriate in all contexts/situations. We will consider each of these three dimensions in turn.

The first thing that needs to be considered is that English is spoken and written differently by people in various parts of the world – this is true for both monolingual and bi/multi-lingual speakers of English. Language variation is a natural phenomenon and is observed in most languages of the world – not only English. In monolingual English-speaking communities (NESTs), these variations are described as dialect variations, e.g., New York accent vs. Southern accents, or London accent vs. Scottish accent; however, in the past, the variations in English used by bi/multi-lingual speakers of English (whose mother tongue is not English, i.e. NNESTs) were seen as mistakes and errors that needed to be corrected (Kachru, 1992). The World Englishes movement challenged such thinking and questioned linguists who argued for a single Anglo-based “norm/standard” for the English language. Researchers working on World Englishes point out that given the historical and linguistic processes involved in the spread of English, English is seen as one of the local languages in many parts of the world (e.g., Ghana, India, Nigeria, Philippines, Pakistan, and Singapore) and is given official status and recognition in the language policies of these countries. These processes of localization, experts on World Englishes illustrate, have given a local texture to the English language and have resulted in “indigenized” varieties of the language with local norms of use. As such, these varieties cannot and should not be judged in relation to the Anglo (inner circle) Englishes. The NNEST movement, in many ways, builds on this understanding of English. Experts working in this area understand the processes of indigenization of English and how it is used, learnt, and taught through localized approaches and practices. This understanding of English having multiple standards and forms leads to the second point of similarity: speaking “native” or “standard” varieties of English is not in itself sufficient for being good language teachers.

Experts working on NNEST issues and World Englishes agree that being a native speaker of a standard “inner circle” variety of English is not sufficient to be a successful English language teacher. Members of both communities have argued that expertise and training is essential for becoming a successful teacher. It needs to be pointed out here that neither the NNEST movement nor the World Englishes movement recommends a laissez faire approach to language teaching where anything goes. Members of these communities recognize, perhaps more than others, the importance of “standard” English and the power that the use of higher valued accents carries with it; however, they do not see the need to have
“native” or “native-like” proficiency in the English language in order to be a language expert or teacher. They take a more functional approach in relation to the target of language that needs to be acquired and are more interested in teachers’ teaching skills and credential than the dialect that they speak.

The third point of similarity is that members of both communities/movements see language learning and teaching as a culturally situated practice. They don’t see language acquisition as necessarily acquiring “native” proficiency and understand that there are local traditions and practices of (language) education that need to be considered. Researchers in World Englishes and people who teach these varieties (mostly NNESTs in non-NABA countries) are aware of the differences between the “native” varieties of English and their own indigenized varieties of the language. They are also cognizant of the fact that the indigenized variety that they use is the model of English that is used in their community and reflects an achievable local target for their students. Furthermore, these teachers bring a socio-cultural and socio-historical understanding of how to teach students in their context and for what purposes and functions. These localized understandings impact their pedagogical choices. This is another reason why teacher education programs that push the “communicative approach” on NNESTs (specially in EFL contexts) do not work – teachers resist the communicative approach because they don’t see it being in harmony with the larger educational culture that they are a part of. Members of the NNEST and the World Englishes communities are sharply aware of the practices and models that are relevant to their local settings and make pedagogical choices that are contextually relevant (see contributions to Canagarajah, 2005 for a discussion of local knowledge in language policy and practice).

The three aspects discussed above show that the two academic movements resist the mainstream, monolingual models of English and English language teaching in similar ways. These discussions of localization of knowledge and practice as well as of power, access and equality are of central concern to researchers and practitioners who look through the NNEST lens and show how the NNEST movement developed in tandem with other movements in the field. The issues raised here are further developed in several of the contributions to this book.

The Volume

Having shared some of the issues that show the need and significance of this volume, I will now briefly introduce the chapters included in this
Chapter One

There are at least five (non-exclusive) areas of focus that are represented in this volume. The chapters are organized around these areas.

The first group of chapters, chapter 2-4 take up issues with some of the dominant literature and ways of thinking in Applied Linguistics and TESOL. In Chapter 2, Romney discusses how race, nativeness, World Englishes, and the perception of these interact within the context of TESOL. In her chapter, Romney uses the NNEST lens to examine the complex relationship between these three issues by raising a number of strategic questions. She asks: 1) Is race associated with the English language? 2) Is the notion of the inner circle related to race? 3) Is there a contrast between the perception and the reality of the English language? 4) How does the perception of English affect TESOL professionals of colour and NNESTs? 5) How does the perception of English affect ESOL students? And 6) What can be done to create an environment in which all Englishes are valued and English is perceived as a world language, belonging to all who speak it? By raising these questions, Romney challenges a number of assumptions made in the field and raises our awareness of how these assumptions impact our approaches to language and language teaching.

In Chapter 3, Ishihara questions the assumption that language learners need to learn or be taught pragmatic norms of the NS alone. Looking through an NNEST lens, she argues that in understanding pragmatics we need to realize that NNSs’ language use is intertwined with their subjectivity. Ishihara shares the findings of a phenomenological inquiry into NNSs’ resistance to employing perceived NS pragmatic norms. The participants in her study at times deliberately diverged from perceived community norms and intentionally maintained a distance from the community. Rather than attempting to be completely native-like, these NNSs in fact exercised their agency to selectively emulate NS pragmatic norms and express their subjectivities. Ishihara argues that given the complexity of pragmatic choices that bilingual speakers negotiate, exploration of the potentials of a bilingual model may lead to more culturally sensitive pedagogy for second-language pragmatics.

In Chapter 4, Ross Forman takes up another critical issue in ELT – that of the role and use of L1 in L2 classes. Forman explores what happens in Thai university level EFL classrooms when expert non-native EFL teachers make use of both L1 and L2 in their lessons. Through classroom observations and teacher interviews, he identifies seven principles of positive L1 use. Forman’s study asserts that while teachers should be supported in their use of L2 whenever appropriate, there are solid reasons for complementary and judicious use of students’ L1. This is a welcome
finding as it vindicates the teachers’ adoption of locally appropriate pedagogical choices.

Ross’s discussion of local ways of teaching and learning allows for a transition into the next area of focus in the volume: attitudes and perceptions. Chapters 5 – 8 examine what various stakeholders perceive as good teaching and who they consider better teachers. In Chapter 5, Mullock asks the question: “Does a good language teacher have to be a native speaker?” She points out that while it is generally agreed that quality in teaching is composed of two distinct components, “good teaching” and “successful teaching”, the notion of quality in teaching, and what constitutes quality, has been under-researched in EFL environments. After reviewing the literature on what makes a good language teacher, and in the light of the debate on NS/NNS teachers, Mullock reports on the views of Thai university students and their teachers on what makes a good teacher of English. In this study, the respondents did not explicitly reflect a preference for either NS or NNS teachers, though students placed high value on strong pedagogical skills and high levels of declarative and procedural knowledge of the English language. The chapter also considers the consequences of the findings for both native and non-native teachers.

Tatar and Yildiz, in Chapter 6, report on the preliminary findings from the piloting of a larger study on the self-perceptions of nonnative-English-speaking teachers and teacher candidates in Istanbul, Turkey. Drawing on qualitative data from in-service English language teachers and teacher candidates, they report that many NNEST are aware of their strengths as teachers in local classroom. Participants in their study identified sharing the L1 and culture with students, the experience of being an L2 learner of English, managing the class, teaching of grammar, ability to act as not only language teachers but also educators, as some of the strengths that they bring to their classes. On the other hand they were concerned about unequal work conditions, establishing their credibility as NNESTs, their lack of intuitional use of the language and having to teach only grammar most of the time. This chapter thus examines issues of NNESTs in their home countries and questions the privileging of NESTs (specially untrained NESTs) in contexts where qualified local teachers are available.

In Chapter 7, Nemtchinova takes a different approach to studying attitudes and perceptions and reports on a survey of host teachers in MA TESOL practicum classes. Using a survey, Nemtchinova explored host teachers’ perceptions of NES and NNES teacher trainees. The findings indicate that while there is no statistically significant difference in most aspects of NES and NNES teacher trainees’ performance, the two groups
of teacher trainees are found to be different in at least one dimension: their adaptability to the multicultural climate of the ESL classroom. The results of the survey have implications for practicum coordinators, host teachers, administrators, and, particularly, for employers who may feel reluctant to hire NNES graduates.

Critiquing the dominant methodologies used in the study of attitudes and perceptions, Lipovsky and Mahboob in Chapter 8 stress the need to examine and analyse the actual language used by students that reflects their attitudes. They point out that while the majority of perceptions studies either use survey data to provide a statistical analysis of participants’ attitudes or use qualitative data to identify the categories of comments that emerge from the data, an analysis of the actual language used by students provides a richer and deeper understanding of what students believe. Their chapter therefore examines the language used to comment on NESTs and NNESTs by using the Appraisal Framework in Systemic Functional Linguistics. The Appraisal analysis highlighted aspects of N/NESTs’ (lack of) knowledge that are doubled-sided, such as when it showed that NESTs’ lack of knowledge in their students’ L1 and NNESTs’ knowledge in their L1 could each be viewed either as an advantage or a drawback. The Appraisal analysis also highlighted affective issues that are downplayed by Thematic analysis. The analysis highlighted that students’ Appraisals of their NESTs and NNESTs often recurred throughout their essays, with long strings of text devoted to a given evaluation, with the result of an ongoing cumulative effect. Furthermore, the students often amplified their evaluations through intensifications or repetitions. This chapter thus questions ways in which attitudes and perceptions are studied in applied linguistics and shares an alternative approach that allows for a deeper examination of the same issues.

Building on the need identified by many of the chapters in the previous sections, the next four chapters provide a sampling of ideas, strategies, and approaches to classroom practitioners (both NESTs and NNESTs), teacher educators, program administrators, and other stakeholders to develop an awareness of NNEST issues and take action in order to professionalize the field of ELT and reduce (if not eliminate) discrimination. Readers will note that there are some overlaps between the suggestions provided in these chapters; such repetition needs to be seen as a sign of effectiveness of these strategies in different contexts. In Chapter 9, Leslie Barratt points out that teacher preparation programs have a key role in the process of developing NEST/NNEST equity. Barratt shares 30 strategies for teacher preparation programs to raise awareness of inequities, to create discourse of inclusion and equity management, as well