

***WIGGLE ROOM* FOR TEACHING ENGLISH AS A GLOBAL LANGUAGE? :
WESTERN-EDUCATED TAIWANESE ENGLISH TEACHERS' IDENTITIES AND
TEACHING OF ENGLISH WRITING**

by

Rae Jui-Ping Lin

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES
(Language and Literacy Education)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
(Vancouver)

March 2017

© Rae Jui-Ping Lin, 2017

ABSTRACT

As the English language spreads around the globe and is used for various purposes in different social and cultural contexts, scholars and local practitioners have called for deconstructing the ideology of native-speakerism (Holliday, 2006, 2015) and reconstructing the local subjectivity of English language education (e.g., Canagarajah, 2005; Kumaravadivelu, 2016). In this transformation process of English language education, language teacher identity has played a central role because how teachers see themselves as English speakers, writers, and teachers is closely linked to what and how they teach in the language classroom (Varghese et al., 2005). Investigating such transformative potential of English writing education in Taiwan, the present ten-month qualitative case study takes social constructionist perspective to examine four Western-educated Taiwanese teachers' writing and teacher identities and their teaching of English writing in relation to the discourse of native-speakerism in four Taiwanese universities.

Based on data generated from interviews, classroom observation, email correspondence, and class materials, the study illustrates that language teachers' training and writing experiences, their ideologies about the English language, and students' and administrators' expectations of how the English language should be taught all have a great impact on teacher identity formation and teaching practices. Two participants (Ava and Beth) depended on native-like English proficiency and Western pedagogical knowledge acquired while studying in Western graduate programs to define who they were as English writing teachers. The discourse of native-speakerism was reinforced in their English writing classrooms, leaving little room for local English norms and pedagogies to develop. In comparison, the other two participants (Sarah and Nita) viewed themselves as

multicompetent writers and offered more space in their writing classrooms for developing non-Anglophone Englishes. However, the possibility for writing alternative forms was denied by Nita's students and administrators, who expected her to help students achieve high scores on standardized tests. The study adds insights into the scholarship of professional identity construction of Western-educated English writing teachers, an area of research that remains scant in quantity. It also provides pedagogical implications for teacher education programs to cultivate more *agents of change* (Morgan, 2010) in teaching English writing as a global communicative means.

PREFACE

This dissertation is original, unpublished, independent work by the author, Rae Jui-Ping Lin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
PREFACE.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	xii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	xiii
DEDICATION.....	xvi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Statement of the problem.....	1
1.2 Situating the study	3
1.3 Purpose of the study and research questions	8
1.4 Significance of the study	11
1.5 Overview of the thesis	13
CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	17
2.1 Introduction	17
2.2 Teaching English as a global language.....	17
2.2.1 The World Englishes model	19
2.2.2 English as a lingua franca	21
2.2.3 Anti-colonial approaches.....	24
Critiques of linguistic imperialism	24
Colonial discourse of Self and Other.....	28
2.2.4 English and linguistic instrumentalism.....	30
2.3. Challenge in local English classrooms: Ideology of native-speakerism	34
2.4 Teaching English as a global language and teacher identity	36
2.5 Teacher identity as social construction.....	37
Teacher identity-in-discourse and identity-in-practice.....	38

2.6 Conclusion	41
CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW	43
3.1 Introduction	43
3.2 Pre-service NNESTs' identity construction and professional development in Western TESOL programs	43
3.2.1 Identity construction through taking courses.....	44
3.2.2 Identity construction through doing teaching / practicums	47
3.2.3 Politics in TESOL programs and professional development.....	52
3.3 Pre-service NNESTs' writing experiences and writing identity construction in Western TESOL programs	57
3.3.1 Accommodating writing conventions.....	58
3.3.2 Creating voice in one's own writing.....	63
3.4 Western-educated returning teachers' identity and teaching practices in their home countries.....	69
3.4.1 Western-educated teachers and Western pedagogies in EFL contexts.....	69
3.4.2 Third space	73
3.4.3 Western-educated writing teachers' identity in EFL contexts.....	77
3.5 Conclusion	80
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY	81
4.1 Introduction	81
4.2 Qualitative case study	81
4.3 Recruitment, participants, and research context.....	82
4.3.1 Ava.....	83
Ai University	84
4.3.2 Beth.....	85
Bei University	86
4.3.3 Sarah	87
Shan University	88
4.3.4 Nita	88
Nang University.....	89
4.4 Ways of knowing.....	91

4.5 Types of data collected	92
4.5.1 Interviews	92
Interview procedure	93
4.5.2 Classroom observation	94
4.5.3 Documents	95
4.5.4 Audio-recording, transcription, and translation	96
4.6 Data analysis	97
4.7 Researcher reflexivity	100
The researcher	102
4.8 Research rigor	105
4.9 Conclusion	106
CHAPTER 5: WRITING IN THE WEST: NARRATING IDENTITY AS AN ENGLISH USER AND WRITER	107
5.1 Introduction	107
5.2 Beth: “After being trained out there, I am a competent English writer”	108
5.3 Sarah: “I can be a multilingual writer and teacher”	115
5.4 Nita: Rejecting biased feedback to construct English writer identity	121
5.5 Ava: Rejecting “American-style” peer feedback to construct legitimacy as an English writer	128
5.6 Summary and discussion	136
CHAPTER 6: CONSTRUCTING A THIRD SPACE FOR PROFESSIONAL LEGITIMACY: BETH’S TEACHING PRACTICE	141
6.1 Introduction	141
6.2 “Expatriate teachers don’t teach writing”	142
6.3 “I don’t think I am a teacher with strong grammar knowledge”	150
6.4 “You should understand <i>their</i> context”	156
6.5 Teaching practice: Evaluation criteria	163
6.6 Summary	167
CHAPTER 7: DEBUNKING NATIVE-SPEAKERISM: CHINESE ENGLISH IN SARAH’S WRITING CLASS	169

7.1 Introduction	169
7.2 Questioning native-speakerism.....	170
7.3 Alignment with native speakers	185
7.4 Summary.....	192
CHAPTER 8: WESTERN-EDUCATED TEACHER AS CULTURAL SELF: AVA AND STUDENT-CENTERED PEDAGOGY.....	195
8.1 Introduction	195
8.2 Student-centered pedagogies	196
8.3 Legitimizing student-centered pedagogies and teacher identity.....	202
8.4 Reproducing colonial Self and Other in the writing conference	211
8.5 Summary.....	221
CHAPTER 9: NITA AS A PRODUCER OF GOOD TEST TAKERS	224
9.1 Introduction	224
9.2 Constructing professional legitimacy from “洋墨水” or “West-ink”	225
9.3 Being positioned as an unprofessional teacher.....	230
9.4 Teacher as a producer of good test takers.....	236
9.5 Summary.....	249
CHAPTER 10: CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS	251
10.1 Introduction	251
10.2 Summary of principal findings and further discussion.....	251
10.2.1 Summary.....	252
10.2.2 Further discussion: The “wobble room”.....	259
10.3 Implications	263
10.3.1 Theoretical implications	263
10.3.2 Pedagogical implications.....	266
10.3.3 Methodological implications	268
10.4 Suggestions for future study.....	269
10.5 Conclusion.....	272
REFERENCES	274
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS	291

APPENDIX B: JEFFERSONIAN TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS	294
APPENDIX C: BETH’S SCORING RUBRICS	296
APPENDIX C: BETH’S SCORING RUBRICS	297
APPENDIX D: AVA’S STUDENT 2’S FULL ESSAY	298

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1: Overview of participants' backgrounds.....	90
Table 6.1: Beth's scoring rubrics.....	164

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 8.1 Essay of Ava's Student 2	216
---	-----

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CLT	Communicative language teaching
EFL	English is learned as a foreign language (English is used in contexts where English has no official status, e.g., Taiwan)
EIL	English as an international language
ELF	English as a lingua franca
ELT	English language teaching
ESL	English is learned as a second language (English is used in contexts where English is an official language, e.g., Canada, India)
L1	First language
L2	Second language
NS	Native speaker
NNS	Non-native speaker
NEST	Native English-speaking teacher
NNEST	Non-native English-speaking teacher
TESOL	Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

People say this is the most difficult chapter to write in the dissertation. Now, it is my turn to find not enough words to express my gratitude for the support, encouragement, and generosity I received from so many people throughout the process of writing my dissertation.

First, I would like to thank the four teachers who participated in this study for their generosity in taking the time and effort to share their life stories with me. Without their insights and help, this dissertation would not have been possible. I would also like to thank the Ministry of Education in Taiwan for providing the funding for the work (2012–2014).

I want to express my deepest gratitude to my PhD supervisor Dr. Ling Shi. I thank you for your continuous faith in my scholarly competence and unfailing support in guiding me through this long and arduous academic journey from the first day I studied at LLED to the completion of this degree. You have been a tremendous mentor and teacher to me; your advice on both research and my career has been priceless. I am also very thankful to have had Dr. Ryuko Kubota on my committee; her scholarly wisdom and passion have led me to think critically about language education, and at the same time to keep alive my hopes for making changes. My sincere thanks also go to Dr. Steven Talmy, my third dissertation committee member; his vast knowledge, warm heart, and encouragement have all inspired me to become a better scholar and educator. A very special gratitude goes to my examining committee: Dr. Monique Bournot-Trites, Dr. Pierre Walter, and Dr. Icy Lee, for showing their interest in my study and for taking the time out of their busy schedules to read the dissertation and provide very helpful comments to improve my work.

I also would like to extend my gratitude to many other professors in the department,

Drs. Patricia Duff, Bonny Norton, Margaret Early, and Anthony Paré, whose inspiring teaching, and always fresh and sophisticated perspectives on language education have nurtured me to grow as a scholar. I also want to thank Drs. Sandra Zappa-Hollman and Reginald D'Silva for providing me with opportunities to teach at UBC- Ritsumeikan Programs, where I gained invaluable teaching experience and learned to be a more understanding teacher. I need also to thank Christopher Fernandez, for his great help with the documents and forms required for completion of this degree.

I am grateful to have studied at LLED with so many brilliant and supportive peers, past and present; sincere thanks go to Amanda Wager, Ling He, Mi-Young Kim, Elliott Yates, Melanie Wong, Roma Ilnyckyj, John Haggerty, Tim Anderson, Liz Chiang, and Ai Mizuta. I would like to express a special thanks to my TESL writing group: Nasrin Kowkabi, Tomoyo Okuda, Natalia Balyasnikova, Ismaeil Fazel, and Joel Heng Hartse, for your friendship and encouragement during my dissertation writing. In addition, I would very much like to thank my discourse analysis writing group for your company, intellectually and emotionally, and for all the stimulating conversations and generous feedback. I am very fortunate to have had you as my close colleagues throughout the years of my PhD journey in Vancouver. Thank you, Bong-gi Sohn, Meike Wernicke, Won Kim, and Ryan Deschambault!

I would also like to send thanks to many friends outside LLED and UBC, particularly to Owen Lo, Chenhou Chiu, Sally Pan, Shih-Lin Chen, Chia-Yang Chiang, SzuYun Hsu, Eric Wu, and Yu-Chi Kuo, for all the good food, laughter, and words of encouragement and support when I felt exhausted from studying and writing. I express my wholehearted gratitude to John Wu for supporting me all the way to completion of this dissertation; thank you for the timely carrot and stick.

Words cannot express how grateful I am to my parents, 林國順 and 曾秀琴, for all of their love and faith in me from day one. Your persistent understanding and confidence in me have been my greatest sources of motivation for achieving this goal. I would also like to acknowledge the support of my brother David Lin, my sister-in-law Anna Liu, and my sister Cynthia Lin. Thank you for continuing to send me positive vibes through countless Line chats. Finally, thank you to my nephews, Ryan Lin and Allen Lin, and to my niece Lilian Lin for always reminding their auntie to work harder on her “homework” so she can come home soon. I am so looking forward to spending more time with you and watching each of you grow into a kind and confident person.

To my loving parents, for all your love and support

獻給爸爸與媽媽，謝謝你們給我的無盡無私的愛

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

If the teaching of EIL as a profession is serious about helping its professionals generate sustainable knowledge systems that are sensitive to local historical, political, cultural, and educational exigencies, then, it must get away from an epistemic operation that continues to institutionalize the coloniality of English language education.

(Kumaravadivelu, 2012a, p. 24)

In a world of English Changing, there is a place—indeed a need—to foster an identity that encourages and supports the transformative potential of teachers.

(Morgan, 2010, p. 36)

1.1 Statement of the problem

Along with the British colonial regime in the eighteenth century, and cultural and economic globalization fueled by American neo-colonial forces after World War II, the English language has spread throughout the world; it has become the most popular second or foreign language to learn for local and global communications in many countries. In his well-known book *English as a Global Language*, David Crystal (2003) states that the English language has reached its global status simply as a result of being “in the right place at the right time” (p. 110). Although acknowledging that the spread of English has its roots in the history of British colonization and American cultural hegemony, Crystal suggests that this legacy be removed so that people around the world can enjoy better education, economic benefits, and intercultural knowledge through learning the language. English learning, from Crystal’s viewpoint, is “the natural choice for progress” (p. 75). The view that the spread of the English language and English education is a neutral product that comes with globalization has been widely questioned for the past two decades by many critical applied linguistics and local practitioners. For example, Canagarajah (1999, 2005), Pennycook

(1998), Phillipson (1992), and Kumaravadivelu (2016) all contend that English language teaching (ELT hereafter) is never neutral but is a hegemonic project that reproduces images of the cultural Self and Other in colonial and neo-colonial contexts to sustain the power of the English-speaking West, which includes the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. Through teacher training and textbook writing, the English-speaking West is portrayed as the advanced and superior Self while the non-English-speaking remainder is linked to the backward and inferior Other (Kubota, 2001; Pennycook, 1998; cf. Said, 1979; Spivak, 1988). Native English speakers are regarded as representatives of the superior Western culture “from which spring the ideal both of the English language and of English language teaching methodologies” (Holliday, 2005, p. 385). The negative influence of this native-speakerist ideology (Holliday, 2005) has been documented in many contexts where English is learned as a foreign language¹ (EFL hereafter). Among the negative influences are the inequality between native and non-native English-speaking teachers (Swan, Aboshiha & Holliday, 2015; Houghton & Rivers, 2013), anxiety among English learners because of their endless investment in acquiring (non-existent) Standard English (Kubota, 2011; Park, 2011, 2013), and the derogation of the local pedagogic culture (Canagarajah, 2005; Chowdhury & Phan, 2008). In view of these issues, ELT should not be viewed as a neutral transmission of language knowledge; the politics that exist between the Western Self and the non-Western Other in local ELT need to be questioned in order to dismiss inherent inequalities and anxieties.

¹ I realize that the ideology of native-speakerism also has a negative impact on English-as-a-second-language (ESL) contexts such as post-colonial countries (e.g., Singapore, India, Hong Kong, etc.) or immigrant communities in English-speaking countries. Since this study examines Taiwan in an EFL context, I focus my discussion on EFL ELT in this section.

Scholars in the fields of World English (Kachru, 1990, 1992) and English as a lingua franca (Jenkins, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2009) have also critiqued the superiority of English native speakers in ELT because it does not correspond to the reality of English being used as a global language. Jenkins (2007) indicates that the population of non-native English speakers (800 million to 1.5 billion) now significantly outnumbers that of native English speakers (320 to 380 million). The estimated number of English users in Asia alone has surpassed those in the US, the UK, and Canada combined (Kachru, 1997). Seidlhofer (2009) further points out that 80% of English communication in non-English-speaking countries involves no native speakers of English. Thus, the majority of English users are non-native speakers and most communication encountered in English does not involve any native English speakers. Viewing Standard English—the English norms used by native English speakers—as the only learning objective, and the native English speaker as the ideal teacher, is irrelevant to many English learners and speakers in the world. Rather than imitating native speakers, “the ability to accommodate to interlocutors with other first languages than one’s own is a far more important skill” (Jenkins, 2007, p. 238). Given the reality that the English language is used in many places in the world for different purposes, one of the important missions in ELT in non-English-speaking countries is to wrest ownership of English language and education from the hands of native English speakers (Jenkins, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2009).

1.2 Situating the study

Because of Taiwan’s close historical ties with the United States, American English has held a privileged status in Taiwan for a long time. After the Nationalists (Kuomintang,

KMT) retreated to Taiwan upon losing China to the Chinese Communist Party, the United States supported Taiwan militarily, economically and politically. During this period of American aid (1949–1967), the Taiwanese government sent many members of the élite to American graduate programs for professional and language training with the aim of catching up with the U.S.-informed agenda of economic and social development (Lin, 2012). After returning from the United States, these individuals were hired to work in various prestigious state-owned institutions and research centers. Since then, an American education and *good* English competence have become symbols of cultural and economic advancement in Taiwan.

Over the past decade, the English language has also reached paramount status—not only in Taiwan but also in many places in the world—as the lingua franca of the global village, with increased international business, encounters, and communication all enabled by information technology and air transportation. Now, in Taiwan, the English language not only refers to American modernity but is also a synonym for 國際競爭力 (international competitiveness) and 與世界接軌 (connection to the world). The impact of rapid globalization on Taiwanese society has resulted in the launch of several educational reforms by the government to enhance the English proficiency of Taiwan’s citizens. Examples of these reform projects include *Challenge 2008: National Development Plan (2002–2007)* (Ministry of Education, 2002); *E-generation Manpower* (Ministry of Education, 2002); *Plan for Enhancing National English Proficiency* (Ministry of Education, 2009); and, *Aim for First-Class Universities and Top-Level Research Centers* (Ministry of Education, 2011). In these documents, English skills are emphasized as building blocks for national competitiveness and economic growth. For example, as stated in *Plan for Enhancing National English Proficiency* (2009, p. 100, English original):

English proficiency is no longer just a tool for communication, but is even more importantly a key capacity for embracing globalization, a service strength to make industries competitive in the international economic arena, and a linking force for cities in the global space of flows. Enhancing national English proficiency is, most of all, a basic building block for creating an intelligent Taiwan and firmly underpinning national competitiveness.

Guided by these official documents, movements of English education take place in every venue, from elementary to tertiary education. For example, the start of mandatory English education was changed from Grade 7 to Grade 5, then finally to Grade 3 in 2005. English villages, learning programs funded by the government, have been widely established to provide opportunities for elementary and secondary students to practice English in an *authentic* context with native English speakers. In higher education, all first-year non-English majors² are required to take English courses to enhance their basic English skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing at least for one year. Encouraged by the Ministry of Education, many universities have set graduation thresholds³ for English proficiency and require undergraduates and graduates of all disciplines to pass certain levels in one of the standardized tests: TOEFL iBT, TOEIC, IELTS, or the General English Proficiency Test (GEPT).⁴ An increasing number of English-medium bachelor's and graduate programs are

² Most English majors are required to take fundamental skill courses (listening, speaking, reading, writing) for two years.

³ Graduation thresholds for English proficiency vary among universities.

⁴ The General English Proficiency Test (GEPT), a locally-developed test very similar to TOEIC and IELTS, is the most common standard test taken among Taiwanese people. The test has five levels (elementary, intermediate, high-intermediate, advanced, superior) and covers the English skills of listening, reading, writing,

also being introduced for Taiwanese students to simultaneously acquire content knowledge and good English competence. University instructors across disciplines are rewarded for giving lectures in English. The movement toward English education has also spread from schools to the public sector as English has become one of the subjects in the national civil service exam.

While English is promoted as a 全民運動 (national campaign), 補習班 (private educational institutes) are sprouting up to help English learners reach the aspired-to English proficiency. Song (2003) observes a “collective hysteria syndrome for English” in Taiwanese ELT. That is, Taiwanese people often feel anxious and under pressure about not acquiring a sufficiently high level of English proficiency. Therefore, endless investment in time and money is being put into pursuing native-level English competence. Below are some anecdotes from various empirical studies and news sources that provide a glimpse of the phenomena that cause Taiwanese people to consider native-like competence to be the dominant discourse about speaking, teaching and learning the language.

[1] Because I have a tendency to imitate native speakers’ tone when speaking in English, it would feel (not me) ... Normally I speak without much intonation, but when I speak in English, I’d try to imitate their tones. Consequently, I feel like pretending. I am not a native speaker, but I speak like one. Then I would feel disgusted about my speaking that way.

(Ke, 2016, p. 294; interview with Taiwanese university student)

[2] It was a big surprise to me that accent is not so vital in judging a person’s ability of

and speaking. Most non-English majors are required to pass the intermediate level, and English majors must pass the high intermediate level. Some prestigious universities have higher requirements. The GEPT was developed by the Language Training and Testing Center (LTTC), which was first government sponsored, but later registered as a non-profit educational foundation co-supervised by the Ministry of Education and several prestigious universities.

English. In fact, I have been troubled by my accent, and I always envy some friends' native-speaker-like accents.

(Chang, 2014, p. 25; interview with Taiwanese university student)

[3] It is a global environment and when students learn English, they expect to have NESTs. Since I am not a NEST, it is even more necessary to have good spoken English. ... As an English teacher, I help them [students] learn the foreign language. Then I could not speak English with a weird accent. They may be like little parrots, too. So I try my best to have authentic English pronunciation.

(Liao, 2015, p. 90; interview with Taiwanese university teacher)

[4] I think it is impossible to teach English as an international language because you need an accent and a culture to follow... In my case, I think if I have to teach my students English, I will teach them an advantageous accent. It is irresponsible to teach any accents that you like

(Lai, 2008, p. 42-43; interview with Taiwanese university teacher)

[5] 國立花蓮女中為強化學生外語能力,邀請外籍教師麥可本月起在校園長期駐點,與學生進行全英文口語演練。(To enhance students' foreign language ability, National Hua-Lien High school has signed a long-term contract with a foreign teacher, Mike, starting from this month. This provides students with opportunities to practice speaking English.)

(Fan, 2011/12/22; news article)

[6] Parent: 你們要請美國,加拿大,英國,澳洲或紐西蘭的老師比較好,至於南非籍的也還可以,只是腔調太重了,我的孩子學的英語會不標準! (It's better to hire American, Canadian, British, Australian, or New Zealand teachers. South Africans will do too, but their accent is too strong; my kids will acquire non-standardized English.)

Owner of private English institute: 會啦! 我們這邊的老師,都會儘量聘請美加的老師 (“We surely will do, we often hire American and Canadian teachers.”)

(Tsai, 2002, p. 20; interview with student's parent)

From these quotations, we see that the ideology of native-speakerism has not only spread to Taiwanese ELT, but it also adds a burden of anxiety for English learners if they do not speak like a native English speaker (1 & 2). Also implied in these quotations is that a non-native English speaker's role in teaching English can be self-marginalized (3 & 4) or marginalized

(5 & 6) when native English speakers and their English norms are taken as the only goal for learning English. Because of this hysteria about native-like English proficiency, Yan and Su (2008) note that English teacher education in Taiwan has long been focused on training pre-service teachers to design “effective” methods and activities to efficiently help students acquire “good” English proficiency. Yan and Su (2008) rightly point out that the purpose of learning a foreign language should be to empower second language (L2) learners for intercultural communication. However, the non-critical pursuit of native-like proficiency has actually disempowered many Taiwanese people from learning the language for this purpose. After all, the concept of a *standard* of native English is only a hypothetical concept (Motha, 2014). Pursuing native-like proficiency is likely to intensify L2 learners’ anxiety and self-denial as they find that it is never possible to reach the desired goal. Moreover, targeting native-like proficiency as the only goal for learning English could reinforce the superior status of the English-speaking West and reemphasize labelling non-English speakers as “handicapped,” “backward,” “inferior”; inequality between the Western Self and non-Western Other is thus perpetuated. For more empowered ELT in Taiwan, I propose, as several Taiwanese scholars have suggested above, a more socio-cultural and socio-political understanding of ELT in order to deconstruct the ideology of native-speakerism that still has a firm grip on English education in Taiwan.

1.3 Purpose of the study and research questions

Recently, in applied linguistics and TESOL, language teacher identity is being put forth as the central topic of investigation in transformational ELT, which I have proposed above. It is believed that how teachers see themselves as English speakers, writers, and

teachers is closely linked to what and how they teach their students in language classrooms (Cheung et al., 2015; Morgan, 2010, 2016; Motha, 2006, 2014; Phan, 2008; Varghese et al., 2005). Therefore, understanding language teacher identity is the hinge to finding the “‘wiggle room’ to re-interpret language policies, curricula, and classroom materials in ways that better reflect the local needs and realities of the students” (Morgan, 2010, p. 36). The purpose of this study is to investigate the “wiggle room” in Taiwanese ELT through understanding the identity development of four Western-educated Taiwanese English teachers.

In Taiwan, English language departments in universities are the hubs for cultivating English language teachers for various venues (e.g., K–12, private English education institutes). The teacher educators—the professors in English language departments—thus have a big role to play in how these teachers-to-be see the English language and their roles in teaching it. As mentioned in the previous section, elite individuals were sent to the United States for higher education during the period in which Taiwan received American aid. Since then, American English and education signify progress and a promising future. Although that aid period ended long ago, the English-speaking West (especially the United States) is still the first choice of many for graduate studies. For example, in the four English departments in this study, 54 out of 77 (70%; 2012, from universities’ websites) faculty members were Taiwanese nationals with PhDs from English-speaking countries. The aim of this study is to investigate the identity construction of Western-educated teachers and the potential impact it has on teaching English writing as a global language. I chose English writing teachers for this study because, while there are increasing numbers of experimental studies showing changes toward more socio-political English teaching in Taiwan (e.g., Chang, 2014; Ke,

2016; Lai, 2008; Liao, 2015), these studies have focused on learning and teaching English speaking. From a socio-political perspective, English writing education in Taiwan is under-researched; English writing teachers and their identity development deserve a full investigation in order to understand ELT in the Taiwanese context.

With these theoretical considerations and a literature gap in mind, this research takes social constructionist approach to investigate four Western-educated Taiwanese writing teachers' writing and teaching experiences, and their writer and teacher identity construction. Understanding identity as socially constructed (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; De Fina, Schiffrin & Bamberg, 2006), I pay particular attention to how the participants negotiate their identities with the discourse of native-speakerism through interaction with me as a researcher and with their students in writing classes. I aim to use the identities of these teachers as the lens through which I explore the transformative potential of deconstructing the ideology of native-speakerism and reconstructing the local subjectivity of ELT. The following two research questions guided this study toward understanding this inquiry:

- (1) How do the participants view themselves as English users and writers in light of the discourse of native-speakerism? In particular, how do the participants' Western-educated experiences play a role in constructing their identities as English users and writers?
- (2) How do the participants construct their writing teacher identities after they return to Taiwan to teach English writing in light of the discourse of native-speakerism? In particular, how do their Western-educated experiences play a role in constructing their teacher identities?

1.4 Significance of the study

In the era of globalization, when English has spread throughout the world and has been used for various purposes, applied linguists and many local practitioners have called for changing to more socio-political and socio-cultural ELT in non-English-speaking countries. Recently, English language teacher identity has become an important area in applied linguistics for exploring the potential to make these changes, because how teachers see themselves as English users and teachers is believed to have a great impact on how and what they teach in language classrooms (Johnson, 2006; Kumaravadivelu, 2012b; Morgan, 2010; Phan, 2008). By demonstrating how four Western-educated Taiwanese English teachers construct their identities in relation to the discourse of native-speakerism, this study makes contributions to furthering scholarly and pedagogical insights into how a teacher's identity works as important terrain in creating or disturbing culturally and politically sensitive ELT in a non-English-speaking context such as Taiwan. In particular, this study strives to deepen the understanding of the interaction between teacher identities and their actual teaching practices, with an aim of providing pedagogical considerations regarding how to deconstruct Western-dependent ELT and reconstruct the subjectivity of local English norms, pedagogies and cultures.

The study is significant in that it bridges several literature gaps in the area of language teacher education and development. First and foremost, increasing numbers of pre-service English teachers from non-English-speaking countries are going to English-speaking TESOL programs for their professional training. While many empirical studies have been conducted to understand the interactions between the experiences of international teacher-trainees and their professional development when studying in Western TESOL programs

(Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 1999; Golombek & Jordan, 2005; Ilieva, 2010; Ilieva & Waterstone, 2013; Inoue & Stracke, 2013; Park, 2012, 2015; Pavlenko, 2003), how their professional identities and practices continue to develop after returning to their home countries to teach remains under-researched to date. This study contributes to this area of inquiry by focusing on how four Taiwanese English teachers' Western educational experiences play a part in constructing their professional identities and legitimacy in teaching English writing in Taiwanese universities. Moreover, as many L2 writing scholars (Casanave, 2009; Lee, 2010, 2013; Ortega, 2009) point out, English writing has been considered one of the most important components in curriculum design in the EFL context, including Taiwan. While L2 students' writing development has been richly documented in the literature on EFL L2 writing, very little is known about the professional development of EFL writing teachers. Examination of the identity construction and professional development of these four Western-educated Taiwanese writing teachers presented in this study contributes to this underrepresented area of inquiry.

By demonstrating how Western-educated teachers negotiate teaching practices in the context of their teaching situations, this study also provides modest pedagogical implications for language teacher education, particularly for Western TESOL programs. The current study contextualizes the local ELT discourse and how it shapes the professional identities and pedagogical choices of Western-educated teachers. The findings can help Western TESOL programs create space for more local-sensitive reflections for teachers from non-English-speaking countries. Last but not least, this study also makes a unique contribution to methodological implications by following a social constructionist approach to understanding language teacher identity-in-discourse and identity-in-practice. (Varghese et. al., 2005, see

details in section 2.5). By analyzing both teachers' narrated identities (what they say about teaching) and enacted identities (what they do in their teaching) as well as the interaction between the two, this study demonstrates a useful methodological approach for investigating the nuanced relation between teacher identities and their teaching practices.

1.5 Overview of the thesis

The dissertation consists of ten chapters. Chapter 2 presents the conceptual framework that guided this study. I first discuss the discourses of teaching English as a global language that are widely discussed in applied linguistics and TESOL. I then articulate the discourse of native-speakerism (Holliday, 2006, 2015), the challenge we face today in ELT. I also theorize on language teacher identity and discuss its potential for deconstructing the discourse of native-speakerism for local ELT.

Chapter 3 is a review of the research literature on the studying and writing experiences of Western-educated, non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) in Western TESOL or relevant language education programs. I focus the literature review on teacher identity development in the TESOL programs and divide the chapter into three sections: pre-service NNESTs and their professional identity in Western TESOL programs; pre-service NNESTs and their writing experiences and identity in Western TESOL programs; and Western-educated teachers and their identity development and teaching practices after returning to their home countries. By reviewing the literature to date on Western-educated teacher identity development and education, I identify several literature gaps which this study aims to fill.

In Chapter 4, I outline the methodology of this study. I first provide detailed

descriptions of the participants, research context, and methods used to generate research data. I also elaborate my epistemological underpinning—social constructionism—and investigate how it guides me to the understanding of teacher identity. I then theorize on my analytical approach—thematic analysis—and discuss how I utilize it to analyze data in this study.

Chapters 5 through 9 present the findings of this study. To address the first research question, which concerns how the participants' Western educational experiences play a role in constructing their identities as English users and writers, Chapter 5 presents and discusses the four participants' narratives about their training and writing experiences and their identity construction within their respective Western graduate programs. I focus my discussion on how each participant negotiates legitimacy as an English writer with the dominant discourse centered on English writing in the TESOL program.

Chapters 6 through 9 present findings that correspond with the second research question concerning the participants' writing teacher identity construction after returning to Taiwan, and how that identity interacts with their teaching practices in English writing classrooms. In Chapter 6, I first discuss Beth's construction of her professional identity based on interview data. The analysis suggests that Beth constructs a third space (Bhabha, 1994), better than native English-speaking teachers and locally educated non-native English teachers, to form her professional legitimacy while teaching in her department. I discuss that the ideology of native-speakerism is emphasized by Beth when she creates this third space in which to construct her professional legitimacy. I then link her constructed identities to her use of scoring rubrics throughout the semester in order to understand the connection between her professional identity and instructional choices.

Chapter 7 presents an analysis of Sarah's narratives about teaching English writing

and discusses how her critical awareness of the politics of ELT developed during her Western education impinges on her teacher identity construction and teaching practices. The interview analysis indicates that Sarah resists taking native English speakers as authorities on the English language, or their norms as the only English standard to learn in her writing class. I then demonstrate how Sarah creates a space during classroom interaction for students to develop a sense of ownership of the English language. Despite that Sarah aims to debunk the discourse of native-speakerism in her own class, like Beth, she reproduces the same ideology to position herself as a more qualified teacher compared to locally educated non-native English teachers.

In Chapters 8 and 9, I report on and discuss two other participants, Ava and Nita, who construct their professional legitimacy while talking about students' resistance to their use of Western-based teaching methods. In Chapter 8, Ava constructs her Western training experiences as a capital in order to position herself as a cultural Self with advanced pedagogical knowledge for teaching English writing. By doing so, she constructs herself as a legitimate English writing teacher even though her students show resistance to the teaching approach she uses. I also demonstrate how the image of the cultural Self and Other (Kubota, 2001; Pennycook, 1998), the key ideology deployed to form Ava's teacher identity, is reproduced in Ava's writing conferences with her students.

In Chapter 9, based on interview data, I first demonstrate that Nita positions herself as a professional teacher by applying a proficiency-over-accuracy approach in her writing class. I also discuss how this approach sheds some light on teaching English writing beyond native English-speaking norms. However, an analysis of email correspondence between Nita and her students indicates that Nita's teaching approach and professional identity are denied by

her students and department head, who take grammar/accuracy/native-like English as the only goals in learning the language. The discrepancy between Nita's professional identity and the expectations of her students and department caused Nita to decide to take a year off from teaching English writing.

In Chapter 10, I summarize the principal findings and discuss the theoretical, pedagogical and methodological implications. I conclude the dissertation with suggestions for further investigation on language teacher identity and development.

CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the conceptual framework of the study. I first discuss the discourse that surrounds teaching English as a global language from various perspectives, including the World Englishes model (Kachru, 1990, 1992), English as a lingua franca (Jenkins, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2011), critiques of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992, 2009), the colonial construct of Self and Other (Pennycook, 1998, 2001), and English and linguistic instrumentalism (Kubota, 2011; Wee, 2008). Then, I articulate the challenge—the discourse of native-speakerism (Holliday, 2006, 2015), faced by English language teaching in non-native English-speaking countries that emerged along with the global spread of English. Recently, more and more scholars in TESOL and applied linguistics have realized the importance of teacher identity in students' language learning and identity construction (e.g., Cheung et al., 2015; Clarke, 2008; Morgan, 2004; Varghese et al., 2005). Thus, the role of teacher identity in light of teaching English as a global language will also be discussed in this chapter. I then theorize teacher identity from social constructionist perspective (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; De Fina, Schiffrin & Bamberg, 2006) and illustrate two concepts — teacher identity-in-discourse and teacher identity-in-practice (Varghese et al., 2005), that guide me to understanding teacher identity as social construction.

2.2 Teaching English as a global language

Today's English(es) derive(s) from England. From the seventeenth century onward, the English language traveled to America, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand as British people settled in the New World and brought their language with them. During the

eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, English spread to South Africa, India, Hong Kong, Singapore, and many other countries along with British colonization. Beginning in the twentieth century, the globalized economy and importance of information technology have caused English to spread to all parts of the world; this has coincided with opportunities for international travel and intercultural communication (Sharifian, 2009). Consequently, English has become the most popular second or foreign language for learners worldwide; knowledge of English can facilitate “free cross-border flows of goods, finances, ideas and people” (Park & Wee, 2012, p. 3).

As the English language continues to spread and thrive, critiques of using and teaching English have also accumulated in TESOL, particularly in academia. Central to these critiques is the premise that a hierarchical power relation between English speakers, English varieties, and different cultures is still at the root of ELT. This belief persists, even though the language has spread to every corner of the world and has become deterritorialized and denationalized for local communicative needs and for identity construction (Kramsch & Uryu, 2012). Over the past few decades, research on teaching English as a global language has aimed to “produce a cogent critique of global English—one that insightfully identifies the problems of English in the world and suggests a perspective of English which can help us take action to counter those problems” (Park & Wee, 2012, p. 3). In this study, I also use the notion of “teaching English as a global language” to refer to its problems, particularly those caused by the discourse of native-speakerism (Holliday, 2015), rather than to the benefits that the spread of English has brought us, although I do not deny all of its contributions to our interconnected world.

In the following sections, I demonstrate five approaches that are most widely used in applied linguistics and TESOL to discuss the global spread of English, all of which have helped me conceptualize the notion of teaching English as a global language. They are the World Englishes model (Kachru, 1990, 1997), English as a lingua franca (Jenkins, 2000, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2011), critiques of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992, 2009), the colonial construct of Self and Other (Pennycook, 1998, 2001), and English and linguistic instrumentalism (Kubota, 2011, 2013; Wee, 2008).

2.2.1 The World Englishes model

Braj Kachru's model of World Englishes is no doubt one of the most influential works in the study of global English. Observing the global flow of English and its flourishing development for different local uses, Kachru (1986, 1990, 1997) proposed the model of World Englishes, which decenters the ownership of the English language from English-speaking countries. This model comprises three concentric English-speaking circles: the inner circle, the outer circle, and the expanding circle. The inner circle refers to the places where English is spoken as a native language such as the UK, the USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The outer circle refers to countries where English is spoken as an additional or second language, introduced particularly through colonialism. Hong Kong, Singapore, India, Kenya, and Sri Lanka are some examples in the outer circle. After the end of colonial rule, many countries in the outer circle chose to keep English as their institutional language (e.g., for official documents and as a medium of education) while using their native languages for everyday communication. As both English and native languages played a key role in people's everyday lives, English was pluralized into local forms as a means of

communication for post-colonial societies. Pluralized English varieties also serve to distinguish the culture of the post-colonial society from that of the colonizer; in this way, they serve as a means of rebuilding national and cultural identity (Jenkins, 2007; Kachru, 1992). Last, the expanding circle includes countries where people use English as a foreign language such as China, Taiwan, Japan, Germany, France, and Russia. While colonialism brought the English language to the outer circle, globalization (e.g., the global economy, popular culture, and information technology) has introduced the English language to the expanding circle (Jenkins, 2006). Rather than using the language at the institutional level and for daily life, people in expanding circle countries learn and use English in a predominantly utilitarian manner, particularly for economic and trading purposes, or merely for leisure (Jenkins, 2006; Kubota, 2011).

The World Englishes model reinforces the idea that the English language is now not only used by the inner circle but has also become an important and popular means of communication for those living in the outer and expanding circles. According to Kachru (1997), the estimated number of English users in Asia alone outnumbers those in the US, the UK, and Canada combined. In addition, given its long and widespread history of penetration into many places around the world, English has been nativized into various and meaningful forms (e.g., Indian English, Singaporean English, African English, and Chinese English); these are used for communication for different social purposes and for identity construction, particularly in the outer and expanding circles. Based on these observations, Kachru (1990, 1992, 1997) and many other advocates (e.g., Bolton, 2005, 2012; Matsuda, 2003) have been arguing that “all world Englishes (native and non-native) belong equally to all who use them” (McArthur, 1998, p. 61). Therefore, every localized variety of English should be treated as a

legitimate variety embedded with social meanings, for use in its own right within each circle. The main effect of the World Englishes model on English-language education is the idea of decentering the dominant role of inner-circle English in English classrooms; in other words, knowledge of Anglophone English needs *not to be* a primary goal. Instead, students' localized forms should be treated as systematic and creative forms for communication, and therefore as valuable resources for pedagogical consideration.

2.2.2 English as a lingua franca

The concept of English as a lingua franca (ELF), developed mainly by Jenkins (2000, 2007) and Seidlhofer (2001, 2005, 2011), is another influential approach in the study of the global spread of English. According to Seidlhofer (2011), ELF refers to “any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option” (p. 7). Like the World Englishes model, the ELF approach is based on the “pluricentric assumption that English belongs to all those who use it” (Seidlhofer, 2009, p. 237). Although ELF shares many theoretical footings with the World Englishes paradigm, ELF scholars observe that English does not necessarily stay within one territory as an intra-national means of communication; rather, it flows *across* all three circles and serves as an international language for people with different native languages. For example, while the local varieties that have developed within India (i.e., Indian English) or China (i.e., Chinese English) are the main focus of World Englishes scholars, English varieties emerging during conversation between Chinese and Japanese presenters at a conference held in Germany are the interest of ELF research. ELF scholars also argue that while English varieties used in the outer circle have been widely recognized and accepted as

legitimate forms, those developed among English speakers in the expanding circle are yet to receive fair recognition (Jenkins, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2011) For these reasons, the work of ELF has focused on how English is used as a contact language in an expanding circle where people of different first languages often meet for business conversations, conference discussions, diplomatic negotiations or simply touristic encounters and English is chosen as the communicative medium in these speech events (Seidlhofer, 2011).

Compared with adherents of the World Englishes paradigm, ELF scholars are more determined to wrest control of English from the hands of native speakers and claim that non-native English speakers should have the power and right to determine how English should be used (Park & Wee, 2012). Seidlhofer (2011) even states that the *real English* has become ELF instead of ENL (English as a native language) since the spread of English around the world means that the former is spoken by a much greater population than the latter. Based on Kachru's World Englishes model, ELF scholars argue that the number of non-native English speakers (i.e., 300–500 million in the outer circle and 500 million to one billion in the expanding circle) has significantly exceeded the number of native English speakers (i.e., 320–380 million in the inner circle). Seidlhofer (2011) further points out that 80% of communication in English in the outer and expanding circles involves no native speakers of English. Since the majority of English users are non-native speakers and most of the communication encounters in English do not involve any native speakers, it is unrealistic to strictly follow the linguistic norms of native English speakers in communication between non-native speakers or between non-native speakers and native speakers. As Jenkins rightly points out, ELF speakers “can no longer be assumed to be deficient where their English use departs from ENL [English as a native language]” and “the ability to accommodate to

interlocutors with other first languages than one's own (regardless of whether the result is an 'error' in ENL) is a far more important skill than the ability to imitate the English of native speakers" (Jenkins, 2007, p, 238).

In English classrooms, it is thus unnecessary to set native English speaker's norms—on the levels of phonology, lexicogrammar, and pragmatics (e.g., idiomatic use)—and ask students to emulate these norms for efficient cross-cultural communication. Instead, English learners need to be prepared to be able to establish relevant and efficient communication with their future interlocutors who are, very likely, non-native speakers with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In order to prepare learners to be efficient ELF speakers, ELF scholars suggest bringing learners' attention to English norms and communicative strategies widely used among ELF speakers that are observed and systematically documented in ELF research projects (e.g., VOICE, the Vienna–Oxford International Corpus of English). The following are some examples of ELF English (lexicogrammatical) norms:

- a) simple present third person *-s* omitted: *He look very sad*
- b) article omission: *Our countries have signed agreement*
- c) treating *who* and *which* as interchangeable
- d) using *isn't it?* as a universal tag

(Prodromou, 2008, p. 31)

As shown in the above sentences, these lexicogrammatical forms are not so-called "Standard English." However, these "ungrammatical" uses are fully comprehensible to both non-native and native English speakers. Even when non-standard forms do at times create obstacles to understanding, ELF speakers use strategies such as gesturing, rephrasing, repeating, or the just-let-it-pass principle to continue the communication (Seidlhofer, 2005, 2011). The

question “What is ELF?” is still under debate (for details, see Jenkins, 2007; Park & Wee, 2012), and it is still too early to implement the features mentioned above into the English class syllabus. However, ELF scholars suggest that it is worthwhile at least to raise English learners’ awareness of the consequences of English spreading around the world. Learners could be made aware of the way in which English is used for “various practical purposes by people with varied norms and scopes of proficiency” (Seidlhofer, 2004, p.212) to facilitate efficient and relevant communication, particularly in the expanding circle.

2.2.3 Anti-colonial approaches

The World Englishes paradigm and the English as a lingua franca approach both focus on the study of localized English varieties and their respective linguistic features. In contrast, the anti-colonial approach demonstrates concern about the hegemonic relationship between Western and non-Western cultures and about the impact of cultural politics on various aspects of English language education. These include, but are not limited to, varieties of English (e.g., Kachru, 1992); linguistic human rights (e.g., Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1994); pedagogical approaches (e.g., Ramanathan & Morgan, 2009); and teacher education (e.g., Motha, 2014). As follows, I will illustrate two anti-colonial orientations of the study of global English pertaining to this study: critiques of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992) and the colonial discourse of Self and Other (Pennycook, 1998; Kubota, 2001).

Critiques of linguistic imperialism

Given the British colonial legacy and the American neo-colonial impact on economics, politics and the military, English has spread as a global language for

communication and education (Phillipson, 1992). In his well-known book *English as a Global Language*, David Crystal (2003) states that the English language has reached its global status simply as a result of being “in the right place at the right time” (p. 110). Crystal holds the belief that English is “the natural choice for progress” (p. 75), implying that those who can speak it will enjoy progress and wealth, whereas those who do not will remain undeveloped and poor.

The view that the spread of English and English language education is a neutral product of globalization has been questioned by Robert Phillipson (1992). In *Linguistic Imperialism*, he argues that the spread of English is an imperial project of the English-speaking countries, particularly Britain and the United States, that employ the English language to maintain power and resources for English-speaking countries in order to consolidate their dominant role around the world. English language education serves as the bridgehead for reaching this end. In this sense, the spread of the English language and English language education represents a political agenda that ensures the continuation of unequal power relations between “the dominant center,” specifically powerful Western nations,⁵ and “the dominated periphery” (p. 52), which is made up of underdeveloped and developing non-Western nations, for the purpose of maintaining power and interests for the center (Phillipson, 1992).

The five tenets listed below are widely promoted by the center’s ELT profession, the most salient manifestation of linguistic imperialism on peripheral English classrooms. The five tenets are as follows:

⁵ While acknowledging the West also includes European nations, the terms “West” or “center” used by Phillipson only refer to English-speaking countries including Britain, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

- English is best taught monolingually.
- The earlier English is taught, the better the results.
- The more English is taught, the better the results.
- If other languages are used much, standards of English will drop.
- The ideal teacher of English is a native speaker.

(Phillipson, 1992, p. 185)

To begin with, the tenets stating that English is best taught monolingually and that using another language will cause English language standards to drop resonate with each other. Both reflect the belief that teaching English should be done entirely through the medium of English. Therefore, English should be the only language permitted in the English classroom. The assumption is that the learner's first language will negatively interfere with learning the target language. Phillipson (1992) contends that there is not enough empirical evidence to support the assumption that the exclusive use of English in the classroom will result in better learning outcomes. He thus argues that these are fallacies created by the center's ELT profession to devalue the learner's first language and culture and to ensure the status of English and its culture as the only valuable learning resources in English classrooms. Moreover, the "the-earlier-the-better" tenet assumes that students should learn English as early as possible if they want to reach native-like English competency. Drawing on several experimental studies, Phillipson (1992) argues that an early start does not necessarily guarantee better second language learning. The hypothesis that starting at an early age results in better second language learning is, according to Phillipson, a fallacy that reinforces the ideology that standard varieties of English are superior and that, in order to acquire a standard variety, students need to learn it at as young an age as possible. In a similar vein, the

“the-more-the-better” tenet suggests that a standard variety of English is more likely to be acquired if students are exposed to a large amount of English input. This tenet not only reinforces the role of center-based English varieties, but it also produces more job opportunities for native speakers, given the increasing demand for English language education in the periphery where native speakers are the preferred English teachers. The four tenets mentioned above are, mostly if not all, closely related to the last one—the ideal English teacher is the native speaker. The idea that native speakers are better teachers reflects the assumption that native speakers are the best embodiment of a standard variety of English and of the culture of the center; by extension, native speakers are best equipped to provide language learners with input in Standard English and with the authentic culture of the region they are from. Phillipson called this tenet the “native-speaker fallacy,” which works to denigrate those teachers who were not born English speakers. This premise ensures that more job opportunities in ELT are guaranteed for teachers from the center. As Phillipson continues, non-native-speaking teachers are no less qualified as English teachers because the linguistic and cultural background shared with their students often enables them to better assist students’ struggles in language learning.

In short, Phillipson (1992) argues that the spread of English and English language education is never a natural and neutral product of globalization. Instead, it is an imperial project to perpetuate the asymmetrical power relations between the center and the periphery and to maintain interests and advantages for the center. Through the five tenets discussed above, asymmetrical power is constructed in the ELT profession to promote the English variety used in the center as the determinate goal for English learners and to ensure that only speakers from the center have the expertise to teach it. In contrast, students and teachers

from the periphery become dependent on teachers from the center who hold expertise and qualifications in teaching the language. Thus, when it comes to English language education, peripheral students and teachers become a subaltern group that always needs assistance from the center.

Colonial discourse of Self and Other

Like Phillipson (1992), who contends that we should not take the spread of English as a power-free incident, Pennycook (1998) also refuses to view English language education as a neutral product of globalization but considers it a site for “cultural constructs of colonialism” (p. 8). He states:

ELT is a product of colonialism not just because it is colonialism that produced the initial conditions for the global spread of English but because it was colonialism that produced many of the ways of thinking and believing that are still part of Western culture. (p. 19)

Pennycook (1998, 2001) argues that the way English language teaching is constructed and practiced is based on the images of the Self and the Other, the central discourse of colonialism. Fundamental to colonial discourse, according to Pennycook, is the construction of the colonized as the Other, usually characterized as backward, primitive, deprived, childlike, and so on, and the construction of the colonizer as the Self, often seen as advanced, developed, modern, and mature. Although the British colonial age is over, this colonial construct has continued to the present in English language education in colonized lands (Shin & Kubota, 2008). The discrepancy between the Self and Other was then reinforced through the influence of U.S.-centered global economics. When it comes to English language

education, anything from the West, including English norms, English teachers, methodologies, and textbooks, are considered advanced and more developed and thus more valuable resources in English classrooms. Meanwhile, those from the periphery are constructed as backward, deficient, and too immature to teach English, thus their efforts are devalued despite the fact that they might be more appropriate for the local context.

Kubota (2001) has nicely demonstrated how images of the Self and Other are constructed in ELT through the practices of dichotomizing, essentializing, and othering. According to her, discourses in applied linguistics often dichotomize cultures into the culture of the West and that of the East, particularly East Asia. Researchers and teachers then essentialize culture based on certain characteristics. For example, Western culture values individualism and encourages students to express their own voices and create innovative ideas. In contrast, collectivism is practiced in certain cultures in the East, in which students learn to respect authority and maintain group harmony rather than to express individual opinions. In terms of the teacher's role, in the West the teacher is a facilitator who values self-directed learning and guides learners to the truth by means of questioning. Conversely, in Asia the teacher is the authority with knowledge, whose major job is to transmit the correct knowledge to students. While no one would doubt the existence of cultural differences in terms of the particular features of teachers or students, Kubota argues that it is the action of *othering* non-Western cultures as inferior and deficient when teaching English that remains problematic. That is, based on the differences they observed in English classrooms, some teachers and researchers, or even students, tend to *other* non-Western cultures, denigrating them as deficient and needing adjustment in order to catch up with Western ways of teaching and learning. To illustrate this, because Western students tend to

express themselves more, they are seen as being more creative and critical. In comparison, Asian students are more dependent and passive learners who lack the ability to challenge ideas different from their own, given that they are used to their teachers' guidance. What's more, teachers from the East are often blamed for holding too much authority in classrooms and thus neglecting students' real feelings and needs in learning. When comparisons are made, those who hold the power have the right to decide who represents the norm and who is deviant. In the field of English language teaching, it is the developed and progressive Self who holds the power to make their norms the standard to follow (Kubota, 2001). In brief, through the practices of dichotomizing, essentializing and othering, the cultural constructs of colonialism—the superior Self and inferior Other—are constructed in ELT. It is these colonial constructs that position peripheral students as passive and lacking critical thinking skills and teachers as too authoritative and neglectful of students' needs. Thus, to be better teachers or students, they need to follow the pedagogical culture of the West.

2.2.4 English and linguistic instrumentalism

There is no doubt that English is spoken all over the world and that it has become a popular lingua franca among people of diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The role of English is further strengthened by the new globalized economy driven by neoliberal discourse (Kubota, 2011). To accelerate regional economic growth, many economic free zones have been created in Asia. These include Inchoen and Busan in Korea; Shantou, Shenzhen, and Hainan in China; and Taipei, Taichung, and Kaohsiung harbours in Taiwan. International associations such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) have also been established. These special zones and associations create more encounters for using

English as a language of communication to increase international cooperation. In these countries and regions, the English language facilitates international business negotiations and communication and serves to attract more foreign investors and capital flow (Park, 2009). Thus, the English language is closely connected to global competitiveness and economic growth for societies that depend on foreign investment. This discourse resonates with the larger “neoliberal discourse of human capital in a knowledge economy” (Kubota, 2011, p. 249). That is, English competence is treated as a crucial skill, as part of the human capital⁶ necessary for a society to compete in the global market.

Under these circumstances, English competence is viewed as vital for citizens of any society that aspires to join the global market. Therefore, national educational policies in many Asian countries promote competence in English as a required skill in order to boost the nation’s economic growth (Kubota, 2011; Park, 2009; Wee, 2008). For individuals, English is learned not merely as a means of identity construction (e.g., World Englishes) or for casual communication (e.g., English as a lingua franca) but as an instrument (Wee, 2008) that enables the speaker to access job opportunities and social mobility made possible by the knowledge economy. When English is learned for its “usefulness in achieving specific utilitarian goals such as access to economic development or social mobility” (Wee, 2008, p. 32), it can be interpreted as an elaborating language that provides individuals with a wide range of opportunities and initiatives for changing their lives (Park, 2011). In other words, as

⁶ According to Urciuoli (2008), the skills essential to human capital development in the new global economy are communication, teamwork, and leadership. He states, “as the neoliberal dream has increasingly saturated the new workplace, workers have come to be seen as personally responsible for skills acquisition, to the point of self-commodification. Thus the value placed on the paradigmatic soft skills of communication, teamwork, and leadership” (p. 212). In non-English-speaking countries, the English language is one of the most important skills for global competitiveness as it is still the dominant global language (Kubota, 2011; Phillipson, 2008).

long as one is eager to make a change for a better life, the English language always provides an opportunity. Boosted by this discourse, the English industry flourishes in non-English-speaking countries. In addition to extra hours allocated to formal English education in schools, a burgeoning private sector of English education has been established that promises to create “opportunities” for people in pursuit of a better life.

This idea of English as a neutral and liberating language has been severely critiqued by many scholars. First, since English is considered to be a crucial skill in developing human capital for the knowledge economy in many non-English-speaking countries, a “lack of English skills is not a mere risk one may choose to take, but a transgression” (Park, 2010, p. 26). The decision to learn English is no longer a personal choice; English has become a basic skill, and individuals have a responsibility to learn it in order to develop their nation’s economic growth. Those who choose not to learn the language are considered irresponsible, both to themselves and to society as a whole (Park, 2011; Piller & Cho, 2013). Such ideology motivates individuals to invest heavily in English language training, making them into neoliberal subjects who “carry the burden of endless self-development, including the continuous improvement of linguistic skills” (Park, 2011). While English learning provides no guarantee of social mobility (Kubota, 2011), endlessly learning the language certainly creates an economic and time burden for learners. It is a delusion that English is liberating; in reality, it is a burden in terms of endless effort and economic investment (Park, 2011; Park & Wee, 2012).

According to Park and Wee (2012), neoliberal discourse and linguistic instrumentalism (Wee, 2008) in ELT are making teaching English as a global language more complex than ever before; this deserves more scholarly attention, especially for countries

where English is not spoken as a native language. Nevertheless, this is not to say that old ideologies in English education are of no relevance to the current state of ELT. Park and Wee (2012), Heller (2010), and Pennycook (2007) all draw attention to the fact that naturalizing the idea of English as a liberating language for learning and teaching could help reproduce the ideologies established during the earlier post-colonial era. As Heller (2010) states:

[...] relations of power established earlier in the political, social, and cultural terms characteristic of colonialism and the immediate post-colonial period are being recast in economic terms to relegitimize and preserve them. The national and imperial markets set up in previous centuries still operate, but they are reframed as collaborative rather than hierarchical and as aimed at economic development and competition rather than at servicing the nation or the imperial center. (p. 105)

In this sense, the colonial structure in ELT still remains, not in a hierarchical sense but as a collective imperative (Heller, 2010). This does not mean that the hegemonic relation between the Self and Other is being eased, but rather that it is being neutralized or erased to justify “the neoliberal logic of human capital development” (Park, 2010, p. 22). That is, to be competitive in the globalized world, learning English is not an option but a necessity. If ideologies such as native-speakerism and the Self–Other colonial discourse are widely exercised in the ELT of a given society, it is fair to assume that learning inner-circle varieties of English, adopting Western pedagogical cultures in local classrooms, or favouring native-speaker teachers over the non-native will also be naturalized into a rational process to help individuals gain the linguistic capital they need to vie for material returns, social mobility, and even their society’s socio-economic development. Under this neoliberal logic, any opinions in favour of practices other than those listed above will be condemned, since the

beliefs and practices listed above are rationalized as the conduits for acquiring the native-like level of English competence deemed necessary to compete in the English-dominant globalizing market.

2.3. Challenge in local English classrooms: Ideology of native-speakerism

As shown in the previous section, over the past three decades, numerous scholars in TESOL and applied linguistics have discussed how the use of English has been dramatically changed as a result of the global spread of English. Although each model has met with criticism for not being comprehensive when talking about the global spread of English (for detailed critiques, see Canagarajah, 2005; Park & Wee, 2012; Pennycook, 2001), these discussions have made a huge contribution to ELT in that they have raised awareness in English classrooms worldwide and have led to a re-examination of *which* English variety should be used, learned, and taught, and of *how* it should be taught. Influenced by these academic discussions about changes in English use and education, many non-native speakers have become empowered to see themselves as equally legitimate English users and teachers as those from the inner circle (e.g., Canagarajah, 2005; Houghton & Rivers, 2013; Llorca, 2005; Phan, 2008). Consequently, they are now starting to view plural forms of English not as deficient forms but as resourceful means of local communication (e.g., Bianco et al., 2009; Canagarajah, 1999; Kachru, 2005; Matsuda, 2003). Despite the efforts made in academia and the positive steps taken by the non-native-speaking community, the discourse of native-speakerism (Holliday, 2006, 2015) is still actively exercised in local ELT and rooted in the mindset of many English learners and teachers, which buttresses the superiority of native speakers, their norms of English and teaching methodologies (Kumaravadivelu, 2012a, 2016).

Holliday (2006) defines native-speakerism as “the belief that ‘native speaker’ teachers present a ‘Western culture’ from which spring the ideal both of the English language and of English language teaching methodologies” (p. 385). Inherent in the idea of native-speakerism is what Holliday (2015) terms “cultural disbelief,” which sees non-Western cultural realities as deficient and inferior. Therefore, when it comes to English learning, those from the English-speaking West are superior and advanced, and their ideas are the ones to follow. This cultural disbelief in ELT was first explicitly promoted in the 1960s when English education was commercialized and became a saleable product that supported American and British aid trajectories in many post-colonial and neo-colonial countries (Holliday, 2015; Phillipson, 1992). Now, cultural disbelief is reinforced, according to Kumaravadivelu (2016), mainly in the practice of self-marginalization. Thus, non-Western ELT practitioners and students have consented to the superiority of Western culture and native English speakers, and see themselves as less competent English speakers and teachers. Through the process of marginalization on the part of the English-speaking West, and the practice of self-marginalization on the part of the non-Western-dominated group (Kumaravadivelu, 2016), this idea of native-speakerism has become a discourse constructed within the ELT profession, which provides “a language for talking about—i.e. a way of representing—a particular kind of knowledge about a topic” (Hall, 1996, p. 201). Thus, the discourse of native-speakerism becomes tacit knowledge and the default, leaving little room for local English learners to speak and write in their own creative ways and for local practitioners to activate local knowledge (e.g., pedagogies) to teach the language.

Kumaravadivelu (2012a) rightly articulates the concern about ELT now shared by many other scholars and TESOL practitioners: “In order for our profession to meet the

challenges of globalism in a deeply meaningful way, what is required is no less than an epistemic break from its dependency on the current West-oriented, Center-based knowledge systems that carry an indelible colonial coloration” (p. 14). There is no doubt that we, as academics and practitioners, need to deconstruct the native-speakerist ideology in local English classrooms in order to reconstruct *cultural belief* (Holliday, 2013, 2015), a belief in the ELT contribution of all English teachers and speakers, regardless of their linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

2.4 Teaching English as a global language and teacher identity

As the English language spreads around the globe and is used for various purposes in different socio-cultural and socio-economic contexts, the meanings and goals of English education around the world are changing dramatically. Learning English in a meaningful way no longer refers to an accumulation of mechanical knowledge (i.e., vocabulary, grammar, pragmatics) to achieve native-like proficiency. Rather, effective learning requires students to develop the ability to understand their relationship to the English language according to the complex social, political, and ideological conditions at play in the changing world. Only when they achieve this can they appropriate their learning to bring it in line with their own values, visions, and practices (Barnawia and Phan, 2015; Kumaravadivelu, 2003, 2006, 2016; Morgan, 2010). In this light, language teachers are not technicians applying the appropriate methodology in order for L2 learners to acquire the target language (Varghese et al., 2005). Language teachers, who are involved in decision making about instruction, curriculum and policies, are now considered to have a vital role in transforming English classrooms into socio-culturally informed learning environments (Johnson, 2006;

Kumaravadivelu, 2012a, 2016; Lin et al., 2002; Morgan, 2010; Ramanathan & Morgan, 2007), and helping to reconstruct the “cultural belief” proposed by Holliday (2013, 2015). It is believed that language teachers are the potential agents of change who can find “‘wiggle room’ to re-interpret [English] language policies, curricula, and classroom materials in ways that better reflect the local needs and realities of the students” (Morgan, 2010, p. 36).

Recently, in applied linguistics and TESOL, language teacher identity has played a central role in this transformation process of ELT; how teachers see themselves as English speakers, writers, and teachers is closely linked to what and how they teach their students in the language classroom (Cheung et al., 2015; Morgan, 2010; Motha, 2006, 2014; Phan, 2008; Varghese et al., 2005). As mentioned earlier, one of the current primary objectives of teaching English is to establish within English learners an ability to critically reflect on socio-cultural and socio-political conditions in relation to English learning. Therefore, understanding language teachers’ “professional, cultural, political, and individual identities which they claim or which are assigned to them” (Varghese et al., 2005, p.22) becomes a crucial site for exploring the *wiggle room* that can possibly bring changes to ELT practices.

The aim of this study is to use teacher identity as a lens for investigating the transformative potential of deconstructing the ideology of native-speakerism in order to construct the cultural belief that allows localized plural English norms and local knowledge of English teaching to develop in the local English classroom.

2.5 Teacher identity as social construction

In this study, I situate myself in social constructionism (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Holsten & Gubrium, 2011; De Fina, Schiffirin & Bamberg, 2006) to understand teacher

identity as social construction. A social constructionist approach to research guides me in viewing knowledge about the world, and experiences of the world, not pre-given but very much socially mediated and constructed through the use of language. From this perspective, identity is not that “people passively or latently have this or that identity which then causes feelings and actions” (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998, p. 2), but it is constituted through social action. De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2011) further state that, *language* has an extraordinary role to play in this construction process, because “it is at the center of most of the social practices in which human beings are engaged.” (p. 158) and construct social meanings. Therefore, identity construction is a process that emerges in interaction within given social context and is achieved in local interaction as people “work up and work to this or that identity, for themselves and others, there and then, either as an end in itself or towards some other end” (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998, p. 2). In this sense, identity is context-sensitive, locally constructed, interactionally negotiated and “[a] set of verbal practices through which persons assemble and display who they are while in the presence of and in interaction with others” (Johnson, 2006, p. 213). By using available discursive resource in situated social interaction, such as words (e.g., identity category, vocabulary, pronouns, metaphors), embodied expression (e.g., gestures, facial expression), paravocal features (e.g., intonation, stress) or ideologies (e.g., discourse about ELT), people “ascribe (and reject), avow (and disavow), display (and ignore)” certain identity categories (Prior, 2016, p. 36), so to articulate the desired identities they want to be understood by their interlocutors (e.g., the interviewer or students).

Teacher identity-in-discourse and identity-in-practice

In this study, I also rely on Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, and Johnson’s (2005)

concepts *identity-in-discourse* and *identity-in-practice* to further my understanding of identity as socially constructed. First, identity is constructed in and through *language* and *discourse*. In our daily lives, language is used not only as the primary vehicle through which we exchange information or express feelings and emotions; it is also used to “organize and reorganize a sense of who [we] are and how [we] relate to the social world” (Norton, 2013, p. 4). In social interaction, we use sounds, words, and the expressions of language and styles to classify and judge people in order to distance ourselves from others and underline our differences; we also use them to align ourselves with others and foreground our similarities (De Fina, 2011a). As the language we use to describe ourselves and others is subject to change across time and space, so are identities (Morgan, 2007; Norton, 2013). Speakers use different words and styles for different interlocutors in order to display desired identities in the situated contexts. In this sense, identities are multiple, contingent, in process and in flux. According to Morgan (2007), as social meanings are mediated through language, meanings of the Self and Other are constructed within discourse: “systems of *power/knowledge* that regulate and ascribe social values to all forms of human activity ... within particular institutions, academic disciplines, and larger social formations” (Morgan, 2004, p. 173, italics original; see also Block, 2009, 2013). Therefore, how we speak and write—how we define ourselves—impinges upon social and ideological structures that inform us about how to act in socially accepted ways. How language teachers construct a sense of self thus involves negotiation with discourses about teaching and learning developed in various contexts (e.g., teacher education programs, situated teaching institutes), including those available or constructed in situated social interactions (e.g., interviews or classroom interaction).

Varghese et al. (2005) also contend that teacher identity is constituted through practice. That is, language teachers “enact their identity through what they do” (Lee, 2013, p. 331). By observing what and how language and ideologies are deployed in their teaching of English language, we understand how language teachers position themselves as particular kinds of teachers. According to Varghese et al. (2005), “language teacher identity is seen to be constituted by the practices in relation to a group and the process of individual identification or nonidentification with the group” (p. 39). From this perspective, identity-in-practice also captures the idea that teachers are not passive individuals who only orient themselves to the dominant discourses to make sense of who they are (identity-in-discourse). When teachers interact with others in their daily lives (e.g., colleagues, students, or research interviewers), they are agents capable of choosing to accept or reject the dominant discourse in order to align, or not, with certain groups or identities (Bamberg, 2004; Canagarajah, 1999; De Fina, 2013a; Duff, 2012). Therefore, to better understand how teacher identity is constructed, it is crucial to observe how available discourses support language teachers in constructing their sense of self, or constrain them, as well as how teachers take an active role in constructing their own experiences and identities in moment-by-moment social interaction.

Understanding teacher identity as mediated both through discourse and practice, I aim to investigate four Western-educated Taiwanese teachers’ construction of their writer and teacher identities through talking about their writing and teaching experiences and through teaching in their own classrooms. I pay particular attention to seeing how they accept, reject, or negotiate with the dominant discourse of native-speakerism in current ELT in the interaction with me as a researcher and with their students in writing classrooms, and how they construct their writer and teacher identities in relation to this discourse. Given that

one's identity formation is dynamic and contingent in nature, and that it emerges in multiple contextualizations (De Fina, 2011b; Morgan, 2007; Norton, 2013), I view each conversation or incident of participants to be one possible version of her life story. Thus, the insights from participants' identity-in-discourse and identity-in-practice that occurred in different social contexts (e.g., interviews and writing classrooms) afford multiple versions to gain a deeper view of how they position themselves as English writing teachers and to explore the wiggle room for reconstructing the subjectivity of English education in the context of Taiwan.

2.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have presented the key conceptual framings of this study: teaching English as a global language, and the role that teacher identity plays in ELT today. I first outlined the discourse of the global spread of English from the perspectives of the World Englishes model (Kachru, 1990, 1992); English as a lingua franca (Jenkins, 2000, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2004, 2005, 2011); critiques of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992); colonial construct of the Self and Other (Pennycook, 1998, Kubota, 2001); and English and linguistic instrumentalism (Kubota, 2011; Wee, 2008). I then pointed out the challenge – native-speakerism, which is now faced in local English classrooms as a result of the spread of the English language. I also theorized on language teacher identity in light of teaching English as a global language because it is now considered by many to be a promising site from which to transform ELT from an Anglo-centric to a local-sensitive orientation. Finally, I articulated my orientation to understand teacher identity – identity as social construction, and presented two concepts that help further my understanding teacher identity from social constructionist

perspective: teacher identity-in-discourse and identity-in-practice. Keeping in mind this conceptual framework, this study aims to investigate the wiggle room available for deconstructing the discourse of native-speakerism, still persistently rooted in Taiwanese society, by examining four Western-educated Taiwanese teachers' identities in relation to this dominant discourse. In Chapter 3, I review the literature on Western-educated teacher identity with regard to teaching English as a global language.

CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Introduction

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the impetus for this research is to investigate how Taiwanese Western-educated teachers see themselves as English users, writers, and writing teachers in respect to the discourse of native-speakerism, and how their identities interact with their teaching after returning. In this chapter, I review research literature on Western-educated NNESTs' studying experiences and teacher identity development that are pertinent to this inquiry: (1) pre-service NNESTs' identity construction and professional development in Western TESOL programs; (2) pre-service NNESTs' writing experiences and writing identity construction in Western TESOL programs; and (3) Western-educated returning teachers' identity and teaching practices in their home countries. I also address several literature gaps this research aims to fill.

3.2 Pre-service NNESTs' identity construction and professional development in Western TESOL programs

Scholars and practitioners in TESOL have critiqued the perceived unequal value of English varieties and speakers. Attempts have also been made in teacher education to restructure the role and identity of the NNEST from that of a "second class citizen" (Pavlenko, 2003, p. 251) to that of a legitimate user and teacher in the English language teaching profession (Amin, 1997; Braine, 1999; Medgyes, 1994; Nayar, 1994; Rampton, 1990). Aware of these politics in ELT, many Western TESOL programs have modified their curricula and invited pre-service NNESTs to critique the NS/NNS dichotomy in class and to reconsider their legitimacy and agency as TESOL professionals (3.2.1). Besides taking

courses, pre-service NNESTs have also found teaching practicums while studying in TESOL programs helpful in transforming their professional identities and giving them a sense of legitimacy rather than inferiority (3.2.2). However, while some TESOL programs provide opportunities to empower NNESTs, others have continued to reproduce hegemonic discourses that disempower them (3.2.3). In this section, I review and elaborate each of these research trends and highlight the role that NNESTs' linguistic identity (i.e., that of "non-native" English speakers) plays in constructing their professional legitimacy during their study in Western TESOL programs.

3.2.1 Identity construction through taking courses

The four studies (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 1999; Golombek & Jordan, 2005; Pavlenko, 2003; Samimy et al., 2011) reviewed in this section discussed how MATESOL courses provided a space for pre-service NNESTs to develop imagined identities (Norton, 2000, 2001) in an *imagined community* (Anderson, 1991; Wenger, 1998), and how that space "offer[ed] identity options that would allow teachers to imagine themselves and others as legitimate members of professional communities" (Pavlenko, 2003, p. 253).

Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (1999) designed the very first graduate seminar and research project in North America that enabled NNESTs to examine the native/non-native speaker (NS/NNS) dichotomy based on classroom discussion, writing response, and autobiography. Their study illustrated how the students, through constantly discussing and reflecting in class on their English learning and teaching experiences in relation to the native-speaker myth, co-constructed English ownership and an insider identity to legitimately use and teach the language. Many of them said that they would continue these alternative

discourses upon their return to their home countries in order to create a more empowering environment for both EFL teachers and students to learn and teach English with a sense of legitimacy.

Pavlenko (2003) also modified a second language acquisition (SLA) course to include more readings and discussion on critical issues in TESOL (e.g., Cook, 1999; Norton, 2001). By doing so she hoped to raise students' awareness of alternative identities with which they could align themselves in teaching the English language. Based on linguistic autobiographies of 40 pre-service teachers (24 American citizens and 20 international students), Pavlenko found that before the course, many non-native English-speaking (NNES, thereafter) students invested themselves into the native speaker community in order to validate their professional legitimacy. These investments included working on their pronunciation in order to sound more like native speakers. Some students aligned themselves with the NNS/L2 learner community, seeing themselves as perpetual L2 learners with no confidence in becoming qualified English teachers. Nevertheless, through readings and discussions of scholarly works (e.g., Cook, 1999; Norton, 2001) throughout the class, many of these pre-service teachers created a multilingual/L2 user community. The new imagined community allowed them to stop pursuing native-like pronunciation and feeling negative about their NNEST identity. It encouraged them to construct new identities, such as those of bilingual speakers and multicomponent English teachers who had a wide language repertoire and sufficient knowledge to teach the English language.

In the same vein, Golombek and Jordan (2005) introduced critical scholarly readings (i.e., Cook, 1992; Lippi-Green, 1997) in a pronunciation pedagogy course for NNESTs, which allowed them to reposition their roles in English classrooms. The authors observed

that the idea of intelligibility in English pronunciation was usually native-speaker defined and often based on speakers' non-linguistic factors, such as race. They also problematized that the burden of English communication usually fell on non-native speakers, forcing L2 speakers to improve their pronunciation until they achieved native-speaker-defined intelligibility. To help students deconstruct these ideologies, the authors conducted this pronunciation course in order to invite the TESOL students to rethink the intertwined relation between race, intelligibility, and English pronunciation in relation to the NS/NNS dichotomy. Based on interview data and the reaction papers of two Taiwanese pre-service teachers in response to readings that challenged the native speaker myth, the authors found that the course created for both teachers "a novel way of imagining new identities for [themselves] and [their] students beyond race and intelligibility" (p. 521). They stopped judging themselves with the native English speaker yardstick of intelligibility that they had used previously, and they invested in a new imagined identity, that of multi-competent English speaker and teacher. With this new identity, they not only valued their L1 knowledge and knowledge of the local teaching tradition; they also saw their potential to change the status quo of English teaching in Taiwan that was deeply rooted in the idea of NS superiority.

Unlike the previous three studies, which were based on short-term observation, Samimy, Kim, Lee, and Kasai (2011) conducted a 3.5-year longitudinal study based on class reflection logs, journal entries, autobiography, and notes of group meetings of three NNES graduate students; they investigated these students' trajectory toward becoming legitimate members of the TESOL profession during and after the TESOL seminar. This study confirmed the findings of previous studies (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 1999; Golombek & Jordan, 2005; Pavlenko, 2003) that exposure to intensive reading and discussion of

alternative discourses (e.g., multi-competence, World Englishes) during the TESOL seminar encouraged the graduate students to reconstruct their agency in teaching the English language. The study also indicated that TESOL students' professional legitimacy could continue to grow after the seminar, with the course professor's mentorship and peer support. After the seminar, the participants in this study were invited by the course professor to co-present in conferences and to co-author papers related to NNEST issues. The participants developed a sense of belonging and legitimacy in the TESOL profession through sharing their experiences as NNES and voicing their opinions about the NS/NNS dichotomy at such legitimate occasions. In addition to this mentorship, peers in the program also supported each other in establishing a positive imagined identity. The participants met on a regular basis during and after the seminar to reflect on their teaching and learning experiences, where they created a "safe house" (Pratt, 1991) to test out alternative identities (e.g., speaker of World Englishes). Such space and support confirmed the sense of empowerment and legitimacy these students developed from the TESOL program, allowing them to see themselves as agents of change in future teaching contexts.

3.2.2 Identity construction through doing teaching / practicums

Besides taking courses, TESOL students also construct a professional identity through teaching. To better prepare themselves to teach in their future classrooms, some TESOL students take part in a teaching practicum, either as a required component of their program or on a voluntary basis. In the practicum, they test out their school knowledge in actual classrooms and make adjustments to their teaching according to specific teaching conditions. The six studies reviewed in this section outline such learning-to-teach

experiences of TESOL students. Some of the studies focus on the notion of the NS/NNS dichotomy in constructing the student teachers' identities and teaching practices (Park, 2012; Reis, 2010, 2011, 2012); still others go beyond this dichotomy and discuss how pedagogical knowledge (e.g., peer review) learned from TESOL programs constructs student teachers' professional identity in such a way that it has an impact on their teaching practices (Lee, 2010, 2013). These studies highlight that teacher identity is not only developed through teacher training, such as taking courses, but is greatly informed by teachers' own teaching practices and contexts.

Based on electronic autobiographical narratives, electronic journal entries, and individual interviews, Park (2012) reported the case of Xia, a TESOL graduate student, and her identity development in relation to native-speakerism ideology during her teaching practicum. Xia, a Chinese speaker, felt very insecure about her English proficiency when she first started her study in a US TESOL program. This insecurity was reinforced when Xia's English competence was questioned by a job recruiter who doubted that her English competence would be adequate for the position of English proficiency test scorer. Because of these disempowering experiences, Xia aimed to master English to an NS level while studying in the program. Only reaching NS-like proficiency would camouflage her NNEST identity and endorse her legitimacy to work in English-related jobs. It was not until her student teaching practicum that Xia started to validate her identity as a NNEST. While observing an elementary ESL class taught by her practicum mentor, a Japanese NNEST, Xia realized that her mentor's bilingual and bicultural competence enabled her to be more understanding and supportive of ESL students' struggles in learning and socializing in school. From this experience, Xia learned that a teacher's attitude toward her students and her pedagogical

knowledge had much more to do with students' learning than her language competence alone. Xia finally learned to live and teach positively with her non-native English, focusing on developing a professional knowledge which enabled her to provide her students with the comfortable learning environment that she had observed in her teaching practicum.

In his dissertation research, Reis (2010) followed six composition NNESTs (MA and PhD students in applied linguistics or TESL) for a semester in an American university to explore how their professional identities developed as they were teaching a freshman composition course modified by Reis by adding reading and class discussion in related to NS/NNS issues. Based on data from journals, classroom observations, interviews, surveys, and teaching philosophy statements, Reis found that the modified course unit served as a mediational space for the participants to articulate and reflect on their teaching and learning experiences; this enabled them to “claim empowering identity options as rightful English speakers and teachers” (p. 35). For example, Lee (a Korean PhD student teacher), despite being a fluent speaker and writer and an outstanding graduate student in his PhD program, often experienced anxiety about his relative inability compared to NS teachers to explain to students the uses of English. Through teaching the modified course, Lee acquired counter-arguments, which eased his negative emotions about being a teacher in view of the NS superiority ideology. By teaching students about these issues, he also developed a positive sense of self (e.g., multi-competence) that gave him the confidence to teach that composition class.

In another NS/NNS-related study, Reis (2011) reported on the case of Kang, a Chinese graduate student, in the same composition program. Kang's sense of self as an English writing teacher constantly wavered in relation to NS ideology. On the one hand, the

modified course raised Kang's awareness of NS/NNS inequality and empowered him to construct a positive identity, such as that of an "expert user," to present himself as a good English writing teacher with a profound English knowledge. On the other hand, Kang also displayed insecurity about his language competence and "tested himself against" his language intuition with his NS colleagues when he was not so sure about language use. Although teaching with confidence and empowerment (i.e., as an expert user), Kang still set *perfect English* and *language intuition* as ultimate goals to pursue in order to maximize his teaching legitimacy in the ESL composition program. Reis attributed Kang's wavering identities to some of his students' expectations of a qualified English teacher, e.g. that the teacher should be white and have no accent when speaking English. Reis suggested that teacher education could help student teachers build a robust and positive professional identity in order to resist possible oppression from their teaching context, such as the students' bias experienced by Kang.

Moving from the NS/NES dichotomy, Lee conducted two studies (2010, 2013) in a Hong Kong TESOL program and explored how a pedagogical knowledge of teaching L2 writing affected the development of professional identity among student teachers. The four participants were all in-service teachers enrolled in an MA program in a major Hong Kong university. Lee was the instructor of the MA course when the data were collected. In the first study, based on interviews and students' research project reports, Lee (2010) explored how the MA course (with writing teacher education as the main component) promoted teachers' professional development. She found that the mini research project assigned as a class requirement was particularly helpful as a form of professional development for these in-service teachers. To meet this requirement, the participants had to carry out a research project

by implementing newly learned theories and pedagogies in their actual classrooms. This learning-by-doing project enabled the student teachers to realize the challenges they might face after going back to the real classroom equipped with the ideal theories they had learned from their graduate programs. According to the findings in their projects, these teachers “blend[ed] idealism and realism” (p. 154) to find a balance between theory and practice to better prepare themselves to teach in their own classrooms.

In another study with the same four in-service teachers, Lee (2013) used Varghese et al.’s (2005) notions of *identity-in-practice* and *identity-in-discourse* and Leontiev’s (1981) *identity-in-activity* to further discuss how the four participants identified themselves differently throughout the MA course. Through interviews and the teachers’ classroom research reports, this study confirmed the findings of all the previous studies discussed in this section, indicating that explicit discussion and class readings of new knowledge offered student teachers opportunities to rethink the nature of English (writing) education and to reflect on their current practice. With the new knowledge acquired in the MA course (L2 writing knowledge, such as peer review and genre writing), all the participants shifted their identity from that of language teacher (e.g., focusing only on grammar and vocabulary teaching) to that of writing teacher (e.g., focusing on the writing process and development). This new understanding of themselves as writing teachers explicitly influenced their instructional practices. For example, instead of the teachers taking the major role in giving detailed grammatical instruction and correction, they gave students the responsibility for their own learning (e.g., by carrying out peer review), hoping to guide students to be more independent and active in their own learning process. The MA course experience also helped the teachers to see themselves as agents with the confidence and ambition to bring changes to

their schools by introducing new and helpful writing pedagogies to their colleagues. However, Lee also found that teachers' positive identities and innovative teaching approaches could be subverted by institutional conditions (e.g., large class sizes, school policies). For instance, an attempt to emphasize content rather than grammar in students' writing was denied by a participant's school, which required writing teachers to mark all students' errors. Lee suggested that writing teacher education should provide more opportunities to blend idealism and realism, making student teachers more aware of the socio-cultural, political, and historical conditions deeply rooted in their teaching contexts, which they might face in their teaching.

3.2.3 Politics in TESOL programs and professional development

While the studies reviewed above have provided increasing evidence that TESOL programs play an important role in supporting NNESTs in the reconstruction of their positive professional identity in ELT in respect to their "non-native" English-speaking status, the studies reported in this section show that the persistence of the native-speaker-superiority ideology continues to be influential in the pedagogy and practice of TESOL programs in various forms.

For example, via electronic autobiographical narratives, electronic journals, and interviews, Park (2015) showed how the cultural capital of two TESOL students was illegitimated in a US TESOL program. The two students, from Korea and China, came to the TESOL program with fully equipped cultural capital (e.g., good English competence, high test scores, a high degree of education, parental support) acquired in their own native countries. The accompanying forms of capital and habitus (Bourdieu, 1991) (e.g., a positive

sense of themselves as good English speakers and teachers), however, were de-valORIZED by the self-perceived and other-positioned marginalization of their identities as non-white and non-native English speakers in the program. The de-valORIZATION, as argued by Park, was due to the dominant discourse that existed in the TESOL program, which still viewed any non-white and non-native-speaking student as a “perpetual foreigner” (p. 122) on the basis of native-speaker-defined standards of English proficiency. For instance, one participant, Liu, found that her opinions were often ignored by her white professor and peers because her ways of expressing ideas were not clear enough to be understood. Liu’s sense of illegitimacy as an English speaker, teacher, and scholar started to grow every time she was silenced. Park implied that this sense of illegitimacy might cause TESOL students to resort to new and appropriate forms of cultural capital, such as native-like English competence, in order to restructure the professional legitimacy and privilege in the TESOL program they are studying in. In other words, Western TESOL programs could be a site for the production and reproduction of the hegemonic relations among English speakers, English varieties, and races.

Aware of the danger of reproducing the hierarchical relationship between Western TESOL programs and international students, Ilieva (2010) brought a critical eye to her examination of her role as a teacher educator in Western TESOL programs in constructing NNESTs’ professional legitimacy and agency. Using Bakhtin’s (1981) constructs of “authoritative discourse” and “internally persuasive discourse,” Ilieva (2010) analyzed 20 end-of-program portfolios of NNESTs from China studying in a Canadian MATESOL program and investigated how these students constructed professional legitimacy through negotiating and appropriating the pedagogical and theoretical knowledge they gained from

the TESOL program. Part of the findings confirmed previous studies (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 1999; Golombek & Jordan, 2005; Pavlenko, 2003; Samimy et al., 2011) that having NNESTs read articles with a critical perspective toward ELT (e.g., Lippi-Green, 1997; Freire, 1970) created a space for them to form “internally persuasive discourse” (Bakhtin, 1981) to believe that they were not any inferior to NESTs as English teachers. Despite the positive impact the curriculum in the TESOL program had on students, Ilieva also observed that the same reading and the discussion around critical approaches to teaching English were sometimes embraced by the students as “authoritative discourses” that were uncritically taken as a panacea to transform English education in China. Nevertheless, this empowering approach toward language teaching (e.g., Freire, 1970) presented in the TESOL program might not be relevant to the Chinese teaching context. Ilieva expresses concern that the unconditional allegation (Bakhtin, 1981) of Western TESOL knowledge could help perpetuate the existing dominant status of native speakers and Western knowledge in peripheral contexts, thereby reinforcing “the march of linguistic imperialism” (p. 355). Therefore, teacher educators and pre-service teachers in Western TESOL programs should all be more aware of and avoid uncritical imposition (by program) and uncritical up-taking (by students) of the centered TESOL knowledge.

To follow Ilieva’s work (2010), Ilieva and Waterstone (2013) conducted a longitudinal study (2007–2011) in the same Canadian MA program, trying to unpack what and how ideologies embedded in the program curriculum were taken up by the MATESOL students in order to construct their academic and professional identities. This study consisted of two sub-studies: (1) students’ training experiences in the TESOL program; and (2) students’ literacy development in an academic literacy program designed to support first-year

international students. Data were collected from students' end-of-program portfolios, written assignment, course outlines, assignment descriptions, email exchanges, and interviews. This study confirmed Ilieva's findings (2010) that some curriculum discourses were taken as "authoritative discourse" (Bakhtin, 1981) by students without much critical reflection. This study provided a detailed example of how scholarly theories and teaching philosophies were "lived and enacted in this program" (p. 19). For example, Freire's critical pedagogy was one of the major concepts covered in the program. When students were asked to design a course syllabus based on Freire's (1970) critical pedagogy, they tended to parrot the benefits of the pedagogy discussed in the course without much reflection of whether this pedagogy was compatible with the Chinese educational context. Ilieva and Waterstone argued that this parroting practice contradicted the central notion of "being critical" in critical pedagogy and limited the students' potential to create a meaningful pedagogy for their own native country. Although Ilieva and Waterstone noticed that the alternative education discourse (e.g., critical pedagogy) helped develop the student teachers' sense of professional legitimacy, they were also cautious about their roles as "technicians of empire" (Luke, 2004), promoting academicism (Stier, 2004) to convince the students that "[Western] methods of teaching, research and degrees are better than those of other countries" (Stier, 2004, p. 93). Ilieva and Waterstone (2013) called for more exploration of how NNESTs actually teach in their local contexts in order to better understand whether the accounts expressed in research conducted in the West "reflected simple parroting of program discourses or a real sense of agency" (Ilieva, 2010, p. 365).

Politics between English speakers (Park, 2015, in this section) and embedded in Western pedagogies (Ilieva, 2010; Ilieva & Waterstone, 2013, in this section) are not only

exercised in a top-down fashion in TESOL programs but are also produced and reproduced among NNESTs. In both Golombek and Jordan (2005) and Inoue and Stracke's (2013) studies, the students studying in Western TESOL programs showed a tendency to take their Western-gained experiences as cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) to position themselves as more legitimate teachers than locally trained teachers. Shao-Mei, one participant in Golombek and Jordan's work (2005), developed a crucial awareness of native speaker superiority after the TESOL seminar and showed a willingness to question this ideology in her future English classes. However, when explicitly asked about her legitimacy as a teacher in Taiwan, she positioned herself as "the next best thing" to a native English speaker because of her two-year exposure in the MATESOL program, where she had access to native American English speakers, American learning styles, and American pedagogies. Inoue and Stracke's (2013) interview-based study also found that, even being aware of the issues of World Englishes and the NS/NNS dichotomy, the eight pre-service NNESTs in an Australian MATESOL program still valued native-like pronunciation and a knowledge of Anglophone culture as key characteristics of qualified English teachers. Both studies indicated that Western-educated NNESTs could continue to be complicit with English linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992) by devaluing other NNESTs in their own countries who do not have the same training experience from the inner circle.

Thus far, I have reviewed studies that explored pre-service NNESTs training experiences in Western TESOL programs and the process of how TESOL students constructed their professional identity during their study in these programs. Since the target group of the current inquiry is Western-educated *writing* teachers, the writing experiences of NNESTs in the Western graduate programs are equally important in understanding their

identity construction. In the next section, I turn to a discussion of NNESTs' writing experiences and their writing identity construction while studying in Western TESOL programs.

3.3 Pre-service NNESTs' writing experiences and writing identity construction in Western TESOL programs

As Blommaert (2010, p. 6) points out, “the movement of people across space is ... never a move across empty spaces: They [the spaces] are filled with norms and expectations, conceptions of what counts as proper, normal ... and what does not count as such.” According to Canagarajah (2013), English academic writing is often closely associated with the values and interests of Anglophone communities. As a result, while studying in Anglophone universities, L2 graduate students have to negotiate the differences in writing norms between their L1 and English. Writing is a terrain to show one's values and culture. Writing in a different culture thus requires negotiation of one's identities and values. In this section, I will give an overview of L2 graduate students' writing experiences in Anglophone TESOL programs and their negotiation between their L1 and L2 identities when writing in new academic contexts. I will first discuss how some students gave up their L1 writing identities and accommodated the required academic discourses of Western graduate programs. I will then review some students' struggles as they tried to keep their L2 voices when writing in English.

3.3.1 Accommodating writing conventions

As L2 graduate students enter Western universities, they soon find a set of writing norms required for academic success. One example is the need to have a clear topic sentence, a brief introduction, a succinct conclusion, and a presentation of critical thinking with sufficient evidence to support the writer's conclusions (i.e., citations). L2 graduate students discussed in this section chose to accommodate these norms in order to succeed in their graduate programs, even though these norms differed from those of their own writing traditions.

In Casanave's (2002) case study, five graduate students⁷ in a TESOL program stated that writing in an unemotional style and with a detached tone were crucial rules to follow in order to meet their professors' expectations. For example, an Armenian student was accustomed to sharing personal experiences when writing in her native language. However, some professors criticized this narrative style as being too emotional and thus not formal enough for English academic writing. As a newcomer in the writing community, with the primary goal of passing the course, the Armenian student chose to accommodate the writing norms required by her professors. Not only did her writing style change, but her identity also shifted to that of an unemotional writer as required by the new community.

Similarly, the Mexican students in a TESOL course in Zhu's (2001) study also struggled between two competing writing identities and conventions. Based on qualitative interviews, the author reported that one major challenge for these students was to adapt to the differences in organizing essays between English and Spanish. Specifically, some students

⁷ Five students participated in the study, two L1 students and three L2 students. However, since the focus of this paper is on L2 writers, I focus my discussion only on the L2 writers.

stated that in Spanish, people tended to write a longer introduction before moving to the topic, whereas the introduction in English tended to be much shorter. To learn how to organize their English writing in the form that was preferred by the course instructor, they referred to the writing samples given by the instructor and imitated those writing styles, or they had native peers help them with revisions. However, even though these students felt more competent in English academic writing after the course, some felt their writing was somehow detached from what they intended to compose and from their sense of themselves. For example, one student stated, “when you have to read it, some parts sound like it’s not from you” (p. 45). Their accommodation to English writing conventions seemed to force the writers to shift from their Spanish selves to their English selves. Some students even explicitly stated that they disliked this change. The newcomers in this study chose to accommodate their writing norms to those required in the new writing community, yet they showed resistance to this accommodation because it caused them to sacrifice their sense of self.

While students like those mentioned above tried to accommodate the imposed writing conventions to construct their academic identity (e.g., good graduate student) in their graduate programs, some students worked on their English writing to meet the program’s expectations for constructing their “teacher” identity. For Jien, a student from People’s Republic China in Leki’s (1995) study, being an English teacher equated to being equipped with near-perfect competency in English. Through interviews with Jien and her professors, written materials from courses, journal entries, and class observation, Leki discussed how Jien developed several strategies to meet her professor’s expectations for writing, including trying to find the writing patterns and styles that she assumed that the professor would

accept, applying every single one of the professor's comments on her writing assignments, and avoiding any of her own opinions that might contradict the professor's stances. With all these accommodations, Jien finally proved herself a good writer by getting the highest score in the class. Competent in writing in the styles and conventions preferred in the course, she also affirmed her identity as an English teacher.

Two Chinese graduate students studying in an Australian TESOL program in a questionnaire- and interview-based case study by Wang (2011) also reported that English writing constitutes a large component in imaging their future professional success; as one of the participants stated, "a qualified English teacher should write better than her students." (p. 49). Adela, a PhD student in the program, planned to teach at the university level after graduation; she was, therefore, very aware that writing academic papers for publication and teaching English writing could be the major professional activities in her future career. She saw every writing activity (e.g., term paper, dissertation) as a good learning opportunity to polish her grammar and rhetoric and her ability to clearly articulate her ideas and thoughts to the reader. While writing in the graduate program allowed her to enhance her sense of professional legitimacy, she somehow felt writing in that context was like "dancing with shackles" (p. 48): while she wanted to be more creative and original, she was required to conform to the norms expected in the TESOL program. For example, although she acknowledged that Chinese English might enrich the creativity in her English writing, she tended to hide her Chinese self in her writing because it contradicted the writing norms of the TESOL program. Instead, she worked hard to avoid "Chinglish" in order to "make writing sound more like native" (p. 53) to meet her supervisor's expectations of a proper academic paper in the field.

Kim's (2015) longitudinal qualitative case study conducted in a Canadian TESOL program also found that academic English writing played a significant role in constructing TESOL students' professional legitimacy. Based on a questionnaire, interviews, journals, and writing samples throughout an academic year, Kim traced five NNES graduate students' academic discourse socialization experiences in which they negotiated and constructed their academic and professional identities. Four of the five NNES graduate students in the study stated that they wished to be academics in the future (e.g., pursue PhD degrees or teach at universities). Becoming a legitimate member in an academic writing community like the TESOL program was, therefore, an urgent task for each of them in constructing their professional identity. Although these graduate students brought various degrees of expertise of English language education from previous training experiences, they all became novice members in learning a new academic language expected by the TESOL program in which they were studying. For instance, the TESOL program took a critical approach in addressing English education issues (e.g., social equality in relation to language education). Some participants, who had received previous training in psychological and cognitive-oriented teacher education programs, found it challenging to find an appropriate voice to formulate arguments related to these critical issues. Through intensive reading, taking part in class discussion, writing term papers, and reviewing teacher feedback, these participants were increasingly being socialized into the academic discourse of the TESOL program. Yet, some students also claimed that although their accumulating scholarly knowledge made them feel more comfortable writing and speaking in the program, the more they learned, the more they became aware of the strict conventions expected in expert-level academic writing. This

realization about actual academic writing discouraged some of the participants from viewing themselves as legitimate academic writers in a larger scholarly community.

Not all international students are successful in negotiating institutional writing norms. Through participants' written materials with instructor comments, course-related artifacts (e.g., syllabi), and interviews, Abasi, Akbari, and Graves (2006) discussed the serious consequences experienced by two MATESOL students who failed to reconcile their own L1 writing tradition with that of the L2 writing community. According to Abasi et al., the writing discourse prevalent in North American academia often expects writers to use their own words to contribute original ideas that are relevant to current issues, along with clear citation. However, coming from Iran, where students usually demonstrate their understanding of knowledge by reproducing what they have read in textbooks to, these students had a different understanding of the role of the writer. They perceived their roles as writers as only to transmit knowledge from the text to the readers; this was contradictory to what was expected in their program, where critical expression and ideas were expected. Moreover, given their limited experience in academic writing and citation, these students' writing contained pieces of text reproduced without reference. The absence of authorial identity (Ivanič, 1998) required in their program and the lack of citation knowledge eventually led to the students being accused of plagiarism. This authorial identity, also known as voice, is a vital component for graduate students to succeed academically in North American universities. A significant amount of research has investigated how L2 graduate students develop a sense of self in their own writing, a review to which I shall now turn.

3.3.2 Creating voice in one's own writing

The concept of voice, also described as authorial identity or self-representation, was developed by L1 compositionists (e.g., Bowden, 1995) to understand how writers establish an authorial presence for expressing their own views (Hirvela & Belcher, 2001; Ivanič & Camps, 2001). It is often used in L2 writing to describe how L2 writers negotiate their authoritative stance when writing English essays in an academic context. Ivanič (1998) defines voice as *self as author* and argues that authoritative stance is constructed in autobiographical self and discoursal self: not only is it formed from the writer's past experiences, it is also "constructed through the discourse characteristics of a text, which relate to values, beliefs and power relations in the social context in which they were written" (p. 25). L2 graduate students often face challenges in developing a voice in English essays, given that the ways they use to present self in their home cultures might differ from those expected in English-speaking communities. The studies reviewed here document L2 graduate students' struggles in negotiating different voices and the strategies they developed to cope with these challenges.

Viete and Phan's study (2007) conducted through self-reflective narratives, reports on the conflict experienced by the second author, Phan Le Ha, a Vietnamese MATESOL student, between her own voice and the one required in her Australian graduate program. Phan observed that international students who studied in Anglophone universities often had to follow the dominant writing norms, such as methods of organization and referencing. In her English academic writing, Phan often used the writing conventions she was accustomed to in her first language, such as using highly personalized argument based on her own experiences to express her opinions. Consequently, her professors critiqued her strong voice

and her sharing of past experiences for lacking a scholarly theoretical basis and for not being formal enough in academic writing. However, Phan did not submit her own voices to the dominant writing discourse. In her thesis, she developed a strategy to sustain her authorial voice while protecting her writing from being criticized. That is, she chose to use an impersonal voice throughout the thesis to make her writing look more “academic” as required. She also concluded her thesis with a letter in a strong personal voice to discuss the rhetoric and beauty of Vietnamese writing. By doing so, she tried to give her readers, including her committee members, an understanding of her concerns about the unfair treatment of Vietnamese and other international students’ English writing without sacrificing her own voice. Positive feedback in her thesis defense evidenced her success in incorporating her own voice into the Anglophone writing context.

Showing evidence of critical thinking in academic writing is also expected in English-speaking academic contexts when presenting one’s own voice in writing. Tran (2011) conducted an interview-based qualitative case study in an Australian university to understand how four international graduate students (two from TESOL and two from economics) negotiated the meaning of “being critical,” as well as the strategies they used to write critically in their respective graduate programs. Xuan, a Vietnamese master’s student of TESOL, mentioned that the Vietnamese tendency to respect authority and value harmony in knowledge building made her feel uneasy about critiquing other people’s writing, a writing activity often required in the graduate program. Trying to meet the assignment requirement, Xuan developed a comparison-and-contrast strategy to show her critical thinking in writing. With this strategy, she only discussed the strengths of different perspectives and chose the most convincing stance among the perspectives to align with in her essays. This way, she did

not have to challenge the authoritative voice which might contradict her Vietnamese identity (i.e., respect for authority), but at the same time she was able to show her critical thinking by providing a convincing argument for the issue she discussed. Tran concluded by suggesting that students' L1 writing traditions should be seen as "alternative ways and diverse aspirations in meaning-making" (p. 72), to enrich academic culture, especially in Western universities with growing international student populations.

In the same light, Phan (2011) interviewed four Vietnamese graduate students (two from a TESOL program and two from an MBA program) studying in an Australian university and discussed how infusing writing components from Vietnamese culture allowed these students to better present their own voices in English writing. Participants in this study noticed that English writing tended to be linear, direct, and straightforward, whereas Vietnamese writing tended to be circular, indirect, and tactical. They argued that being circular and indirect did not mean that the writer was unable to construct a direct and linear argument. Rather, direct and straightforward writing was, in Vietnamese culture, considered impolite, rude, and even lacking in sophistication in developing an argument. Therefore, when these students wrote in English, they tended to use a flowery style with beautiful and poetic words in order to show the sophistication of their writing. These culturally informed styles, according to Phan, should be not only acknowledged but also valued, as they are crucial components in the establishment of a truly multicultural learning environment—the very goal of these Australian universities.

Two Chinese scholars, Shen (1989) and Guo (2006), reflected on their graduate writing experiences when studying in English-speaking countries and shared their successful experiences of blending their L1 and L2 voices to enrich their English writing in their

graduate programs. Shen (1989) described his experiences of writing English in an American academic setting as a process of reconciling his identity between two different writing worlds. Coming from a communist society, Shen valued social welfare over the individual. This social value extended to his writing in both Chinese and English: “I is always subordinated to we” (p. 460). Soon he found that avoiding the use of “I” in his writing was contradictory to what was expected in the American society, where individuals’ voices were highly valued. To join the new writing community, Shen created an English self that was more assertive and aggressive. While he welcomed the L2 identity that provided him with a new dimension to see and write about the world, he did not give up his Chinese self. He appreciated this new writing identity that enabled him to move between two cultures for a richer representation of his ideas in English writing.

Like Shen, Guo (2006), in her own narratives, also stated that she learned to write academic English by swinging between two different languages and cultures, Chinese and Canadian. Proud of her identity as a communist, she often wrote from a perspective against the capitalist society. This communist-oriented voice was heavily criticized by some of her Anglophone professors. Similarly, her preference for using Chinese metaphors in her English writing, such as using bamboo to describe humbleness or fire to describe passion, was also marked as strange and illogical usage. After these critiques, self-doubts about her own writing skills grew. These negative feelings were mitigated when she entered another university to pursue her PhD degree. In the new program, where she was empowered by works of writers such as Pennycook (1998), Guo started to view her marked identity as a Chinese English writer with a communist perspective as an asset, not a liability (Kubota, 2002). With this new perspective, she began to view herself as the owner of both languages

and cultures, who was able to combine the merits of both sides to create more possibilities for English writing.

While Shen and Guo's identity and writing had both been othered in their graduate programs, another L2 scholar, Li's (1999) otherness was valued. Like most graduate students, Li viewed herself and her writing as different and so sought to eliminate elements from her English writing that were characteristic of Chinese rhetoric, including organizational style, syntax, and semantics. Instead of correcting these Chinese characteristics in her English writing, Li's professor encouraged her to view them as unique and beautiful assets to her writing. With her professor's support, Li started to appreciate her Chinese self and voice in her English writing. Her Chinese self, therefore, became an enhancement, making her English writing attractive.

Aware that students' voices can determine their success in graduate schools, some writing scholars have tried to help their advisees to develop appropriate institutional voices without sacrificing their own. Phan Le Ha (2009), the graduate student in Viete and Phan's study (2007), was determined to help her students to form their voices when she became a professor. Despite her encouragement, Arianto, an Indonesian student in an Australian university, hesitated to display his own voice and stance when writing. He chose to stay with the more impersonal tone that he had been taught to follow in other classes. The situation changed as Phan kept providing him with readings from scholars such as Pennycook (1998) and Phan's own successful writing as samples. Arianto started to reflect on his own agency as he wrote, and finally, he presented his views and supported his argument in his thesis by drawing on his own life experiences and writing a first-person poem. In a similar fashion, based on what she had learned from her research methods courses in a North American

university, Youngjoo, a Korean doctoral student and the second author in Hirvela and Yi's self-reflective article (2008), also stated that professional academic writing should not involve personal tones and experiences. As a result, she distanced herself and her own voice throughout her dissertation, as if she had not conducted the research. However, her supervisor, Alan Hirvela expected her to be not merely the reporter but the owner of her research and encouraged her to include her own experiences and voice in the dissertation. After revisiting the data, she revised her dissertation from a voice-free research report to a narrative case study in which she shared her reflections and experiences as a researcher. The identity as narrator made her feel that she owned the study and had become a real researcher.

As demonstrated in sections 3.2 and 3.3, significant numbers of studies have been conducted to investigate Western-educated NNESTs' training, writing experiences, and professional development when studying in Western TESOL programs. What remains scantily explored is how this group of teachers develop their professional identities and teaching practices after returning to teach in their home countries. An increasing number of pre-service teachers from non-English-speaking countries have come to English-speaking countries for professional training and certification. For example, Llurda (2005) showed in his survey study that nearly 40% of students enrolled in English-dominated TESOL programs (MA and PhD) were international students. Polio's (1994) survey study conducted in seven MATESOL programs in the US also showed that 72% of the student population was from Japan, Korea, and Taiwan, and that 90% of them planned to return to their home country to teach English. Given the high percentage of Western-educated returning teachers in many places around the world, these teachers' professional development and identity deserve a full investigation (Holliday, 2005; Liu, 1999; Llurda, 2005). Only recently has an

increasing number of studies been documented to discuss this group of teachers' experience and professional identity development when teaching in their home countries. I will review these studies in the next section.

3.4 Western-educated returning teachers' identity and teaching practices in their home countries

In this section, I first review studies that have focused on the challenges Western-educated teachers have faced when applying pedagogical knowledge acquired in the West in their local classrooms (Chowdhury & Phan, 2008; Diallo, 2014; Pu & Pawan, 2014). Then, I outline another group of studies that have used the notion of third space (Bhabha, 1994) to discuss Western-educated teachers' appropriation of both Western and local pedagogical cultures to maximize students' learning (Dobinson, 2014; Ilieva, Li, & Li, 2015; Phan, 2008). Since the current study focuses on writing teacher's experiences, I will lastly discuss Western-returning writing teachers' teaching of writing in light of their Western training experiences (Casanave, 2002; Liu, 2008; Shi, 2003).

3.4.1 Western-educated teachers and Western pedagogies in EFL contexts

An increasing number of English teachers from EFL countries have been sent to the English-speaking West for further training in communicative language teaching (CLT), a student-centered and interaction-oriented approach that is believed to efficiently develop students' English communicative competence. For example, based on interview data, classroom observation, participants' teaching materials, and researchers' reflection notes, Pu and Pawan (2014) reported on four Chinese Western-trained teachers' experiences of using

CLT in Chinese universities. While these teachers regarded CLT as a creative and empowering pedagogy for both teachers and students, they soon found they could not fully implement CLT in local classrooms, mainly because of students' unfamiliarity with the Anglophone culture largely embedded in CLT materials. These teachers then appropriated CLT by extracting the essence from Western-Chinese pedagogical cultures to create a "learning-centered instruction" (p. 90): prioritizing students' learning needs by infusing locally sensitive CLT activities. For instance, instead of using writing prompts from the textbook to write a critique, one teacher encouraged students to write about a local news story which students were familiar with and which they were able to critique. Although their writing was full of grammatical errors, students were able to address the social issues using critical thinking, an important component that CLT tries to develop. Moreover, instead of spoon-feeding students the Anglophone norms of communication, these teachers raised students' awareness of the value of the Chinese culture of communication, such as sustaining harmony in teamwork and teaching students how to avoid conflict in intercultural communication. The positive feedback from students established these Western-trained teachers' ownership of this Western-established methodology. Although they borrowed the pedagogy from the West, they appropriated it by infusing Chinese culture into it and made it a pedagogy that maximized the students' learning.

Chowdhury and Phan (2008) used interviews, emails, and online conversation to explore the views of four Bangladeshi teachers, two Western trained and two locally trained, about the application of CLT in relation to the cultural politics at play in Bangladeshi English education. The authors observed that the Western-trained teachers were aware of the challenges of implementing CLT in Bangladesh, such as conflicts between traditional

teacher-centered education and Western-informed student-centered pedagogy. They were also conscious of the “hidden agenda” (p. 313) embedded in CLT to “brainwash” learners (p. 313) and sell Western values to the global market through pedagogy. Despite this awareness, they believed CLT could help their students develop good communicative competence, the “linguistic power” (Kachru, 1986, p. 1) they needed in this globalizing world. Based on their findings, the authors argued that the colonial mission appeared in the form of pedagogy (e.g., CLT) by spreading Western values to Bangladeshi English education without much consideration of local needs, and by perpetuating the superiority of Standard English linguistics and of Western pedagogy in local English classrooms. The authors suggested that local teacher education providers should develop a course for returnee teachers, in which they would be able to interact with local teachers and institutions and learn more about the local teaching context before adapting Western pedagogy.

Similarly, Diallo (2014) observed (research methods not explicitly stated) that the cultural incompatibility of the instructional content as a result of uncritical use of Western-based pedagogy by Western-trained teachers could threaten religious and traditional culture in a Muslim society. The findings showed significant resistance from Muslim students when their cultural identity, including their epistemic, cultural, and religious values, was at odds with those of their Western-trained teachers. When Western-trained teachers consciously or unconsciously brought Western epistemology (e.g., liberal views regarding gender) into classroom discussion, students used silence and indifference as a way to reject this perceived threat to their cultural identity based on Muslim religion and tradition. The author suggested that for effective English learning to happen in this context, Western-educated teachers

needed to consider the various epistemic, cultural, and religious traditions that played a role in constructing the identity of Emirati students.

In response to the inappropriate and uncritical transfer of a pedagogy from one social context to the other (e.g., Chowdhury & Phan, 2008; Diallo, 2014), Kumaravadivelu (2001, 2003, 2006) proposes a post-method approach that calls for social, cultural, and political context-based approaches to teaching. With this in mind, Barnawi and Phan (2015) followed two Western-trained Saudi teachers teaching at universities in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and explored how they applied the notion of post-method—in other words, how they brought the methods they had learned from their Western TESOL programs to their local English-language classrooms. Based on data obtained from questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observation, the authors demonstrated that both teachers, rather than adapting Western-informed methods in their entirety, developed a pedagogy more suitable for their students' learning. For example, Ali, a writing teacher, allowed plenty of space for teacher–student negotiation. This approach emphasized both the teacher's scaffolding and the students' active role in maximizing students' writing development. The authors indicated that the agency to develop a bottom-up method with consideration of the students' prior experiences and preferred learning styles not only induced meaningful English learning in the local context but also gave both teachers a sense of ownership of their English teaching.

The teachers described in Pu and Pawan (2014) and Barnawi and Phan (2015) all displayed a sense of ownership of their own English teaching by developing a working method most appropriate for their students' learning. However, Liao (2015) showed in her dissertation research that three American-trained Taiwanese teachers' sense of ownership of teaching was compromised when they compared their English competence with that of

NESTs. Although the study does not focus on teaching pedagogy, it is worth discussing because it foregrounds Western-educated teachers and their teaching practices. Based on interviews, classroom observation, and participants' teaching materials, Liao compared three US-educated and three Taiwan-educated Taiwanese teachers and discussed their professional legitimacy in relation to accessible forms of capital (Bourdieu, 1986, 1991). Compared to their Taiwan-educated counterparts, the US-educated teachers in the study received higher value in terms of linguistic, cultural, and symbolic capital in Taiwanese society, where people still deeply believed that "the representativeness of English is often associated with the English-speaking West and teachers who speak mainstream English own a certain degree of unquestioned legitimacy" (p. 113, cited from Motha, 2014). Despite their confidence in teaching, none of these teachers, although self-evaluated as advanced English users, positioned themselves as legitimate English-speaking teachers compared to English native speakers. Liao indicated that this was likely because native-like or Standard English was still positioned as the goal to achieve, and English native speakers were considered the most legitimate teachers when it came to English education in Taiwan. Thus, these teachers, despite their training in the West, claimed neither ownership nor legitimacy in teaching English compared with the NS.

3.4.2 Third space

The concept of a *third space* or *hybridity*, originally theorized by Homi Bhabha (1994), is used to capture the in-between position that provides "an ambivalent space in which third perspectives can grow in the margins of dominant ways of seeing" (p. 237). This concept is increasingly used as a useful lens through which to investigate Western-educated

teachers' complex process of negotiating their roles when teaching in a local context.

According to Bhabha (1994, p. 4), the third space “entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy.” This hybrid space, then, provides people with the freedom to

“continually negotiate and translate all available resources in order to construct their own hybrid cultures and, consequently, reconstruct their own individual identities”

(Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p. 124). The Western-educated teachers in this section presented the ability to create a third space in order to manage the pedagogical resources they had gained from two cultures; in this space, they constructed a sense of legitimacy of English teaching in their local context.

Following Bhabha's (1994) concept of *third space*, Ilieva, Li, and Li (2015) explored the dynamic process of nine Canadian-educated Chinese English teachers' negotiation of ownership and legitimacy of teaching English in China. Based on interviews with the teachers, the authors reported how these teachers were influenced by constant discussions of socio-political, socio-cultural, and social equality issues in their Canadian TESOL program, as they tried to teach English by guiding students in reflecting critically on the use of the English language. Challenges faced by these teachers included students' resistance against their too-much-focus-on-non-linguistics approach. Despite these tensions, these teachers were able to find a third space in which they could adjust their teaching approaches. For instance, one teacher (Helen) decided to bring up Chinese political issues to the class to develop students' critical thinking skills, along with teaching the grammatical knowledge needed for the students to pass the local exams (e.g., college English tests). This adjustment allowed her to find an *in-between* pedagogy through which she could implement her own teaching philosophy, which she had gained from the West. It was in this in-betweenness that

these teachers constructed a sense of legitimacy as evidenced in one teacher's statement: "because I always think maybe this way is better, either this way is better or that way is better. But for other teachers ... there's only one way to do it" (p. 11).

Phan (2008) found that this third space was also created by Western-trained Vietnamese teachers in the process of constructing their professional identity in the Vietnamese teaching context. Through interviews, participants' reflective writing, and email correspondence, Phan explored 16 teachers who had studied overseas for master's degrees in TESOL-related programs in Australia, the UK, the US, or New Zealand. These teachers often struggled with several contradictory roles as English teachers when talking about their teaching in Vietnam after receiving professional training from the West. For example, their role of teacher in Vietnam (teacher as morality guide) was contradictory to that promoted in Western countries (teacher as facilitator). They often found it challenging to position themselves, especially when they found teacher as facilitator was often evaluated as more positively than teacher as morality guide in the local context. Instead of becoming Western-like teachers, these teachers created a third space to foreground Vietnamese cultural values in order to reject an imposed negative identity. For instance, teacher-led methods were often looked down upon as traditional approaches that hindered students from developing creativity. However, the teachers in this study emphasized that teacher-led pedagogy was necessary in Vietnamese English classrooms because teachers played an important role in conveying the notion of *morality*, even when teaching English. By foregrounding morality in their teaching, the teachers developed agency and power to resist the negative cultural identity imposed by Western culture (i.e., traditional = backward) and strengthened their cultural/national identities to teach English in their own right in the hybrid and diverse

globalizing world.

Dobinson (2014) interviewed two groups of TESOL postgraduates studying at the same Australian university: the first group consisted of Asian postgraduates studying onshore in Australia, while the second group was made up of Vietnamese postgraduates studying in offshore branch of the Australian university in Ho Chi Minh City. Like many of the participants shown in the above studies, several teachers felt that Western learning theories and approaches provided them with different ways of teaching, such as strategies for independent learning, a sense of humour, and the ability to give positive feedback to students. These strategies helped them build a good relationship with their students to enhance learning. However, many teachers reported that they often felt inferior and frustrated because of an asymmetrical relationship between Asia and the West, which emerged when conflicts arose because of pedagogical differences between the two cultures. For example, when these teachers modified the Western method (e.g., CLT) to meet the local students' exam-oriented needs (e.g., grammar knowledge) in their teaching institutions, their methods were considered by their English-speaking colleagues to be "too ready to follow 'regulations', too 'disciplined' and principled, and not ready enough to show 'initiative' or 'creativity'" (p. 16–17). Unlike the participants in Ilieva, Li, and Li (2015) and Barnawi and Phan's (2015) studies, who gained agency and ownership of pedagogies in the third space, the "thirdness" of the participants' in this study was denied by their English-speaking colleagues. This left the Western-trained Vietnamese teachers with no room to create their own working methods; instead, they had to follow the "advanced" and "innovative" Western pedagogies.

3.4.3 Western-educated writing teachers' identity in EFL contexts

Since Western-educated teachers are increasing in number in EFL contexts, scholars are becoming interested in how Western-educated teachers negotiate their professional identity (see section 3.4). However, there is a lack of research into Western-educated *writing* teachers' identities and their teaching practices in EFL contexts. The three studies in this section are the only few to date that explored returnee teachers' teaching experiences with regard to their *writing identity* as negotiated in local contexts.

Shi (2003) extended her consideration of the identity struggles of bilingual returnees in her exploration of the dilemmas these teachers faced when teaching English in the People's Republic of China. Shi noted that each institution held different sets of conventions made up of particular interests, values, and practices, all of which would thus shape writers' "intellectual identities" (p. 370). Professors participating in this interview-based study with degrees from both Chinese and Anglophone universities had developed a strong sense of biliterate/bicultural intellectual identity. However, after juggling two writing discourses, Chinese and English, many bilingual professors chose to align themselves with the Western writing community. This resulted in a tendency to foreground their identity based on their Western training when teaching English writing. For example, although one professor valued the organizational system used in Chinese composition, he chose to teach his students the English conventions (e.g., a clear introduction to let readers know what the paper is about), since he believed it would benefit the students. Shi suggested that that this was probably a result of the intellectual identities these professors developed when studying in Anglophone universities. In other words, having experienced the ideological practice in the West where

English writing conventions were valued more highly, the professors took on the L2 identity when they returned to teach in China.

Yasuko, a returnee professor in Japan in Casanave's study (2002), provided another example of the impact of a teacher's Western-trained experiences on her teacher identity formation and teaching of English writing. Based on interview data and classroom observation, Casanave reported that Yasuko developed her academic identity as a narrator and observer of what happened in education after six years studying in a qualitative-oriented doctoral program in North America. These experiences and academic identities blended later when she designed a writing course for her undergraduate students in Japan. For example, she asked her students to observe an interesting phenomenon and write it up as a story as a final project for her course. During the class, unlike in her colleagues' classes where the instruction was full of teaching forms and mechanics such as APA, Yasuko's class emphasized paragraph structure and the analysis of the characteristics of good stories, which she considered to be important in writing a narrative. She believed that by letting the students write based on a story they had experienced in person, they could truly own their stories and thus develop themselves as authors.

Finally, Liu's (2008) action research did not look specifically at writing teacher identity, but it highlighted her own experiences of studying in the West and the significant impact of such experiences on her teaching practice after returning to Taiwan. Based on her own teaching journals, students' writing materials, and notes of teacher-student writing conferences, Liu conducted an action research project in her own writing classroom to see how her students negotiated an imported pedagogy, a sequential writing approach, which she had learned in her American graduate program. Originally proposed by Leki (1992), this

writing pedagogy includes five interconnected writing assignments: project proposal (literature review constituted a big part), summaries, a survey, an interview with an expert, and a final report (Leki, 1992). To reduce the course load for her EFL undergraduate students, Liu adjusted this approach by combining the survey and interview activities into one assignment. The results showed that many students encountered difficulties in writing using that approach. For example, some students hesitated to transform knowledge, which required blending their own voices with the acquired knowledge, but instead merely paraphrased and displayed their knowledge of what they had read when writing their final report. After holding writing conferences with her students, Liu learned that this imported pedagogy might not be appropriate for her students in the local EFL context, where students often needed to display knowledge in their writing rather than critiquing the work of another. Liu suggested that when applying an Anglo-American pedagogy in a local context, teachers should be aware of their students' struggles as well as their learning goals. She concluded that only by doing so can the pedagogy benefit the students as they are learning to write.

As demonstrated in this section, research into Western-educated teachers focused on teaching English speaking or teaching English in general; little is known about Western-returning *writing* teachers' teaching experiences and identity development. Many L2 writing scholars (Casanave, 2009; Lee, 2010, 2013; Ortega, 2009) have pointed out that English writing is one of the most important components in curriculum design in EFL contexts. Given that a large number of Western-educated teachers return and teach in their home countries, the development of professional identity among Western-educated writing teachers in EFL contexts deserves legitimate investigation. The present study seeks to address these literature gaps by looking at how Western-educated Taiwanese writing teachers continue to

develop their identities as English users, writers, and teachers after receiving their PhD degrees and returning to Taiwan to teach English writing in their respective universities. The scholarly knowledge this study intends to provide will not only benefit English language teaching in respect to the discourse of native speakerism in Taiwan, where Western-educated teachers constitute a significant teacher population (at least in universities), it will also provide insights for other similar teaching contexts for English teaching and for Western TESOL programs for curriculum consideration.

3.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I first reviewed pre-service NNESTs' training and writing experiences in TESOL programs in English-speaking countries in relation to the development of their professional and writing identities (sections 3.2 and 3.3). I then overviewed Western-educated teachers, including writing teachers' professional identity construction and teaching development after they returned and taught in their home countries (section 3.4). I also addressed a few literature gaps the current study aims to fill. I now move to Chapter 4, where I discuss the methodology of this study.

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I outline the methodology of the study. I start with a description of the qualitative case study and my rationale for using it. I then provide the context of the study, a description of the participants, the ways of knowing in this study, the types of data collected, and the approach to analyzing the data. I conclude the chapter with a discussion of researcher reflexivity and the rigor of the study.

4.2 Qualitative case study

This research is a qualitative case study conducted over ten months, from February to November 2012, involving four Western-educated writing teachers teaching at the university level in Taiwan. A qualitative case study follows a descriptive and interpretive research approach and is designed to explore a bounded social phenomenon comprising a few particular entities in the natural settings where they take place (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Duff, 2008; Hatch, 2002; Stake, 1995, 2003). The idea of concentrating on a few particular cases enables researchers to understand the complex and dynamic nature of the particular entity or individual. According to Miles and Huberman (1994), a case study is “a circle with a heart in the center” (p. 36), in which the focus is on the heart, while the circle defines the study’s boundary. To explore the heart in the center, it is necessary to understand the contextual factors within the boundary that shapes the case under investigation. Taking contextual factors into consideration, a case study often incorporates multiple data sources for an in-depth understanding of the heart within the circle. The construction of identity among Western-educated teachers is a complex process involving their past and current

experiences within different social, cultural, and political contexts. I therefore designed my research as a qualitative case study to explore participants' dynamic identity formation within the boundary of teaching English writing in Taiwanese universities. I draw upon contextual factors such as government, institutional policies, and interpersonal relationships between teachers and students to understand the four focal teachers' identity construction. Multiple data source, including interviews and email correspondences with the participants, classroom observation, participants' teaching materials (e.g., syllabi and handouts), students' writing materials, and other relevant documents (e.g., policies), were collected to help me gain in-depth understanding of the cases. I will discuss the details of data collection in section 4.5.

4.3 Recruitment, participants, and research context

I recruited four Taiwanese English writing teachers (Ava, Beth, Sarah, and Nita, all pseudonyms) to participate in this study. The participants were all born in Taiwan and received their general education from elementary school to university in Taiwan. They earned their PhD degrees in English education in English-speaking countries including the United States (Ava and Sarah), New Zealand (Nita), and the United Kingdom (Beth). All participants were teaching English writing in English language-related departments of different universities located in three cities in Taiwan. Before the study began, I sent out an invitation letter via email asking them to participate in this study. I then visited each participant's office and introduced myself and my research. Among the participants, only Sarah and I had met prior to this study at an academic conference. Beth and Nita were recommended by my friends who were teaching at the same universities. Ava replied

directly to the invitation letter I sent via the email addresses I accessed from departmental websites. All participants knew that I was also born in Taiwan, and that I had received my undergraduate education in Taiwan before going to the US for my master's degree and then to Canada for my PhD studies. They also knew that I was interested in teacher identity and development in relation to World Englishes and in teaching English writing in EFL contexts.

In this section, I outline the four participants' backgrounds, with a focus on their educational backgrounds and teaching experiences. After presenting each participant's background, I introduce the respective department and university where the participants were teaching at the time. This information helps to contextualize the institutions where the teachers were situated. To ensure the participants' anonymity, pseudonyms are used to refer to all institutions and participants in this study. I created pseudonyms based on the location where each participant had received her highest degree. Specifically, Beth earned a PhD in Britain, Nita received hers in New Zealand, and Ava and Sarah completed theirs in the USA.

4.3.1 Ava

Ava, in her late thirties, was an assistant professor teaching English writing in the foreign language department at Ai University. After receiving her bachelor's degree in English in Taiwan, Ava went to the United States for her master's degree in TESOL. After completing her master's degree, Ava came back to Taiwan. There, she taught English for three years in college as a part-time lecturer before she went back to the US for her PhD in language and literacy education with a focus on composition studies. She then returned to Taiwan and had been teaching for four years, since her graduation from the American PhD program. At the time of data collection, Ava was teaching academic English writing to two

groups of second-year students. Each class had about 20 students. I observed one of the writing classes. Ava was enthusiastic and well prepared for each class. Her textbooks were filled with notes and post-its. Ava often divided her three-hour writing class into two sections: the first half for a lecture, and the second for class activities. In the second half of the class, various writing activities were conducted to facilitate students' writing abilities, including peer reviews, paraphrasing activities, and analysis of writing samples. However, Ava's enthusiasm gradually decreased over the period I observed her class as she encountered the students' indifference to her teaching and their reluctance to study. From classroom observation, I could, at times, feel the tension between Ava and her students; for example, some students refused to do in-class writing activities. When asked by Ava to comment on the activity they had done, students kept silent in class but complained to each other about the activity after the class. Despite being discouraged about teaching, Ava was very interested in my research topic; she often asked me to send her the interview questions beforehand so that she could think about the questions more carefully before the interview. She was generous in sharing her experiences in every interview and also very responsive to my emails regarding her teaching.

Ai University

Given the high admission rate of university entrance examination in Taiwan (88% in 2012, Ministry of Education, <http://depart.moe.edu.tw/ed4500/cp.aspx?n=002F646AFF7F5492&s=1EA96E4785E6838F#>), many high school graduates go to university. They choose their university and major right after the university entrance examination; English language-related departments have always been popular choices. Ava was teaching at Ai University, a private university known

for its foreign language department with several unique pedagogical policies that were not observed in other departments in this study. For example, unlike other departments, which require students to take key English courses (i.e., listening, speaking, reading, and writing) for two years, Ai's department requires students to take these courses for three years. All key skill courses are kept small ($N < 20$) to ensure the quality of student learning; this is very different from other departments where the average number of students in one class was 35. The website of this department (2012) showed that 22 full-time faculty members were employed in 2012; of these, 17 were of Taiwanese nationality and each held a master's and/or PhD from the UK, US, or Australia in English literature, linguistics, or applied linguistics. Ava once mentioned that she greatly enjoyed her working environment because almost everyone had experienced studying abroad; their similar backgrounds and shared English learning experiences allowed for easier communication.

4.3.2 Beth

In her mid-thirties, Beth was teaching English writing as an assistant professor in the Applied Linguistics Department of Bei University. Right after graduating from a Taiwanese university with a BA in German language, she spent six years to complete her master's degree and PhD in the same TESOL program in the United Kingdom. She had been teaching at Bei University for four years since finishing her graduate study in the UK. During her undergraduate studies, Beth was an exchange student in Germany. Probably because of her long and intimate experience with the German language, Beth at times related her experiences of studying German to her teaching philosophy of English writing education. For example, she appeared to value the teacher's role in developing her

fundamental German skills (i.e., listening, speaking, reading, writing), and she believed that the grammar-translation method was an efficient way to develop learners' language competence. Her belief about the teacher's role in student learning was also observed when she talked about studying in the British TESOL program. The feedback from her professors was clearly a very important factor in helping her to improve her academic English, as she mentioned this several times in the interviews. Influenced by her own learning experiences, she spent much time in class doing teacher-centered lectures based on one textbook.

Bei University

Bei University, where Beth was teaching, is a relatively new and small private university located in the suburbs of a small city in Taiwan, with an enrolment of approximately 6,000 students. Bei's Applied English Department was also very small, with only nine faculty members and 160 undergraduate students enrolled (one class per cohort). The department was noted for its practice-oriented ESP curriculum design. In addition to four fundamental skill courses, the department provided a wide range of ESP courses including business English conversation, business English writing, international etiquette (e.g., communication manners, table manners, and dress codes), and introduction to English teaching and methodology. The department stated on its website that they believed this practical knowledge of English would prepare students with excellent English skills, a basic knowledge of Western literature and linguistics, a good knowledge of English and the skills to teach it, competent communication ability for business purposes, and cooperative teamwork skills. Students could choose courses according to their career orientation. Based on the department's website (2012), two faculty members were Americans who had completed their highest degrees in the US. Among seven Taiwanese teachers, three had

received their master's/PhD degrees in the UK or US, three in Taiwan, and one in the Philippines.

4.3.3 Sarah

Like other participants, after completing her BA degree in English literature at a Taiwanese university, Sarah pursued her master's and PhD degrees at an American university in the area of composition studies and TESOL. When the study was conducted, Sarah had been teaching in Shan University for two years since completing her PhD degree in the United States. During her studies in the US, she also taught English writing to adult ESL students for three years at the language institute affiliated with her program. I had met Sarah at a few academic conferences on language education in Taiwan and the United States when she was still a PhD student. With similar research interests in World Englishes, L2 writing, and critical applied linguistics, Sarah and I enjoyed talking to each other. Of the four participants, Sarah was the only one whose PhD research was related to critical applied linguistics. She shared with me how much she had been inspired by the critical scholars in applied linguistics such as Suresh Canagarajah and Ryuko Kubota. The concept of World Englishes or the legitimacy of L2 speakers to teach and speak English was often raised in classroom discussions. As a young faculty member who was humorous and approachable, Sarah had a good relationship with her students. Her writing classes were full of interesting and engaging discussions on controversial issues such as gun control, abortion, gender equality, or the death penalty.

Shan University

Shan University, where Sarah was teaching, is a private university located in the suburbs of another small city in Taiwan. There were two pedagogical foci in the Shan department: (1) English teaching, and (2) English for business. Students could choose to specialize in one of them by completing certain required courses. Located in a city where an international airport was situated, the Shan department identified itself as a hub where students could be cultivated into “English talent with international vision” (from the Shan departmental website). To build this “international vision” for students, the department had hired a large number of faculty members with PhDs obtained in the West. According to the website of the department (2012), there were 24 full-time faculty members: three Americans (all American-educated) and 21 Taiwanese. Of the 21 Taiwanese teachers, 19 had received their master’s or/and PhD degrees from the US, the UK, and Australia. As advertised on the department’s website, the large faculty population with Western-educated backgrounds would benefit students studying in this authentic English environment in advancing their English proficiency.

4.3.4 Nita

In her early forties, Nita was an associate professor in the English Department at Nang University. She had a BA in English education from a Taiwanese university. She then pursued her master’s degree in linguistics in the US. She came back to Taiwan and taught English in several universities for four years before starting her PhD studies in New Zealand with a focus on second language writing. Her choice of New Zealand for her PhD, she explained, was mainly because of lower living expenses than those in countries such as

the United States and the United Kingdom. Nita was a very experienced teacher of English writing. At the time when the study was conducted, she had been teaching English writing for nine years in different Taiwanese universities since returning from New Zealand. Nita was the most vocal participant in this study and was passionate about sharing her life, teaching, and research experiences with me. Given her research interest in computer-assisted teaching, she tried to use different software and online resources in her teaching. Unlike the other participants' classes, Nita's writing class always met in a lab, where students worked on computers.

Nang University

Nang University, where Nita was teaching, is a private university located in a suburb of a large Taiwanese city; it had 12,000 undergraduate students. Nang's English department was one of the oldest departments in the University, with a fine reputation for English education. After completing the fundamental four skill courses by their third year students could choose to specialize in one of the following: English literature, English linguistics, or English language teaching. When I was on site, the department was undergoing a reform of the curriculum for its English writing courses. The department was under pressure from the dean and president who had received complaints from employers of Nang's former students, which stated that they still made serious grammatical mistakes and looked very unprofessional. The website of the department (2012) showed that 22 full-time faculty members were hired in the department: one was from the US, one was from France, and the rest were Taiwanese. Among the 19 Taiwanese faculty, four had completed their master's or/and PhD degrees in linguistics or English literature in Taiwan, and 15 had received theirs in the UK, the US, Australia, New Zealand, or France; their studies had been in English

literature, applied linguistics, and adult education. Table 4.1 outlines the participants' backgrounds in this study.

Table 4.1: *Overview of participants' backgrounds*

	Ava	Beth	Sarah	Nita
Age	Late 30s	Mid-30s	Early 30s	Early 40s
Undergraduate study location & field	Taiwan; English	Taiwan; German Studies	Taiwan; English	Taiwan; English education
Master's degree location & field	USA; TESOL	UK; TESOL	USA; TESOL	USA; Linguistics
PhD degree location & field	USA; Language and literacy education with focus on composition studies	UK; TESOL	USA; Composition studies and TESOL	New Zealand; Curriculum studies with specialty in L2 writing
Years since returning to Taiwan	4	4	2	9
Current teaching school	Ai University	Bei University	Shan University	Nang University
Current teaching department	English	Applied English	Applied English	English
Observed class	Third-year academic English writing	Second-year academic English writing	Second-year academic English writing	Second-year academic English writing
English teaching experience	7 years in Taiwan	4 years in Taiwan	3 years in the US; 2 years in Taiwan	13 years in Taiwan

4.4 Ways of knowing

Before moving to a discussion of data generation and analysis, it is important to articulate my epistemological approach to data and analysis. Aligning myself with a social constructionist orientation (Gubrium & Holstein, 2008; Holstein & Gubrium, 2011) in this study, I understand my participants' experiences of their professional training and identity as constantly being constructed and reconstructed in dynamic social interactions with me in interviews and with students during classroom interaction—and language is the essential medium that they use to construct their sense of self and the sense of the world around them. I view “knowledge about the world and experience of the world [to be] very much socially mediated and that individual experiences [to be] always the product of internalized social constructions” (Willig, 2012, p. 12). Therefore, when participants tell their stories and experiences to the researcher, they are not presenting the inner reality or revealing the truth and facts of their experiences and beliefs. Instead, they are deploying “socially available ways [i.e., language] of talking about the phenomenon of interest [i.e. discourses]” (Willig, 2012, p. 12) to interpret and construct their versions of reality (Holstein & Gubrium, 2011; Talmy, 2010). Thus, it is not my intention to search for a singular, objective, and universal truth (e.g., “Who am I?”), existing out there in the world to be observed. What I am interested is how the participants construct their sense of who they are through discursive resources (e.g., language and discourses) at a particular moment in time (Willig, 2012). It is with this epistemological underpinning in mind that I discuss the types of data collected and the methods used to analyze the generated data.

4.5 Types of data collected

In this case study, multiple sources are incorporated to understand multiple alternative versions of participants' experiences, identity construction, and teaching practices. These sources include interviews, participant observation, and documents. All data were collected in Taiwan from February to November 2012, with the exception of three follow-up interviews conducted through Skype after September 2012, when I returned to Canada.

4.5.1 Interviews

Interviews are the major method of data generation in this study. I align myself with Talmy's (2010, 2011) concept of *interview as social practice*, which suggests that narratives generated in research interviews are also a kind of *social practice*. It is a "situated sociointeractional activity" (Kasper & Prior, 2015, p. 233), where meanings and knowledge are locally generated and co-constructed by both the interviewer and interviewee. This orientation views the research interview as a central analytic site where participants not only *talk about* their beliefs, attitudes, and identities but also *perform* and *produce* them with one another and the researchers in the interview interactions (Talmy, 2010). According to Wooffitt and Widdicombe (2006), how the interviewer and interviewee react to each other are "shaped by and oriented to the interactional context" (p. 56). From this perspective, an interviewee is not someone who "only holds facts and details of experience, but, in the very process of offering them up for response, constructively adds to, takes away from, and transforms the facts and details" (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003, p. 70). Interviewers are significant in this process because their presence plays a role in shaping and occasioning

how the interviewees respond. Given my awareness of the interactional dynamics between interviewers and interviewees, I pay particular attention to the complex power relations (e.g., age and social status) between my participants and myself in the interviews because these determine “who chooses what—and what not—to discuss, who asks what questions, when, and how, who is ratified to answer and who is not, who determines when to terminate a line of questioning” (Talmy, 2011, p. 31), all of which work as pivot points and moments framing the interview data for analysis.

Particularly, narratives in interviews are seen as privileged contexts for articulating identities because “they afford tellers an occasion to present themselves as actors in social worlds while at the same time negotiating their present self with other interactants” (De Fina, 2011a, p. 275; see also Kasper & Prior, 2015). Telling narratives *to* audiences allows a venue for someone to make relevant the past experiences significant to their life, which they take as a resource from which to negotiate and articulate their identities in the local interaction. Research interviews, as one kind of social action in which different conversational rules are followed and social relationships are involved, afford an occasion for the participants to do such identity work (De Fina, 2009; Kasper & Prior, 2015; Wortham et al., 2011). This narrative-in-interview approach is particularly helpful for me to understand how my participants construct their identities as English writers and writing teachers in situ when they are telling about their writing and experiences during their studies overseas.

Interview procedure

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with protocols for the questions (Appendix A). The questions addressed the participants’ (1) experiences of writing and

professional training in Western TESOL programs; (2) role as Western-educated teachers teaching English writing in Taiwan; (3) English writing teaching practices in Taiwanese universities; and (4) perspectives on teaching English as a global language. I also reflected on field notes and added questions accordingly to the protocols for interviews throughout the course of data collection. In total, I conducted five interviews each with Ava, Beth, and Nita, and four with Sarah. Each interview lasted 1–1.5 hours. They were conducted face-to-face, with the exception of three post-interviews with Ava, Sarah, and Nita, which were conducted using Skype. The face-to-face interviews were usually scheduled right after my visit for class observation. Before each interview started, I let the teachers choose to use either Mandarin or English, depending on which they were most comfortable with. All the participants told me that either was fine and threw the option back to me. Mandarin was always the language I chose whenever I encountered this situation, as it appeared to be the most comfortable language for me to use with these teachers. It was not only the language we used to greet each time we met for the interviews, but we also used it to chat when I visited their classes for observation. Therefore, Mandarin, the first language we all shared, became the primary language used in the interviews. Interestingly, those who had post-interviews via Skype chose to use English.

4.5.2 Classroom observation

I also relied on classroom observation to help me understand teacher identity formation and how that interacted with their instructional practices. Every participant's writing class met once a week from February to July 2012 (spring semester), and each class lasted two hours. I observed each participant's writing class every other week during the

semester. In total, I observed seven classes from Sarah, eight classes from Beth, and nine from Ava and Nita (missing classes due to statutory holidays or/and personal reasons). The names of the observed classes can be found in table 4.1 presented above. Every class observation was audio-recorded, with both the teachers and students' agreement. In every class visit, I made notes and paid close attention to interaction between teachers and students, teachers' lectures, and in-class activities, particularly those in relation to native-speakerist discourse (e.g., native/non-native speakers, English standards, Western/Eastern culture, etc.). I also compared similarities and conflicts between what the participants said and did in the classroom and what they said in their interviews. I depended on note taking to access what I had observed in the classes. As with research interviews, "our view of ourselves as observers will color the ways we go about observing and note taking" (Richards, 2003, p. 115). In this sense, field notes only represent the observer's interpretation rather than offering the truth about what has been observed.

4.5.3 Documents

Various types of documents were collected from each participant throughout the course of data collection to contextualize participants' accounts in interviews and classrooms. Materials used during class observation were collected; these included textbooks, syllabi if available, in-class handouts, and scoring rubrics. Online resources used during the class observations were also collected; these included video clips on YouTube used to initiate class discussion and cyber space for class communication and correspondence (e.g., Wikispaces). Students' writing assignments and term papers were also collected, which involved several drafts and teachers' feedback and comments. The feedback on students'

papers given by the participants at times became a topic for further investigation in interviews. Finally, email correspondence between the participants and me was another important source of data collected for analysis.

4.5.4 Audio-recording, transcription, and translation

All interactional data, including interviews and classroom interactions, were audio-recorded. Right after the fieldwork, I first transcribed all the interview data verbatim in the original language used (English or Mandarin). After an initial analysis of interview data, I also transcribed classroom interactions verbatim, but only those relevant to the themes that I had developed in interview data (see 4.6 for details). Following my close reading, I adopted Jefferson's (2004) transcribing conventions (Appendix B) to capture the fine-grain interactional details in order to see how the participants construct their identities through linguistic and other semiotic resources. According to Prior (2016), while transcripts provide helpful referential tools for analysis, "they do not replace the recordings" (p. 22). Therefore, I constantly compared the transcripts with recordings during the course of analysis. I would also like to note that audio-recording and transcription are always a representation and interpretation as they are "partial, selective, motivated, methodologically driven and an integral part of the analytic process" (Prior, 2016, p. 22; see also Bucholtz, 2000; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008). Because the analyst decides what and what not to record and transcribe, the excerpts are understood and interpreted from certain perspectives (Wernicke-Heinrichs, 2013). As such, recording and transcribing in this study are treated as the first step in interpretation of the inquiry, framed by my background and research agenda.

To present the data and findings, I translated every Mandarin interaction into

English. For each extract to be analyzed, I first present the original data in Mandarin and then the translated data in English. At times, English was used by all speakers in interactions; in these cases, the original English is presented in the extract. Like recording and transcription, translation is another layer of interpretation, as the analyst “must constantly make decisions about the cultural meanings which language carries, and evaluate the degree to which the two different worlds they inhabit are the same.” (Simon, 1997, p. 463). As Simon notes, “the process of meaning transfer has less to do with *finding* the cultural inscription of a term than in reconstructing its value” (p. 138). As a member of Chinese culture myself, I activate my ethnographic knowledge in choosing the English word I interpret as being the closest in value to the word my participants used. My engagement in the translation process thus constitutes an integral component of interpreting work in this study.

4.6 Data analysis

I adopt Braun and Clarke’s (2006) thematic analysis method to analyze the text and talk about this study. According to them, thematic analysis is “a method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (p. 79). This analytic approach allows the researcher to capture the repeated patterns of meanings across a data set in order to generate compelling arguments and claims based on well-organized key features of a large body of data. The key character of a “theme” is not necessarily dependant on “quantifiable measures” (p. 82), but rather on whether it captures the important and relevant text and talk from collected data that helps the researcher appropriately and adequately address the research questions.

I started the analysis by listening to and transcribing verbatim all interview data I collected (see 4.5.4 for process of transcription). I then closely read the transcripts (original language) and coded the linguistic or other semiotic forms the participants used (words, phrases, intonation, etc.) in relation to the discourse of native-speakerism. The analytic software Nvivo was used to facilitate the coding procedure. At this stage, I paid attention to both the semantic and latent meanings of what the participants had said, in order to capture the surface meanings of the utterance but also the underlying social meanings and ideologies the chosen linguistic forms indexed (Braun & Clarke, 2006; see also *indexicality*, Silverstein, 2003). For example, one of the participants, Ava, made “the West” and “the East” relevant to the conversation when talking about English language teaching. I read these word choices “West” and “East” as their literary meanings referring to the “Western culture” and “Eastern culture.” I also read the ideologies embedded in these two word choices, for example, the hierarchy between the West and the East or between native and non-native English speakers and cultures, based on my theoretical orientation (e.g., discourse of native-speakerism). By reading both ways, I capture the elements for analyzing both *identity-in-language* and *identity-in-discourse*. I then interpreted what identities were being constructed in the given interaction or text through the particular use of discursive resources.

After I had gone through the transcripts and coded the relevant texts and conversations across the interview data, I compared and contrasted the codes, sorting and developing codes into potential themes and subthemes for each participant’s writing and teaching experiences. Having done the initial analysis of interview data involving the steps described above, I then moved on to analyze data collected from the participants’ actual

teaching, *identity-in-practice*, by listening to the classroom interaction and writing conference conversation, as well as by reading teaching materials (e.g., students' assignments, scoring rubrics). During this phase, I searched and selected texts and talks from the participants' actual teaching practices that were relevant to the themes developed from interview data analysis. Given that the themes developed from the interviews varied across participants (e.g., each responded differently to the discourse of native-speakerism), the data selected for analyzing participants' teaching practices varied among participants in order to elaborate the arguments that I wanted to make from the themes coded and developed from the interviews. Moreover, given that Western-educated English writing teachers' teaching experiences after returning home is still very little explored, I purposefully chose different types of data to represent each participant's teaching practice, namely scoring rubrics for Beth, classroom interaction for Sarah, writing conferences for Ava, and email correspondence with students for Nita. By doing so I hoped to provide a wider and deeper understanding of this group of teachers' teaching experiences, with various types of data relating to pedagogical practices presented and analyzed. Having coded the data sets collected and developed themes for each participant's writing and teaching experiences, I then selected the texts, talks or conversations with the essence of the claims I wanted to make and translated them into English with corresponding transcription conventions (Jefferson, 2004) and started to write up the analysis.

Grounded my research in social constructionism, I analyzed the data excerpts of this study not as a direct report or as the truth that represented the participants' inner world. Instead, I analyzed and presented them as *accounts* (Talmy, 2010) of how the participants deployed available linguistic and semiotic resources to construct their identities as English

writers and teachers in interactions either with me in the interviews or with their students in classes. Viewing identity as constructed mainly through social interaction, I also applied sequential analysis (Schegloff, 2007; Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby, & Olsher, 2002) to help understand *how* talk is sequentially structured in interaction by co-participants' responses to each other (e.g., the interviewee and interviewer; the teacher and students), and how identities are negotiated through the sequential organization.

The analysis is not linear in fashion, simply moving from one step to the next. Rather, it is a recursive process that required moving back and forth throughout the phases as necessary, including re-listening, re-transcribing, re-translating, re-coding and re-interpreting until an argument could be solidly made.

4.7 Researcher reflexivity

In social constructionist spirit, the researcher's role is intrinsic to the process of knowledge production (Holstein & Gubrium, 2011; Potter & Hepburn, 2008; Willig, 2012). I view my role as a researcher as an intrinsic issue in producing the knowledge presented in this study in two senses. First, I position myself as a "researcher-subject" (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 27) who collaboratively constructs the social meanings of the stories told to me by the participants. My presence in the *in-situ* interviews and classroom interactions as a researcher, or having other related identities such as a Western-educated doctoral student, an L2 English speaker, a Taiwanese, and a young woman, constitutes not only part of the data but also a significant analytic resource for analyzing the data (Talmy, 2011; Wernicke-Heinrichs, 2013). Second, my "[social] background and historical context contribute both to the particular topics of inquiry as well as the ways in which the studies

get framed” (Roberts, 2001, cited in Prior, 2016, p. 8). The way in which I have been raised, how I have been educated in Taiwan and Western countries to understand the world, how I have learned English, and how I have been developing and positioning myself as a teacher and researcher in the field of language education give weight to both my interest in this particular research topic and my ways of interpreting what is said by the participating teachers (Phan, 2008). I particularly acknowledge that I am privileged to have been educated in Western countries for my MA and PhD studies, during which I constructed most of my professional development and identity in the field of English education. Therefore, how I interpret the stories of four Western-educated writing teachers is largely formed by my experiences as an English user and researcher “through the mode of Western-thinking” (Phan, 2008, p. 23). From these two viewpoints, the researcher’s role is both reflective and constitutive in the social process of generating and analyzing data. The researcher’s interpretation of what is said and observed from the research site is not seen as contamination of the data and analysis; it is an essential resource in co-constructing *how* the participants construct themselves as social types, in this study, as English teachers.

Roberts (2001) uses the term “researcher’s personal anthropology” (p. 326) to describe the critical reflection on one’s social background and identities in the process of knowledge production. Given my pivotal role in generating and interpreting the participating teachers’ stories and identity formation, I now write my personal anthropology about my relation with the English language and learning, and with the Western educational experiences in relation to my professional development. This short personal autobiography is for readers as well as myself; through this account, we can access my role in the process of producing the knowledge presented in this study (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2009). It is

worth noting that this autobiography is also contingent and recipient-designed, and thus only presents one version of many stories about me as an English user, a teacher, and a researcher.

The researcher

Rae and English. My relationship with the English language has a lot to do with my father's social background. My father was born in 1946 and was raised in the 1950s during the American aid period in Taiwan when the English language became the most important and popular foreign language to learn for a better education and better job opportunities. My father chose the English language as his major in university. Unfortunately, he did not finish his degree because he was financially not able to support his own studies. His belief in the English language did not just fade. He passed his passion for learning English on to his children. I was always told how important English was and how necessary it was that I master it in order to gain a decent job and prestigious social status. My parents were generous enough to provide the materials and resources I needed to master the language. I started to learn English in grade 5 at a private institute. Because of this early access to the English language, my English ability was superior to that of most of my peers in secondary school, where English was taught as a subject. My faith in the English language grew with my confidence in my English ability. I deeply believed that if I kept studying English, I would someday gain the kind of privileged job and social status my father had mentioned.

My faith in the English language was also confirmed in those days when peers and teachers all talked about how English could expand our worldview and offer opportunities to become global citizens. This deep belief developed in my daily life prompted me to choose English literature and language as my major in university. There, I started to gain

intensive training in speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills in English. I learned how to write an argumentation essay with five paragraphs and topic sentences, and also to understand American accents and to roll up my tongue to imitate how a Hollywood movie star talked. With all this training and skill, I was full of hope that someday the effort to learn English would bring me a promising future. However, somehow there was a voice from the bottom of my heart telling me I did not really like the language. I felt the competition among peers. I felt pressured when I heard the teacher praising my peers for their beautiful American pronunciation and native-like writing. I felt I could never reach the native-like level of my peers because I had never been immersed in an English-speaking country like they had. At the end of my university years, I was introduced to several ELT courses offered in my department. I was especially convinced by the pedagogical approaches I encountered (e.g., communicative language teaching), which helped me see the possibilities of how I, and students like me, might be able to speak or write native-like English. With such hope, I decided to pursue a master's degree in TESOL in one of the English-speaking countries, the origin of these cutting-edge theories and pedagogies of English education.

Rae and Western education. As soon as I decided to advance my studies in English education, I consulted my professors about which university I should choose. Not surprisingly, the United States was the first choice of my professors, all of whom had earned their degrees in the United States. I started my master's degree at the University of Pennsylvania with confidence and enthusiasm. My interest in ELT theories and classroom methodology was enhanced during my master's studies. However, my confidence in my English ability was knocked down when I found myself unable to express what I wanted to say. I hesitated to speak up and express my opinions when I found that my native English-

speaking peers in the program could say the same thing much better than I could. My way of talking made my opinions sound less smart than they were intended to be. I hid my fear and anxiety about my inadequate English ability through silence. I could not help but ask myself, “How can I teach English if I myself cannot speak or write it fluently and appropriately?” From this point, I knew the English language had become part of my identity.

This doubt about myself extended to the early years of my PhD studies in my current program. The arduous readings in PhD-level courses slowed my understanding of the topic being discussed in class; at the same time, I did not articulate my own opinions in front of my eloquent English-speaking PhD peers. For a year, I was totally silent in class, self-doubting all the time, worrying that I was not a legitimate English speaker, teacher, and PhD student. However, although speaking in front of the class was almost a nightmare for me, I found writing a way out of my anxiety. Writing term papers became a place where I let out all the ideas and thoughts I did not feel comfortable sharing in class. With more time planning and pondering, writing allowed me to better organize my ideas. I felt that I “sounded” much smarter and more confident in writing than in speaking. I experienced the power of writing and thus I developed my research interest in second language writing. Moreover, my confidence as an English user and teacher also developed because I was exposed to a large amount of literature on critical applied linguistics including Pennycook, Kubota, Canagarajah, and Phan, to name just a few. Their writing helped me gain agency as an English user, teacher, and researcher by questioning the imbalance in power relations in ELT that allows certain groups of speakers and communities the privilege of defining and evaluating whose English and teaching of the language are considered valuable and

acceptable. With my own experiences speaking and writing in countries of “cultural Self” and my professional training in critical applied linguistics, I realized I could identify myself as a legitimate speaker and writer in my own right. Since then, native-like English has not been the gold standard by which I judge my own English ability, and it will not be for my future students. While I am empowered by these great scholars’ thoughts to become a more confident English speaker, writer and teacher, my feeling of inadequacy at times still exists, especially when witnessing the hegemonic discourses in ELT that are still widely spread through job advertisements, taken for granted in ETL professional meetings, and even reproduced in friends’ conversations. The politics of ELT seems to be a long-term issue to deal with as long as the hegemonic discourses in ELT mentioned above are yet to be adequately deconstructed. With these concerns in mind, I acknowledge my privilege in accessing professional development, mainly through my PhD studies in Canada, which affords a space and a chance to see my potential to change the status quo by challenging it as the initial step.

4.8 Research rigor

In this study, I take the social constructionist approach to understanding participants’ identity construction through language and discourse. In social constructionism, one does not look for the objective truth of the story (e.g., whether the teacher really sees herself as a legitimate teacher), but how participants construct versions of their stories through linguistic forms and other semiotic resources. As mentioned earlier, in Chapter 2 (section 2.5), given that available linguistic and other semiotic resources vary across time and space (i.e. identity-in-discourse), participants’ identity work is dynamic and contingent in nature.

Therefore, data generated in each interactive incident by participants are seen to represent one possible version of the story. Multiple research methods (e.g., interviews and observation) thus afford alternative data production and therefore multiple versions of the story being told (De Fina, 2013a, 2013b; Wood & Kroger, 2000). From this perspective, research rigor of social constructionist research is not ensured by looking at how true and complete participants' opinions are, but by seeking "collective representations" (De Fina, 2013a, p. 45) of the story being told across participants, time and space, to add breath, depth, complexity, and richness to the study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).

4.9 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have outlined my research design as a qualitative case study over 10 months of data collection. I have also described the study contexts and participants, the epistemology that guided my approach to data generation and analysis. I have also discussed the types of data being collected and approached to analyze the research data. In addition, I have articulated researcher reflexivity and the establishment of research rigor. In Chapter 5, I will present the analysis and findings that answer my first research question: *How do the participants view themselves as English users and writers? In particular, how do the participants' Western-educated experiences play a role in constructing their identities as English users and writers?*

CHAPTER 5: WRITING IN THE WEST: NARRATING IDENTITY AS AN ENGLISH USER AND WRITER

5.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to answer my first research question: *How do the participants view themselves as English users and writers in light of the discourse of native-speakerism? In particular, how do the participants' Western-educated experiences play a role in constructing their identity as English users and writers?* In this chapter, I focus on how the participants constructed their identities as English users and writers in the interviews as they narrate their studying and writing experiences in Western graduate programs. Narratives in interaction, rooted in social constructionist tradition, not only allow the story tellers to tell what happened in the past, but also “afford tellers an occasion to present themselves as actors in social worlds while at the same time negotiating their present self with other interactants” (De Fina, 2011a, p. 275). That is, by telling narratives *to* their interactants, in this study to me as the interviewer in interviews, the participants made relevant the past experiences significant to their identity construction, from which they negotiated and articulated the identities they wanted to be heard in here-and-now interaction (De Fina, 2011a; see also De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2008, 2011). From this narrative-in-interaction perspective, I understand not only how each participant wants to be understood as an English writer at the moment when the interviews were conducted, but also how their Western graduate programs shaped each of their identities as English writers.

The data discussed below show that all participants are characterized as illegitimate or incompetent L2 writers in their respective graduate programs, or by me as an interviewer, for not being able to write as expected by their graduate programs. Negotiating these

incompetent L2 writer identities when telling their stories, each participant constructs a writer identity by aligning or disaligning with Anglophone writing norms expected in her English-speaking graduate program. I start with Beth's story.

5.2 Beth: "After being trained out there, I am a competent English writer"

After her formal education in Taiwan, Beth went directly to the UK to pursue her MA and PhD in TESL from a UK university, with a TESOL specialization. Although she started to learn general English writing in secondary school and academic writing in university, she said that she did not really get proper training in English academic writing until her studies at the British university. In excerpt 1, I ask Beth whether she received any unforgettable evaluations or feedback on assignments from professors when she started learning academic writing in her graduate program. Beth then shares a writing experience that happened in the first year of her master's program, when her very first assignment was being *referred* (line 4). According to Beth, the term "being referred" was used in her British graduate program to refer to assignments being returned by the professors to the student writers for further revision. After revision, students could resubmit the papers for grading. I will use *being returned* instead of *being referred* in the following analysis to avoid possible confusion.

[Excerpt Beth 1] Interview
March 20 (00:58:16–00:58:51)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R : 那有什麼作業還是教授給你評分的那個評語-
- 2 是你比較難忘的嗎?
- 3 B: 有啊我第一個 practice assignment 被 referred [returned] (笑聲)……他不算真的
- 4 assignment 就是他其實就是有一點點像是課堂上老師告訴你他企圖要
- 5 告訴你說一個作業該長什麼樣子。

[English translation]

- 1 R: Was there any assignment or professor's evaluation or comments – that were
- 2 unforgettable for you?
- 3 B: Yeah, my first practice assignment was referred [returned] (laughs) ... it was not
- 4 really an assignment, but like the professor intended to tell you what an
- 5 assignment should look like.

In the course Beth was taking, before students wrote their first formal assignment, the class instructor gave a practice assignment to guide students in understanding “what an assignment should look like.” (lines 4–5). Based on the instructor's feedback on this assignment, students could familiarize themselves with the writing conventions required in the academic context. As Beth tells me that the purpose of the assignment was to “tell someone what the assignment *should* look like.” (lines 4–5), she indicates that there was a set of writing conventions to follow in order to pass the course or to become a legitimate writer in the graduate course or program. Apparently, Beth was not one of the legitimate writers in the course, at least at the beginning, because her assignment was returned and needed further work to improve it before resubmission.

In excerpt 2, I ask Beth to elaborate on why her assignment had been returned. In this conversation, Beth seems to distance herself from the writer identity indexed by her returned assignment.

[Excerpt Beth 2] Interview
March 20 (00:59:13–00:59:57)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R : 為什麼被 referred [returned].
- 2 B : 其實是那時候還搞不清楚狀況啦,就是那時候根本就不知道一個作業長
- 3 什麼- 該長什麼樣子.
- 4 R : 就 academic writing 長什麼樣子.
- 5 B: 對, 完全沒有概念然後你會用- 用<很多的>不應該是屬於 academic writing

- 6 的(.) 東西放在裡頭, 或是不夠嚴謹的東西.
7 R: 恩恩恩恩.
8 B: 對啊, 你還<抓不準>那個要求是什麼.
9 R: 比如說什麼.
10 B: 比如說會用會用過- 過多的描述可是或是- 是沒有- 缺乏自己的
11 argument 我覺得這是一個很嚴重的-
12 R: 喔:
13 B: 對他們來說有時, 我不知道我看(的是什麼).

[English translation]

- 1 R: Why was it referred [returned].
2 B: Actually at the time I wasn't clear on, like at the time I knew
3 nothing about what an assignment should look like.
4 R: Like how academic writing looks.
5 B: Right, totally no idea ... Then you would use – use <lots of> non-academic
6 elements in it, or non-rigorous elements.
7 R: Um huh, um huh.
8 B: Right, you were still <unable to grasp> what they really want.
9 R: Like what.
10 B: Like I would write too much description, or lack my own argument,
11 I think it's a very serious –
12 R: O:h
13 B: To them (instructors) sometimes they don't know what they read.

Beth explains that her assignment was returned because “you used lots of non-academic” (line 5) or not-rigorous elements (line 6) or “you were unable to grasp what they really want.” (line 8). Interestingly, Beth used the second-person pronoun “你” or “you” instead of the first-person pronoun “I” to refer to her own experiences of having assignments returned. According to O'Connor (1994; see also Kuo, 2002), when people use the self-indexing “you,” there are three possible intentions: self-distancing, other-involving, and self-addressing in his/her own past. Beth first uses “you” to refer to her past self, who used a lot of improper academic elements. By so doing, she distances her current self from the writer

she used to be. That is, although she used to use inappropriate and non-rigorous elements in her academic writing, she seems to show that now she no longer writes like this. Moreover, the use of “you” is also used to assign me (other-involving), the only interlocutor in the conversation, as a ratified actor as well as to suggest a sense of camaraderie (Kuo, 2002) with Beth as a novice academic writer who once studied in a Western academic context and who had difficulty knowing how to produce a proper assignment paper. By involving me in the same experience and projecting me as having a “once novice writer identity in a Western writing context.” Beth seems to invite me to agree with her that although she was not a competent writer back then in her graduate program, she is now a different kind of writer.

However, my response in line 9 (“Like what”) immediately shows my non-affiliation with the identity Beth has just projected to herself and me. That is, as an L2 writer studying in a Western graduate program, I do not have the same writing experience as Beth and thus do not know what she meant by “you were unable to grasp what they really want.” (line 8). Not aligning with the categories Beth invoked, I at the same time deny Beth’s distancing of herself from the writing issues she mentioned. Probably because of my non-affiliation with her, Beth switches the second person pronoun to the first-person pronoun “I” in line 10, “like I would write too much description, or lack my own argument,” explaining that her lack of argument in writing made it confusing for her instructor to understand her writing, the key reason why her assignment was being returned.

As she continues to share the story in excerpt 3, Beth then attributes the lack of arguments in her writing to be the result of the differences between English and her first language, Mandarin. By doing this, she again tries to distance herself from the negative identity indexed by the returned assignment.

[Excerpt Beth 3] Interview
March 20 (00:59:59–01:00:47)

[Mandarin]

- 19 B：對啊，我覺得這是英文跟中文最大的差別，因為像我現在上那個
20 研究所的，英文論文寫作，然後大部份-台灣訓練出來的學生-
21 都比較難掌握這一塊。就是我在裡面要有我的 argument。
22 或者是說他們有，可是他們把它刻意的隱藏在一些(笑)文字
23 中間。
24 R：(笑) 他們不敢表達自己的想法。
25 B：對，可是，可是後來，我比如說像我們在那邊受過這些訓練之後，你就會知
26 道說人家要看的就是你這個東西。
27 R：恩恩恩恩

[English translation]

- 19 B: Right, I think this is the biggest difference between English and Mandarin.
20 Now I am teaching English academic writing to graduate students. Most of
21 them - like students trained in Taiwan - have difficulty grasping this part.
22 Like to have my own argument in the writing. Or they actually did, but they
23 intentionally hide them between (laughs) lines and words.
24 R: (laughs) They dare not show their own ideas.
25 B: Right, but – but later – for example, like us, after being trained out there, you
26 know what people really want from your writing.
27 R: Um huh, um huh.

To elaborate on her writing issue—lack of arguments in writing when studying in the UK, Beth compares her writing and her Taiwanese graduate students’ writing and states that the biggest challenge for Chinese writers, including herself and her current students, is that Chinese writers do not have points to argue in their writing (lines 21–22) or even if they do, they tend to “hide arguments between lines and words.” (line 23). By introducing these two characteristics of Chinese writers, Beth implies that English academic writing requires critical and argumentation competence as well as the ability to clearly present the writers’ arguments. In contrast, many Mandarin writers lack these writing skills, which makes their

English writing unclear and confusing. Beth's comparison of English and Chinese writing styles reflects the contrastive rhetoric orientation to teaching English writing initiated by Kaplan (1966). The assumption underlying this approach is that each language has its unique cultural patterns and rhetoric, and that learners' L1 rhetorical conventions might interfere with their L2 writing. Particularly, this approach tends to categorize the writing system of English as linear and clear, and those of other languages as circular and indirect (Kubota & Lehner, 2004). Here, Beth categorizes herself and her students as Chinese speakers whose English writing is heavily influenced by the unclear and indirect style of Chinese writing; this influence was the main reason why she had difficulty making arguments in her writing, and resulted in her assignment being returned by her instructor.

In my next turn speaking, in line 24, I first respond with laughter, followed by a statement, "they dare not show their own ideas." My laughter first shows my understanding of Beth's description of how Chinese writers produce argumentation. Further, I interpret the tendency of hiding arguments between lines to be because Chinese speakers "dare not show their own ideas." By giving laughter and interpretation as my response to Beth, I orient myself as an insider to this kind of Chinese writing, either as an English writer myself or as an English teacher who has experienced or witnessed English writing by the Chinese writers described by Beth. My alignment with Beth's comparison of English and Chinese writers works to construct a "co-membership" (Stoke, 2012, p. 294) between Beth and me; both of us understand why Chinese writers lack arguments in English writing.

It is after this co-membership is constructed that Beth immediately makes relevant her Western-educated experiences (lines 25–26, "like us, after being trained out there, you know what people really want from your writing.") to distinguish herself from this indirect

and circular writing style Chinese writers use in English writing. In this account, by using “我們” or “us” (line 25), Beth categorizes both herself and me as writers who have been educated in the West and who know what people want from English writing, that is, making arguments explicitly and clearly when writing. By associating writing competence to Western-educated experience, Beth’s account resonates with Motha’s argument (2014) that people often associate mainstream English with the English-speaking West. Our Western-educated experiences have allowed us to acquire the necessary writing skills from the mainstream English-speaking West, making both of us competent writers who know how to write English academic essays with clear and direct arguments. My acknowledgment in line 27 (“um huh, um huh”) displays my alignment with Beth’s construction of herself and me to this positive English writer identity. My alignment with her positioning has jointly constructed Beth an identity as a competent writer who knows how to produce proper academic English writing after being trained in the West. That is, she was an incompetent English writer at the beginning of her British graduate program due to the influence of her Chinese ways of writing, her lack of arguments. Yet, after several years of studying in the West, she managed to rectify these Chinese writing characteristics and change them into mainstream English writing norms, and she was able to convey her ideas clearly and explicitly to Anglophone readers.

As Beth was telling the story about her returned assignment, she indicated that there was a set of writing conventions in her graduate program that required her to have points to argue, and to argue them explicitly. In the process of telling the story, Beth made relevant her Western-educated experiences and showed her ability to write as her graduate program required. By doing so, she constructed a competent English writer identity by aligning

herself with Anglophone English writing conventions. While Beth constructed her writer identity by showing her native-like writing competence acquired during study overseas, Sarah, whose story follows, is someone who established her own legitimacy as an English writer by refusing to align with the dominant writing conventions.

5.3 Sarah: “I can be a multilingual writer and teacher”

Sarah had been teaching at Shang University for two years, since she graduated from an American university with a PhD in TESOL and specialization in L2 writing and composition. The curriculum of Sarah’s TESOL program heavily emphasized critical applied linguistics, and student teachers constantly reflected on critical issues in ELT, such as the politics between English speakers and English varieties. Her training in the graduate program had a great impact on Sarah in various ways, including how she viewed herself as an English writer and teacher. To understand how Sarah’s writing experiences in the graduate program shaped her view of herself as an English writer, I initiated the conversation in excerpt 1 and asked Sarah whether she had any writing difficulties or challenges when studying in the program.

[Excerpt Sarah 1] Interview
March 23 (00:30:48–00:31:30)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R : 你還有什麼, 就是比較有印象的就是
- 2 你覺得啊怎麼- 來到這邊唸書寫得東西好難喔, 比較有挑戰性的.
- 3 S : 恩- 其實我一開始我並不會覺得很難寫, 一開始因為你不知道
- 4 什麼是要寫得怎麼樣, 所以你就自己用你自己知道的寫,
- 5 覺得寫得很好...我還覺得我寫得蠻好的, 因為我就覺得
- 6 我還能辦的.

[English translation]

- 1 R: Is there anything else that you still keep in mind, coming here
- 2 (the US) to study and finding writing very difficult or challenging.
- 3 S: Uh – actually I didn't find it challenging writing there at the beginning,
- 4 because you didn't really know how well you need to write,
- 5 so you just used your own ways to write and felt good about
- 6 your own writing ... I think I wrote pretty well, because I had a lot to say.

By asking my question (lines 1–2) “coming here (the US) to study and finding writing very difficult or challenging,” I, as an interviewer, assume there was a set of writing conventions in Sarah's graduate program and that Sarah, as an L2 speaker from another culture, might have had difficulty and challenges in writing in the way her graduate program expected. To respond, Sarah explicitly states that she did not find writing challenging in the new academic context, and that she actually felt confident about having many ideas to share and had no problem expressing herself in writing in the program.

Hoping to gain more input from Sarah about her writing experiences in the program, I clarified the question and asked Sarah again after the conversation shown in excerpt 1 whether she had any unforgettable writing experience such as negative feedback from her professors or peers when she started studying in the program. Instead of responding to my question about her unforgettable *writing* experiences, Sarah changes the conversation topic and shares stories with me about two unforgettable *professors* she had taken courses with during her graduate studies. The change of topic, as I will discuss later, can be understood as used by Sarah to reject the negative L2 writer identity that I projected to her in my interview question.

The first professor Sarah mentioned taught her composition class and showed his caring and thoughts about minority groups. Because the professor was a believer in Brazilian

educator Paulo Freire's teaching philosophy, he introduced to the class topics such as *the Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) or issues about minority groups (e.g., African Americans and working-class communities) and their literacy education. As Sarah states in excerpt 2, that course was a very special experience for her because the knowledge she gained from the professor provided an alternative perspective for her in considering what education can offer.

[Excerpt Sarah 2] Interview

March 23 (00:40:23—00:41:48)

[Mandarin]

- 1 S: 這對我來說是很特別的。因為台灣的那種教育
- 2 給我感覺教書就是教課本上面的知識,可是對我來說,
- 3 他是一個不只是教知識的人,他還讓我成長,
- 4 然後有點是看到不一樣的東西,就是教育他
- 5 可以更廣。
- 6 R: 恩恩。
- 7 S: 他雖然就是在作文上面沒有特別給我什麼啟發,可是他就是
- 8 讓我覺得說我們在教書的時候,不是應該只是去注重教課本
- 9 本身的一些技能,應該要是他整個
- 10 人的一個發展這樣。
- 11 R: 嗯嗯嗯。

[English translation]

- 1 S: That was a very special experience for me, because like before in Taiwan,
- 2 I thought education was about teaching the knowledge in textbooks.
- 3 But to me, he was not merely a person teaching me knowledge, but also
- 4 making me grow, so it's like I saw things differently, and realized that
- 5 education can offer much more.
- 6 R: Um huh.
- 7 S: Right, although he didn't inspire me particularly – especially in terms of
- 8 English writing, he made me think that when we are teaching, we
- 9 shouldn't just pay attention to skills in textbooks, but we should think about
- 10 developing the whole person.
- 11 R: Um huh um huh.

Influenced by her education in Taiwan, Sarah said that she thought teaching was all about transmitting textbook knowledge from teachers to students. Not until she took the course with that particular professor, she learned that education was not merely about teaching skills or textbook knowledge but that it should enable students to grow as people (lines 3–5). As she continues to say, although her professor did not inspire or help her improve her English writing skills, by sharing awareness of and thinking about educational issues concerning minority groups, he inspired Sarah to become a better teacher with awareness of and empathy for minority students. By telling this story, Sarah not only indicates that the education she received from the American graduate program developed her teacher identity, it also guided her to teach students more than language skills and knowledge from textbooks.

Also, by telling the story about her learning from this professor, Sarah seems to refuse the L2 writer identity I projected to her in earlier questions by asking her whether she encountered any difficulties and challenges in writing using mainstream academic conventions. That is, by projecting her professor as someone who cared about things beyond language skills, Sarah indicates that learning to become a teacher was more important than learning language skills in her program. Therefore, it would not be an issue for her or her professor that she did not acquire language skills—Anglophone writing conventions that I, as an interviewer, assumed she had difficulties catching up with. Through telling the course-taking story, Sarah rejected mainstream Anglophone writing conventions that I, the interviewer, made relevant as the vital component for constructing her writing identity.

Sarah then goes on to talk about the other professor she mentioned who inspired her

during her graduate studies, the professor from her TESOL methods course.

[Excerpt Sarah 3] Interview

March 23 (00:45:27–00:46:20)

[Mandarin]

- 1 S: 另外一個老師他是比較實際上的那個幫助, 他就會跟, 我們看到的那個像
- 2 Paul Matsuda 啦 Canagarajah 比較類似那種. 就是, 他會以 L2 去出發, 然
- 3 後他讓我身為一個 non-native speaker 就是會比
- 4 較有自信.
- 5 R: 嗯嗯嗯.
- 6 S: 因為我以前去的時候我會自己覺得說- uh 自己想要變成 native speaker 阿
- 7 或者是 native like, 然後會想要把英文學好啊可是我們根本不知道要
- 8 幹甚麼. 可是他就會去, 有點 deconstruct 這樣子的一個 myth 或者是
- 9 ideology, 然後他就會告訴你, 你可以是 multilingual 你可以比 monolingual
- 10 更好啊.
- 11 R: 恩恩恩.
- 12 S: 然後, 就是, 有點是 empower 自己, 我當一個學生的老師, 就是
- 13 讓我覺得 empower 這樣子.
- 14 R: 嗯嗯嗯.

[English translation]

- 1 S: The professor [TESOL methodology course] was helpful in a more practical
- 2 way, like what we saw from Paul Matsuda, more like Canagarajah. Like he
- 3 would stand in an L2's shoes [speakers]. He made me feel more confident as a
- 4 non-native speaker.
- 5 R: Um huh um huh.
- 6 S: Because when I first studied there, I felt – uh I want to become a native speaker
- 7 Or native-like. Then I wanted to learn English well, but I didn't really know
- 8 what I was doing. But he would like try to deconstruct this kind of uh myth or
- 9 ideology. Then he would tell you, uh, you can be multilingual, you can be
- 10 better than monolingual.
- 11 R: Um huh huh.
- 12 S: Then, it kind of empowered me as a teacher, this made me feel
- 13 empowered.
- 14 R: Um huh huh huh.

In this conversation, Sarah states that when she first studied in the US, she often wanted to

become like a native speaker (line 6) or acquire native-like English ability (line 7). However, despite her hard work to achieve this goal, she somehow got lost in what she was pursuing. It was not until the professor of the TESOL methods course introduced the works of critical scholars such as Paul Matsuda and Suresh Canagarajah to the class that she learned to question the myth and ideology surrounding the privileged status of native speakers in ELT. Sarah states that these scholarly works provided her with an alternative view, that of a multilingual speaker/writer (line 9), empowering her to see herself as a confident and legitimate non-native writer and teacher of English. According to Canagarajah (2013; see also Cook, 1992), multilingual speakers are those who can speak or write in two or more languages. Their multilingual competence is not merely the sum of discrete monolingual competences; rather, it is the integrated knowledge of two or several languages. When this idea of multilingual speakers applies to L2 writers, it suggests that L2 writers have multi-competence that bears richer linguistic repertoires, consisting of both English and their mother language(s), to express their ideas in English essays. Given that the linguistic competence and repertoire of a multilingual writer is richer than that of a monolingual writer (e.g., an English native speaker), when it comes to writing in English, there is no need to follow the idealized competence of native English speakers.

Through telling her learning experiences from this professor, Sarah constructs herself a multilingual writer identity (line 9), with which she positions herself as a competent writer who processes both English and Mandarin as her linguistic repertoire to express herself in writing. Therefore, although she might not write native-like English and writes with some degree of non-nativeness because of the influence of her L1, she sees this not as a challenge to overcome but rather as an advantage for her writing. With this multilingual identity, she

even takes a further step, viewing herself by no means as inferior to native English-speaking monolingual speakers because she has a richer linguistic repertoire for expressing herself in writing.

Like Sarah, who constructed her writer identity by rejecting alignment with the negative L2 writer identity that I, as an interviewer, projected to her, Nita constructs her English writer identity by rejecting the incompetent L2 writer identity imposed by her dissertation examiner.

5.4 Nita: Rejecting biased feedback to construct English writer identity

After receiving a bachelor's degree in Taiwan, Nita went to the US for her MA in linguistics and to New Zealand for her PhD in curriculum studies, specializing in L2 writing. Like Beth, Nita said that although she received some basic training in English writing in Taiwan, it was not until she started to write academic English in her English-medium graduate programs that she learned how to write a proper English essay. The following excerpts are stories about her writing experiences during her PhD studies in New Zealand. I began a conversation with Nita by asking her to share the most unforgettable writing experiences she had during her studies in the West.

[Excerpt Nita 1] Interview
March 26 (01:00:46–01:01:35)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R : 那你最: 有沒有最難忘的寫作經驗啊, 在國外求學得期間,
- 2 就比如說老師給一些 feedback 然後很 harsh 阿, 還是, 什麼的,
- 3 有很比較難忘的-
- 4 (5.0)
- 5 N : 還好欸.
- 6 R : 還好 (1.5) 還是剛到美國的時候.

- 7 N：不過耶：(2.5) 就是我都覺得我已經表達得很-
8 很白了,可是, 因為我那兩個指導教授呢最後也是有(0.8) 有就是還是: 兩個很
9 認真的最後一筆他們還-還好像在- 就是還在幫我 proofread, 然後整個整個幫
10 我改這樣子。
11 R：嗯嗯恩嗯恩。
12 N：然後我都覺得(.) hh 我們再怎麼樣好像就是沒辦法像 native speaker.

[English translation]

- 1 R: So do you have the most, – any unforgettable writing experiences, during your
2 studies abroad, like a professor gave you harsh feedback, or something like
3 that. Do you have any unforgettable –
4 (5.0)
5 N: Not really.
6 R: Not really (1.5) or when you first arrived in the States.
7 N: BU:T eh: (2.5) like I thought I put my ideas quite – quite clear there ... But,
8 because my two supervisors at the end they had (0.8) the two
9 were taking time (1.5) the last draft they still – still helping me proofread the
10 whole draft.
11 R: Um huh huh huh.
12 N: Then I felt (.) hh even when we try hard we will never be like native speakers.

Nita shares a story that took place when she was writing her PhD dissertation in New Zealand. She elaborates that, although she had made her points very clearly in her dissertation, her writing still did not satisfy her two native-speaking supervisors and thus received a lot of editing from them (lines 8–10). This seems to have discouraged her because, no matter how hard she tried, she could never write as clearly as a native speaker (line 12), the writing quality expected by her supervisors. Up to this point, Nita seems to see herself as an L2 and non-native English writer, who has come to the English-speaking academic community with challenges in English writing, and who therefore needs editing help from her supervisors.

Yet, as she continues to talk about her dissertation writing experience in excerpt 2,

she appears to reject this non-native English writer identity as she talks about the external examiner for her dissertation and the biased judgment this examiner gave about her dissertation writing.

[Excerpt Nita 2] Interview
March 26 (01: 01:37–01:02:02)

[Mandarin]

- 15 N: 然後我的外審(CAP) ((用筆用力敲桌子))
16 我有一個那個外審是筆試的。
17 R: 摠摠摠摠。
18 N: 就是她會寫 comments, 他還是講說我不夠, 我的英文還是要
19 再注意, 那我都覺得都已經有這兩個 老師 supervisors,
20 我兩個-
21 R: (笑)都已經改成這樣。
22 N: 對啊, 然後你還是說我就是不夠, 不夠 native spe- 就
23 是說英文還是要再注意。
24 R: 摠。

[English translation]

- 15 N: THEN MY EXTERNAL EXAMINER ((tapping desk quickly and heavily with
16 a pen)) I had a: examiner for the writing exam
17 R: Um huh huh
18 N: When she commented on my writing, she STILL said that I was not ready she –
19 my writing still needed to be improved. Then I think my two supervisors had
20 already, I had two –
21 R: (laughs) already spent time editing your paper
22 N: Right. Then you still said that I was not enough – not like a native spe- that
23 my English still needs improvement.
24 R: Mm

With a loud voice (line 15 capitalized THEN MY EXTERNAL), and heavily tapping the desk with her pen (lines 15–16), Nita showed that she was upset when talking about it; even after having her dissertation proofread and edited by her two native-speaking

supervisors, her external examiner still disapproved of her writing because it was not sufficiently native-like and needed further improvement and editing (lines 22–23). Here again, the identity category “a non-native speaker” (line 22) is made relevant to the conversation. The first time Nita introduced this category was in excerpt 1 (line 12) when she said, “we will never be like native speakers.” What is interesting to me is that, when uttering the term “non-native speaker,” in excerpts 1 and 2, Nita uses different footings (Goffman, 1981) to present different positionings of herself to this non-native speaker category. According to Goffman (1981), when people interact, we take up different roles, namely *animator*, *author*, *principal*, to show the authority our words are supposed to have. We change footing to display the “alignment we take up to ourselves and the others as expressed in the way we manage the production and reception of an utterance” (Goffman, 1981, p. 128). First, the *animator* refers to the person who merely produces the utterance. The source of the uttered words is the *author* who originates the beliefs in what has been said. Then, the *principal* is someone whose position or viewpoints are established by the words that are spoken, or someone who “is socially responsible for having performed the action done by the original utterance of that talk.” (Goodwin, 2007, p. 5). In excerpt 1, when saying “we will never be like native speakers” (line 12), Nita positioned herself as both the *author* who uttered “non-native speakers” and the *principal* whom the term represents. In this excerpt, when saying “you still said that I was not like a native speaker” (lines 22), Nita attributes the *authority* of the term “non-native speaker” to the external examiner and positions herself merely as the *principal* who *was being* presented as a “non-native speaker” by her external examiner. By shifting the footing from author to merely principal, Nita positions herself not as a *subject* of the category, but *subject to* the category that was assigned by the external

examiner. That is, while her external examiner criticized her writing as being problematic and non-native-like, Nita took these negative comments as bias-driven judgments from the external examiner. In other words, the trouble source of her examiner not being able to understand her writing was not her lack of English proficiency as a non-native English writer. Rather, it was her examiner's bias toward her, assuming that she could not write well just because she was a non-native speaker. Refusing to orient herself to the trouble source for her examiner's understanding of her writing, Nita refuses to orient to the incompetent non-native writer identity projected by her external examiner. By doing so, Nita positions herself as a competent English writer with no difficulties writing using mainstream Anglophone English norms and able to write a proper dissertation in English. Although she is an L2 writer, she does not necessarily find it difficult or challenging to write in English-speaking writing communities.

In the next excerpt, Nita continues with another story about an experience she had while shopping in a grocery store that informs her writing experiences in her PhD program. In this story, she treats the miscommunication between herself and a cashier in a supermarket as a form of discrimination. In doing so, she reinforces the native English speaker's bias toward non-native English speakers' English ability and further establishes her legitimacy as an English speaker and writer.

[Excerpt Nita 3] Interview
March 26 (01:03:11–01:03:51)

[Mandarin]

- 1 N : 就像我去超市, 我明明跟你講啊,
- 2 two hundred dollar cash-out.
- 3 R : 恩恩恩恩.
- 4 N : 前面的人跟你講的很開心, ↑然後你看到我就會

- 5 一付, 哈哈 >你說- 你說什麼?< 我聽不懂 hh
 6 °我就覺得° 這哪裡的錯誤,是你的錯誤還是
 7 我的錯誤.
 8 R: 恩.
 9 N: 所以在 writing, 有時候說還是很挫折就是覺得- 因為我們非: (1.0) 非
 10 母語 >對對對<.
 11 R: 恩恩.

[English translation]

- 1 N: LIKE WHEN I WENT TO THE SUPERMARKET, I clearly told you,
 2 two hundred dollar cash-out
 3 R: Mm uh uh
 4 N: You were having a good conversation with the customer right before me, ↑
 5 and then your face turned like – (Nita frowns) ah ah >What did you say, what
 6 did you say?<, I don't understand hh ° then I thought° Whose fault is this – is
 7 this your fault or my fault.
 8 R: Mm.
 9 N: So when writing (ENG), sometimes [I] still felt discouraged like because
 10 we are no:n (1.0) non-native English speakers >yah yah yah<
 11 R: Mmmm.

The story took place when Nita asked for a cash-out after grocery shopping in a supermarket when she was studying in New Zealand. Before she asked for this service, the cashier was talking pleasantly with the customer standing right in front of her in the check-out line. As soon as the cashier saw Nita, the cashier suddenly looked puzzled and claimed that she could not understand what Nita was asking for (line 5: “what you said, what did you say?”). It is worth noting that in line 2, Nita code-switches to English when she says “two hundred dollar cash-out.” By repeating to me in this conversation what she said to the cashier at the time, Nita is showing me that she has no problem pronouncing this simple request in English properly and clearly. By showing her ability to say the request, she attributes the responsibility of this communication breakdown to the cashier. That is, the trouble source of

the breakdown is not her lack of English proficiency but the cashier's bias against her English proficiency because of her non-native speakerness.

In her next speaking turn, in lines 9 and 10, Nita goes back to the topic we discussed earlier, her writing experiences, and says that this non-native English speaker identity makes her feel discouraged when writing. By relating her experience with the cashier to her writing experiences, Nita is implying that her external examiner exercised similar discrimination against her. Like the cashier's reaction, the examiner's evaluation of her writing was morally problematic because the examiner might have judged Nita's writing not on the basis of her linguistic ability but on her racial or linguistic background. Even though her dissertation had been edited by two of her English-speaking supervisors, which should have guaranteed the quality of her writing, the external examiner still asked her to improve and edit her writing in her dissertation. This could be because her examiner judged her writing not on the basis of writing quality but on her being a non-native English speaker, whose English was never native-like and thus needed to be improved and edited.

Treating the external examiner and the cashier's comments and reactions to her non-nativeness as examples of misconduct and that are morally unacceptable, Nita rejects the non-native-speaker-as-deficient ideology they used to position her as a less-capable English speaker and writer just because she is a non-native speaker. The trouble source of her writing ability was the biased judgment of the examiner, not her linguistic ability per se. By telling these stories, Nita has constructed an identity as a competent and legitimate English writer who has no difficulties writing using the English conventions expected in her graduate program.

Like Nita, Ava forms her legitimacy as an L2 English writer by attributing the

responsibility for negative feedback on her writing to her American peers and professor, who ignored the positive aspects of her writing.

5.5 Ava: Rejecting “American-style” peer feedback to construct legitimacy as an English writer

Ava earned both her master’s and PhD degrees in language and literacy education at an American university. To understand her writing experience in the graduate program, in the first extract I asked Ava the same question I asked the others about any unforgettable writing experiences she had when studying in the US. In response Ava introduces a pedagogical approach, that of peer review as used by a professor in one of her graduate courses, and describes it as a very special writing experience for her (line 3).

[Excerpt Ava 1] Interview
March 15 (00:18:26–00:23:33)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R : 好, 那: 下一個題目是, 就是你在美國唸書的時候, master 或 PhD, 你有遇
- 2 過什麼樣比較特別的寫作經驗是你比較難忘的嗎.
- 3 A : Uh 應該是第一次 peer review 的: experience 非常的特別.
- 4 R : 恩.
- 5 A : 因為那時候在課堂上, 老師就是讓我們彼此做 peer review,
- 6 所以我們每個人都必須 p-就是要 review 所有其他同學們的 paper ,
- 7 可是那時候就是: uh: 因為美國式的 peer review 就是他會給很多 negative
- 8 comments 就是把你批評的就是: 都很: (0.5) 就是讓你會覺得說
- 9 一文不值這樣子.
- 10 R : 恩.
- 11 A : 所以, 那時候-
- 12 (0.3)
- 13 R : 是美- 美國人嗎美國同學?
- 14 A : 恩, 對對對對, 那我們教授就是有問我們大家就是對這個 peer review 就是-
- 15 同學們給你 peer review 就是覺得有沒有很建設性. 然後那時候我記得我就
- 16 講說, 我沒有想到大家給我的 comments 都這麼的差, 都沒有好的. 我說我想

17 我大概不適合做研究這樣子。

18 R: 恩。

[English translation]

1 R: Alright, so the next question is – when you were studying in America, master’s
2 or PhD, did you ever encounter any unforgettable writing experiences.

3 A: The first peer review experience was very special.

4 R: Uh.

5 A: Because at the time in class, the teacher would let us peer review, so each of us
6 needed to p- like need to review other classmates’ papers, but at the time it was
7 u:h because American-style peer review like they would give lots of negative
8 comments, like they would critique li:ke ve:ry (0.5) like could make you feel
9 you were worth nothing.

10 R: Um.

11 A: So at the time –

12 (0.3)

13 R: Was that Am- Americans, American classmates?

14 A: Uh, right right right yah.then our professor asked us to comment on this peer
15 review like – do you find your classmates’ comments constructive. I
16 remember at the time I said I didn’t expect others’ comments to be all
17 negative. I said uh I think I am probably not qualified to do research.

18 R: Um.

Ava states that this peer review was a special experience for her because she received a lot of negative feedback from her American classmates throughout her paper (line 7, line 13).

Some of the feedback was so harsh and critical that she saw herself as a person who was “worth nothing” because of her English writing (lines 8–9). Although Ava does not mention specifically what aspects of her writing were harshly critiqued, from her phrase “make you feel you were worth nothing,” I assume that the negative feedbacks could be throughout her essay, including grammar, organization, and content. She calls this peer review activity an American-style peer review (line 7) and depicts it as too negative, harsh, and even condescending to the extent that it makes the recipient feel that she is “worth nothing.”

After the peer review activity, her professor asked the students to share their thoughts about it. Ava then told the class that she was upset by the overwhelmingly negative comments, which made her think that she was not qualified to be a researcher because of her limited ability to write (lines 16–17). Up to this point, Ava has depicted herself as an incompetent and incapable writer and researcher in her graduate program; otherwise, she would not have received so much negative feedback from her peers. In other words, to become a legitimate writer and researcher in the program, Ava needed her writing to be free of those harsh comments from her American classmates. One way to achieve this, as one would assume, is to write in a way that Ava’s American peers would appreciate or accept—the Anglophone English standard. However, in the next excerpt, where she describes how she reacts to her professor’s comments, Ava shows no intention of accommodating this American-style peer review that put her down as a less-legitimate writer. Instead, Ava introduces a contrastive pedagogy, “Asian-style peer review,” to strategically counter the incompetent writer identity formulated in the American-style peer review practice.

[Excerpt Ava 2] Interview

March 15 (00:18:26–00:23:33)

[Mandarin]

- 22 A：然後，那時候當我講出這句話的時候，我的教授
23 其實是很生氣的，因為他覺得說，站在他們美國人的文化- 就是站在
24 American culture 的觀點，他們覺得說既然就是要做 peer review 就是一
25 定要把，就是盡其所能講出就是任何有建設性的-
26 R: 恩
27 A: 就是說盡量講一些就是 uh 你哪裡需要改進改進，可是因為站在我們這
28 種比較，可能- 比較恩-亞洲式的思想。
29 R：恩。
30 A：我們會覺得說，盡量說好話，所以那時候我在給他們 review 他們的 paper
31 時候我都是盡量講，我覺得你哪裡寫得好，跟他們- 他們覺得我哪裡需
32 要改進是不一樣的。

33 R：恩恩恩.

[English translation]

22 A: At the time I expressed my feelings to the class, my professor was
23 actually very angry, because he thought, from their American culture – like
24 from the perspective of American culture, they thought when people do a peer
25 review, the feedback should be as constructive as possible –

26 R: Um.

27 A: Like try to say something like uh what you need to improve, but
28 because we have this kind of more, like – more uh Asian-style thought.

29 R: Um.

30 A: We would think it's better to try to say something positive, so at the time
31 when I reviewed their papers, I tried to say things I thought were well written,
32 not like the things that they thought I should improve.

33 R: Um huh huh.

After Ava told the professor and the class that the negative feedback was discouraging to her, her professor became very angry at Ava's response because he thought "from their American culture" (line 23) that critical feedback needed to be as constructive as possible to help improve one's writing (line 25, line 27). Describing her professor as "very angry," Ava at the same time orients the professor to the harsh reviewer category, like her American classmates who considered critical feedback to be acceptable and helpful. Now, eliminating the negative aspects of her writing is not merely a suggestion from her American peers but also a requirement of the professor. Ava had to work hard to revise her paper based on her American peers' "constructive" feedback, that is, to follow Anglophone English writing conventions, otherwise she might have failed the course. Yet, in line 28, Ava introduces the term "Asian-style thought" as contrastive to "American-style peer review" and uses it to reject the negative English writer identity indexed by the critical feedback from her American peers.

As Ava elaborates on the term “Asian-style thought,” she states that, unlike Americans, people from Asian cultures love to encourage others (line 30). Thus, when it comes to giving feedback, as in the context of peer review, Asian people, including herself, tell people the positive aspects of their writing instead of merely telling them what to improve (lines 31–32). By comparing the differences between American and Asian cultures in terms of giving feedback, Ava depicts Asians as tending to say positive things in peer reviews to encourage writers while Americans only give negative comments and might ignore the possible value in someone’s writing. With this comparison, she implies that her writing could appear valuable in the eyes of supportive and positive non-American or Asian reviewers. She is, in a sense, questioning her American peers and professor for their lack of awareness of the different cultural ways of giving feedback, and their subsequent failure to appreciate her writing. That is, the harsh comments Ava received resulted not from her lack of linguistic competence but from the American peer reviewers who may have been too negative, and who overlooked any positive features of her writing. By attributing the trouble source of the negative feedback on her writing to her American peers’ attitude and lack of cultural awareness (i.e., too negative and harsh) instead of her own writing, Ava rejects the negative L2 writer identity indexed by the harsh feedback she received.

Moreover, as discussed earlier, the negative feedback from her American peers indicated that, in order to become a legitimate writer in her PhD program, Ava needed to revise her English writing to the norms, including structure, organization, or content, her American/native-speaking peers and professor expected, that is, Anglophone English writing norms. By orienting her American peers and professor as too critical and thus unable to appreciate her writing, Ava indicates that if they were more positive and encouraging, they

would appreciate her English writing, even though it did not conform to Anglophone English norms. From this viewpoint, Ava also refuses to take up a writer identity in line with Anglophone English. Only if her American peers and professor learn to appreciate and support her writing is she a legitimate English writer, albeit one who writes in a way that is different from Anglophone English norms.

Shortly after the conversation shown in excerpt 2, Ava tells me a follow-up story about the peer review activity. Not long after the course, the professor told her that he finally understood why Asian students were so upset when receiving negative feedback. The conversation continues in excerpt 3.

[Excerpt Ava 3] Interview
March 15 (00:25:36–00:26:29)

[Mandarin]

- 36 A: 事後他- 很像他告訴我說他終於了解了, 後來他就覺得說這
37 非常有趣的一塊。
38 R: 恩恩。
39 A: 他還知道說, 原來中西就是差異這麼大這樣子對, 然後他就, 他就不會再認
40 為說為什麼, 就是, 就像之前這樣。
41 R: 恩恩, 那種反應這樣子。
42 A: 嘿嘿對, 他就不會像之前那種反應了
43 R: 恩恩恩恩
44 A: 對嘿, 然後他也就學習說, 就是對於亞洲學生可能要改變成就是盡量(笑
45 聲)都用鼓勵(笑)來取代批評這樣子。
46 R: (笑)
47 A: 對, 因為受限於文化不同, 所以他也是之後他從那文獻當中他才學到這一
48 點這樣子, 然後又從文獻, 就是先從我這個 case, 然後之後看到就是相關
49 文獻有其他相關的研究, 他才知道有這樣子一個-
50 R: 恩恩。

[English translation]

- 36 A: After he – like he told me finally he understands, and later he found this
37 was very interesting.

38 R: Uh
39 A: He also realized that the difference between East and West was so big, so he
40 wouldn't think like – like he did before.
41 R: Um huh didn't react like that.
42 A: Right yah yah, he didn't react like he did before.
43 R: Um huh uh huh.
44 A: Right yah, then he also learned that with Asian students he should probably try
45 to (laughs) encourage them (laughs) rather than critiquing.
46 R: (laughs)
47 A: Right, because of limited knowledge of different cultures, it was not until later
48 that he learned from some research literature, from my experience as a case to
49 start, and learned from literature, and then he finally understood –
50 R: Uh

In this follow-up story, Ava first states that the professor later showed understanding of her negative reaction to her peers' comments (line 36), though initially he considered it problematic conduct (i.e., being very angry). Ava goes on to say that her professor even found it “very interesting” (line 37) how Western and Eastern students differ greatly in their reactions to peer feedback (line 39). With this understanding and interest, Ava states that the professor was no longer upset about her resistance to the negative feedback she received (line 40). Significant to note here is how Ava changes the affective stance of her American professor from being angry (excerpt 2: line 23) to understanding (excerpt 3: line 36) and finally to being very interested (excerpt 3: line 37). By depicting her professor's attitude changes, Ava indicates that her professor has accepted her resistance to the negative feedback her American peers gave her.

After my two agreeing acknowledgments “um huh (he) didn't react like that” (line 41) and “Um huh uh huh” (line 43), Ava elaborates on the professor's attitude and invokes the verb “learn” when saying “he also learned that with Asian students.” (line 44) and “he learned that from some research literature,” and “learned ... from my experience” (line 48).

The verb “learn” can be defined both positively (e.g., I learn so much from you) and negatively (e.g., I learn a lesson from you). Indexed by the positive features of Asian/Eastern culture in the context of peer review (e.g., being positive and encouraging) that Ava invoked in excerpts 1 and 2, I interpret that “learn,” as used here by Ava, is a positive term meaning that the professor not only acknowledged but also appreciated the Asian/Eastern teaching and learning culture. According to Ochs (1996), affective stance is used by social actors to convey their point of view, attitude, or disposition to other members of a community. From this perspective, the change of the professor’s affective stance from anger to interest and finally to appreciation can be interpreted as being designed by Ava as an authoritative warrant that she constructed in excerpt 2 to confirm her legitimacy in writing in the graduate program. That is, by taking her professor’s positive affective changes as evidence, Ava tries to prove that her paper being full of negative feedback was not because she could not write well. Instead, it was because her professor and peers did not understand or appreciate the advantages of giving positive feedback and gave only negative feedback to Ava, thereby ignoring the positive aspects of her writing.

In narrating these writing experiences, by constructing American culture giving feedback as discouraging pedagogy, being critical and harsh, Ava refuses to take up the identity as an incompetent writer constructed by the negative feedback she was given, a result of her peers’ neglect of valuable aspects of her writing. Moreover, by depicting her American peers and professor as being too critical and even condemning, Ava also indicates that if they were more positive and encouraging, they would see the positive aspects of her writing and thus would give less negative feedback, even though it did not conform to their expectation of English academic writing, that is Anglophone English writing norms. From

this perspective, Ava seems to imply that her non-nativeness was one of the targets of the negative feedback she received, and she questions the appropriateness of her peers giving feedback based on the linguistic backgrounds of non-Anglophone students. Finally, by showing the positive changes of her professor's affective stance—from being angry, to understanding, interested and appreciative—and taking these changes as a warrant to back up her resistance to the negative feedback, Ava constructs herself as a legitimate English writer in the PhD program. Approved by her professor, the negative feedback was a result of cultural differences in giving feedback, not of her lack of English writing competence.

5.6 Summary and discussion

In this chapter, I have discussed four participants' studying and writing experiences while in their respective English-speaking graduate programs. I have paid particular attention to how they constructed their here-and-now English writer identity in relation to English native speakers or Anglophone English writing norms as they were telling their writing experiences and stories to me. As demonstrated in this chapter, each participant was, to some extent, positioned or assumed to be an "illegitimate L2 English writer" by her graduate program or by me as an interviewer, owing to their inadequate skills in writing native-like English essays. In order to show that they were/are legitimate English writers, each participant tried either to accommodate the English writing norms expected by her program (e.g., Beth) or to develop a counter-discourse to resist the illegitimate L2 identity her program had imposed on her (Sarah, Nita, Ava).

As Beth was telling the stories about her first assignment being returned by her instructor when studying in the UK, she indicated that there existed a set of writing

conventions to follow in order to become a legitimate writer in the program. Through telling these stories, Beth first positioned herself as an incompetent writer in the program as her assignment had been returned for revision because of her indirect and confusing writing style, influenced by her L1. Beth then made relevant her Western-educated experiences as a resource to position herself as a competent writer who managed to diminish her Chinese-influenced English writing after several years of studying overseas. By so doing, she positioned herself as a competent writer who had mastered the mainstream Anglophone English writing norms.

Sarah was positioned by me, the interviewer, as an incompetent English writer who might have had difficulty writing to meet the expectation of her graduate program. Telling her stories about how her two professors had inspired her to see that education went beyond teaching language skills and to view herself as a multilingual speaker/writer, Sarah showed resistance to the ideology embedded in my interview question, that of taking Anglophone English writing conventions as the only goal for her to pursue as an L2 graduate student in an English-speaking academic context. By rejecting the ideology, she refused to orient herself to the negative L2 English writer identity I projected; instead, she constructed for herself a positive L2 English writer identity whose non-nativeness was not a liability but an advantage that would enrich her linguistic repertoire for expressing herself better in English writing (Canagarajah, 2007; Kubota, 2002).

Nita was positioned by her thesis examiner as an incompetent English writer when she was asked to revise and improve her English writing, even after it had been proofread by her two native-speaking supervisors. Instead of taking up this negative L2 writer identity projected by this examiner, Nita seemed to treat her examiner's negative comments on her

English writing as discrimination against her racial or linguistic background, but not based on her language competence per se. By attributing the trouble source of her external examiner's inability to understand her English writing to the examiner's bias against her L2 writer identity, Nita showed resistance to the non-native-speaker-as-deficient-English-user ideology her examiner used to place her as less competent in managing the language. Nita viewed herself as an L2 writer with no difficulty in following the English writing conventions expected by her graduate program.

Finally, Ava rejected the incompetent writer identity constructed by negative feedback from her American peers. By attributing the overwhelmingly negative feedback on her paper to her American peers' limited cultural knowledge about giving feedback in Asian cultures, she constructed her American peers as neglectful of the positive aspects of her writing. The analysis also suggested that, by constructing her American peers as only giving negative feedback to recipients, Ava indicated that the American peers were not only unwilling to support writers from non-American cultures but were also unwilling to appreciate English writing from non-Anglophone English traditions. By so doing, Ava positioned herself as a legitimate English writer even though she did not follow Anglophone English writing norms.

It is important to note that the ideologies about L2 writing in relation to native-speakerism discussed above were not produced unilaterally by the participants but were worked up in interaction with me. In other words, I, as an interviewer, participated in the process of identity construction of the participants. For example, certain ideologies about L2 writers writing in Anglophone graduate programs were embedded in the interview questions I asked each of them (e.g., my assumption that they must have encountered some challenges).

Through negotiating—either rejecting or accepting—these ideologies, each participant constructed an image of how she wanted to be understood as an English writer at the moment when the interviews were conducted.

As shown in this chapter, while doing their identity work, Sarah, Ava, and Nita all developed a counter-discourse to the native-speakerism ideology for their English writing experiences. For instance, both Sarah and Ava refused to see Anglophone English writing conventions as the only norms to follow to become a legitimate English writer. Instead, Sarah constructed a multilingual English writer identity and took her rich linguistic repertoire of both English and Mandarin as an asset that enhanced her English writing. Ava, too, positioned herself as a legitimate English writer even though she did not follow the English writing norms expected by her professor and her American peers. She even took a further step and argued that if her American professor and peers had gained some cross-cultural knowledge, they could have learned to appreciate writing by English writers from non-Anglophone cultures. As for Nita, although she was positioned by her examiner as an incompetent English writer, she exercised agency by refusing to take up the imposed negative identity based on a discriminatory judgment. According to Varghese et al. (2005), how teachers see themselves as English speakers and writers is closely linked to what and how they teach their students in their own language classrooms. Sarah, Ava, and Nita's agency indexed in these counter-discourses, which they used to construct their legitimacy as English writers, could shed light on teaching English writing to counter the native-speakerist ideology.

In the next four chapters (Chapters 6 through 9), I move to discussing how the participants construct a *writing teacher identity* as they teach writing and talk about teaching

after moving back to Taiwan. I also consider how their identities as English writers, as discussed in this chapter, reflect on their teacher identity construction and teaching practices.

CHAPTER 6: CONSTRUCTING A THIRD SPACE FOR PROFESSIONAL LEGITIMACY: BETH'S TEACHING PRACTICE

6.1 Introduction

By investigating Western-educated teachers' identities, this study explores the potential for teaching English writing in opposition to the dominant discourse of native-speakerism now prevalent in ELT, including in a local context like Taiwan. In Chapter 5, I demonstrated the participants' construction of their writer identities as they told stories about their study and writing experiences in Western graduate programs. The counter-discourse, resistance to the ideology of Anglophone English writing norms as the only standard to follow, which Sarah, Nita, and Ava each established to construct their writer identities, sheds some positive light on developing more empowering and meaningful English language teaching in the context of EFL in Taiwan. In this chapter (Chapter 6) and the next three chapters (Chapters 7 to 9), I continue to look for the "wobble room" for socio-cultural oriented ELT in Taiwan by looking at how each participant constructs her teacher identity after coming back to Taiwan to teach English writing. My analysis and discussion aim to respond to my second research question: *How do the participants construct their writing teacher identity after they return to Taiwan to teach English writing in light of the discourse of native-speakerism? In particular, how do their Western-educated experiences play a role in constructing their teacher identity?*

As previously mentioned, both teacher identity-in-discourse and identity-in-practice are crucial to gaining a richer understanding of the construction of teacher identity. Thus, from Chapters 6 through 9, I report on and discuss each participant's narrated identity, as constructed in interviews, as well as their enacted identity in actual teaching practices. By

investigating both teacher identity-in-discourse and in-practice, I aim to understand the complexity and richness of how each participant's Western-educated experiences, teacher identities, and teaching practices interact and inform her pedagogical practices and choices in relation to the discourse of native-speakerism in local English writing classrooms.

In this chapter, I start with Beth's construction of her identity as an English writing teacher after returning from the UK to teach English at a Taiwanese university. As presented in Chapter 5, Beth constructed her writing identity by displaying that, after several years of studying in an English-speaking country, she now does not write Chinese-influenced English (e.g., indirect and circular) but can write in a way that Anglophone readers understand. In other words, native-like proficiency is the key component for Beth to construct her sense of legitimacy as an English writer. The analysis presented in this chapter suggests that Beth creates an in-between identity, a third space (Bhabha, 1994), to position herself as a more legitimate English writing teacher compared with her NEST and locally educated NNEST colleagues. In this in-between identity, the native-like proficiency she gained from her Western-educated experiences is again taken up by Beth to construct her superiority to locally educated NNESTs. The ideology of Anglophone English norms as the standard to learn that Beth used to construct her writer and teacher identities is reified in the scoring rubrics she used to evaluate her students' writing throughout the semester.

6.2 “Expatriate teachers don't teach writing”

Prior to excerpt 1, Beth and I talked about the geographic backgrounds of teachers in her department. While the majority of the teachers were Taiwanese nationals, there were two NESTs in her department, one from Canada and the other from the United States. Given that

English was the common language among the colleagues, teachers in the department used English on many occasions, such as in faculty meetings or email correspondence. This conversation about teachers' linguistic backgrounds in the department roused my curiosity about whether linguistic background (i.e., Mandarin speakers and English speakers) determined the courses each teacher should teach. So, in excerpt 1 below, I asked whether the expatriate teachers also taught English writing.

[Excerpt Beth 1] Interview
April 24 (00:49:00–00:49:43)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R：你剛說你們系上也有外籍老師嗎。那你們外籍老師
- 2 有教同一堂課嗎，有教寫
- 3 作嗎。
- 4 B：好像沒有外籍老師通常都是教- 那個 speaking.
- 5 R：喔真的都教 speaking 喔，沒有在教寫作喔。
- 6 B：寫作有時候要解釋文法他們沒有辦法。
- 7 R：喔，那還蠻妙的欸，所以只有寫作都是台灣老師？
- 8 B：對。

[English translation]

- 1 R: You just mentioned that there're also expatriate teachers in your
- 2 department. Do the expatriate teachers teach the same courses.
- 3 Do they teach writing.
- 4 B: No, expatriate teachers usually teach speaking.
- 5 R: Oh really, they all teach speaking, no one teaches writing.
- 6 B: (Teaching) writing sometimes requires explaining grammar, they couldn't do it.
- 7 R: Oh, that's interesting, so only Taiwanese teachers teach writing?
- 8 B: Right.

It is interesting to me that the rationale for this course allocation is not because expatriate teachers are better at teaching speaking skills, but because expatriate teachers could not explain grammar knowledge to students, a skill that appears to be important for Beth in

teaching English writing (line 6). In the same line, Beth then makes quite a strong evaluation “they couldn’t do it” and indicates that expatriate teachers are less competent in teaching English writing. By saying “they” couldn’t do it, Beth at the same time positions “we,” the Taiwanese teachers, including her, to be more qualified writing teachers given their better ability to explain English grammar to students.

However, Beth’s evaluation of expatriate teachers is not taken up by me. As Pomerantz (1984) observes, when an interlocutor’s assessment is sequentially projected and agreement is invited, any delaying devices such as not talking, requesting clarification, or repeating the question are often shaped as subsequent turns to show disagreement by another conversant. In my responding turns in lines 5 and 7, instead of providing immediate consent to Beth’s evaluation and positioning, I form questions based on Beth’s accounts and ask her to provide further clarification (e.g., line 7: “Oh, that’s interesting, so only Taiwanese teachers teach writing?”). Asking further questions to confirm Beth’s opinions rather than agreeing with her thus indicates my disaffiliation with Beth’s evaluation of expatriate teachers as lacking competence to teach English grammar and writing. My disaffiliative response also shows my lack of uptake to Beth’s positioning of herself and other non-native English-speaking colleagues as more qualified in teaching English writing.

My disaffiliation requires Beth to provide justification for her evaluation. Thus, in the subsequent conversation shown in excerpt 2, Beth provides further accounts to support her evaluation.

[Excerpt Beth 2] Interview
April 24 (00:49:44–00:50:13)

[Mandarin]

- 9 R: 都是台灣籍老師。
10 B: 我覺得這也是, 台灣人的一個(.)迷思吧。
11 R: 摠為什麼。
12 B: 就是外國人沒有辦法教文法(笑)
13 R: 文法。
14 B: 對啊但也的確是因為他們在學英文的時候他們不需要
15 學文法。
16 R: 摠:
17 B: 對啊, 這是他們的母語。
18 R: 對。
19 B: 就像我們如果要去教中文我們也是要另外再學漢語語言學。
20 R: 對, 對對對對。
21 B: 對啊是一樣的。
22 R: 一樣的。

[English translation]

- 9 R: All Taiwanese teachers.
10 B: I think it's a myth Taiwanese people hold.
11 R: Um, why.
12 B: Like expatriate teachers, they are not able to teach grammar (laugh)
13 R: Grammar.
14 B: Right, but it is also true because they don't need to learn grammar when they are
15 learning English.
16 R: Um:
17 B: Right, this is their mother language.
18 R: Right.
19 B: Like if we want to teach Mandarin we need to learn Mandarin linguistics, too.
20 R: Right, right right right.
21 B: Yah, it's the same.
22 R: The same.

To answer my confirmation request about whether only Taiwanese teachers teach English writing in her department, Beth responds that the fact that expatriate teachers are less

competent to teach English grammar is the “myth Taiwanese people hold” (line 10). In other words, most Taiwanese people, not only Beth, believe that expatriate teachers do not teach English writing owing to their lack of grammar knowledge. Interesting to note here is that, unlike in excerpt 1, where Beth made a strong personal statement with the evaluation that expatriate teachers couldn’t teach English grammar and are thus less competent in teaching English writing (line 6 “they [expatriate teachers] couldn’t do it.”), in excerpt 2, she ascribes the source of this belief and the responsibility of this statement not her personally but to nearly all Taiwanese people. Here, Beth has changed the footing from being the author and principal—who holds the belief in and responsibility for what has been uttered, to an animator—who merely uses voice to utter the words that Taiwanese people say (Goffman, 1981). The footing switch has worked to ascribe the source of this belief to all Taiwanese, a national category to which I, the interviewer, am part of. This simultaneously adds credence to the utterance (it is now attributed to most Taiwanese rather than only to Beth) and invites me as a member of the “Taiwanese-national” category to be co-author and co-principal of the evaluation she has made about her native-speaking colleagues. Involving Taiwanese people and me to add credence to her evaluation, Beth is possibly enhancing her epistemic stance (Ochs, 1996), or the degrees of certainty of the knowledge in the statement “they couldn’t do it” in excerpt 1, in order to avoid my further disaffiliation with her negative evaluation on expatriate teachers, like what I did in lines 5 and 7 (excerpt 1). Thus, the switch of footings can be interpreted as designed by Beth as a means of reconstructing the advantageous position of non-native-speaking teachers, denied by me as an interviewer in excerpt 1, that they are more competent in teaching English grammar and writing compared to native-speaking English teachers. My response in line 13 where I repeat “grammar” after Beth re-

states “Like expatriate teachers, they are not able to teach grammar” (line 12) shows my alignment with this evaluation. This also shows my agreement with Beth for re-positioning herself and her non-native-speaking colleagues as more qualified English writing teachers compared to their native-speaking colleagues.

In lines 14–19, Beth adds that all native language speakers are less competent in grammar knowledge because L1 speakers do not need to learn the grammar of their mother languages (lines 14–15, 17). Following this logic, Beth goes on, “Like if we want to teach Mandarin we need to learn Mandarin linguistics, too” (line 19). Beth implies that, like English native speakers, native Mandarin speakers are not competent to teach Chinese writing either, because we haven’t had the training to explain Chinese grammar to Chinese learners. In line 19, by using the plural pronoun “我們” or “we,” Beth orients me to the membership of Mandarin speakers, or Taiwanese nationals, the identity categories she has used to identify herself and me in previous and current turns, and casts me again as a co-author and co-principal of her evaluation of native speakers’ competence in teaching writing. Here by inviting me again to evaluate the statement, Beth tries to add more credence to this evaluation, by which she uses to highlight her better competence in teaching English writing compared to NESTs. Beth’s positioning as better English writing teacher is confirmed by me as I finally give my affiliation in line 20 (“Right, right right right”) and 22 (“the same”) to her further accounts that “native speakers, of either English or Mandarin, do not learn grammar and thus do not know how to teach grammar of their mother language,” which she states in lines 19 and 21.

In this excerpt, Beth constructs an identity that “she is better qualified in teaching English writing than native-speaking teachers.” This identity does not emerge in a vacuum

but is negotiated and co-constructed in the interview conversation with me as an interviewer. Beth's change of footing (from author/principal to animator) frees her from my further disaffiliation, from which she creates a context where she draws Taiwanese people and Mandarin speakers, including me, to co-evaluate the native-speaking teachers' teaching competence. This co-authorship and co-principalship increases the credence of her evaluation; they are taken by Beth as discursive resources to convince me about her evaluation. With my alignment to her evaluation, she then re-constructs her desired identity—a better English writing teacher than expatriate teachers.

In excerpts 1 and 2, Beth treated grammar knowledge as a basic qualification for teaching English writing. In excerpt 3, I then wonder and ask Beth why grammar plays such an important role in English writing.

[Excerpt Beth 3] Interview
April 24 (00:33:12–00:34:23)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R：所以你覺得台灣對寫作這塊，大家還是會覺得文法正確還是
- 2 最重要的。
- 3 B：我覺得在台灣學生會希望，到底<對不對>，他們-這個也是被訓練出來的就是
- 4 他們希望有一個<正確答案>，所以如果你告訴他說這樣也可以，那樣也可以，
- 5 他就會覺得confused.
- 6 R：台灣學生不喜歡confused的感覺，他喜歡老師告訴他
- 7 對還不對。
- 8 B：對，因為你是老師你supposed應該要告訴我對還是對不對...
- 9 所以為什麼我覺得文法要很強的原因就是你必須要告訴他說，
- 10 比如說I could, I can, 如果是在講possibility的時候這中間細微的差別
- 11 是什麼，比如說未來式有兩個I will, I am going to 但是他中間是有非常細微
- 12 的差別，那他們會想知道我什麼時候用哪個。
- 13 R：摠
- 14 B：對，他可以接受說兩個都可以，但是如果你可以告訴他這中間
- 15 細微的差別他就會覺得你是個很厲害的老師。
- 16 R：摠

[English translation]

- 1 R: So you think in Taiwan, when it comes to writing, people still think grammar is
2 the most important component.
- 3 B: I think this is what Taiwanese students want. Like if this is <correct or not>. They
4 have been trained to seek a <correct answer>So if you tell them this is okay
5 and that is okay too, they will feel – confused.
- 6 R: Taiwanese students don't like confusing answers, they like teachers to tell them
7 what is correct.
- 8 B: Right, because you are the teacher who is supposed to tell me this is correct or
9 not ... so this is why I think [the teacher having] strong grammar knowledge is
10 necessary, because you have to tell students the subtle difference between English
11 usages, like *I could* or *I can* when talking about possibility, or *I will* and *I am*
12 *going to* for future tense, they want to know the very subtle difference.
- 13 R: Mm
- 14 B: Right, students might be fine if you say either can work, but if you can tell them
15 the subtle difference, they will really admire you.
- 16 R: Mm

In response, Beth states that having been educated in a traditional exam-oriented education system, her students are trained to seek correct answers when studying (lines 4). Therefore, when learning English writing, they also expect the teacher to teach them the “correct English usage” so they do not get confused when they need to use certain structures in either communications or exams (line 5). For example, Taiwanese students would expect a writing teacher to teach them the difference between “I can” and “I could” to talk about possibility, or between “I will” and “I am going to” for future actions (line 11). In particular, when a teacher is able to explain the subtle difference between these very similar usages and to tell the students when to use each one, she will be highly respected by the students (lines 14–15). This conversation again shows that Beth has taken grammar knowledge as a key component of being qualified to teach English writing in Taiwanese universities. Beth has constructed

the NNESTs in her department, including herself, as more qualified English writing teachers than NESTs, given that they have better grammar knowledge and can explain the nuanced differences in English usage to help students avoid confusion when learning the language.

However, in the following two excerpts (4 and 5), although grammar knowledge is considered a key factor in differentiating NNESTs from NESTs in her department, Beth somehow distances herself from having equally good grammar knowledge as her locally educated Taiwanese colleagues.

6.3 “I don’t think I am a teacher with strong grammar knowledge”

In excerpt 4, I ask Beth to list the essential characteristics of being an English writing teacher in the Taiwanese teaching context. Beth once again points out that having good grammar knowledge is one of the necessary characteristics an English writing teacher needs (lines 4–5). However, in this conversation, Beth withdraws a bit from her positioning as a writing teacher with good English grammar knowledge, as she did in excerpts 1–3. Instead, she states in line 6, “I don’t think I am a teacher with strong grammar knowledge.”

[Excerpt Beth 4] Interview
April 24 (00:30:28–00:31:31)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R：那- 在台灣這個教書的環境裡面，你認為什麼是當一個英文寫作老師的
- 2 要素。
- 3 B：我覺得如果要好的話我覺得恩，文法要
- 4 很強吧。
- 5 R：要很強。
- 6 B：對啊，可是像，我覺得我就不是一個文法很強的老師。
- 7 R：恩
- 8 B：我們系上有一個專門教
- 9 文法的老師，他的文法就很強因為他有時候那個 powerpoint 會留在桌面，然

- 10 後點開我整個大傻眼, 就是那個樣子就是那個樣子對就看到很多很多的代號,
11 然後什麼子句啊, 後面是怎樣這個子句後面是怎樣,
12 然後我說這太厲害了。
13 R: 呵呵呵呵呵

[English translation]

- 1 R: So – in the teaching context in Taiwan, what do you think – what is essential in
2 being an English writing teacher.
3 B: I think if, um, to be a good one I think one should have very strong grammar
4 knowledge.
5 R: To be very strong.
6 B: Right, but like – I don't think I am a teacher with strong grammar knowledge.
7 R: Um
8 B: Right, like there is a teacher in our department whose specialty is teaching
9 grammar, his grammar knowledge is pretty strong. Yeah, like sometimes I saw his
10 PowerPoint in the same classroom and I am usually in big shock. There are many
11 symbols, and all kinds of relative clauses, and after this clause it should be – and I
12 thought, this is just awesome.
13 R: Ha ha ha ha

She shares an anecdote about one of her Taiwanese colleagues whose speciality is teaching grammar (lines 8–12). In another conversation that happened later in the same interview (April 24, 2012, 00:51:03), I learned that the colleague mentioned by Beth was still studying for his PhD in a Taiwanese university. Although in previous excerpts she positioned herself as a better English writing teacher compared to expatriate teachers, in this conversation, she places herself in a position only secondary to her locally trained Taiwanese colleague, who she thinks has a more solid English grammar knowledge for teaching English writing. Depicting her locally educated Taiwanese colleague as being better than her in terms of teaching grammar, at the same time Beth distances herself from the teacher identity with good grammar knowledge that she constructed for herself in an earlier conversation.

In the interview conversations shown in excerpts 5 and 6, Beth creates even further distance from locally trained teachers in terms of teaching English writing. Rather than

showing her admiration for their expertise in teaching English grammar, Beth switches to construct the “teacher with *only* good grammar knowledge” as being insufficiently qualified to teach English writing. By so doing, she positions herself as a more qualified teacher among non-native English-speaking teachers, with more to offer her students.

Prior to excerpt 5, Beth and I talked about her students’ expectations of her writing class. She complained that her students often asked her to teach them short cuts to improve their English writing. For example, some students asked her to provide templates for writing an English business letter. By simply copying the sentences and vocabulary from the templates, students can quickly write a business letter. Some students also asked Beth to provide a list of one hundred sentences that are most commonly used in English. By imitating these sentences in their own writing, students can quickly compose their own essays. In excerpt 5, Beth states that she was not happy about her students’ requests because she thought that teaching students only grammar or sentences might guarantee a “quick achievement” (line 1) but it would not help students develop solid writing skills.

[Excerpt Beth 5] Interview
June 12 [00:55:48–00:56:52]

[Mandarin]

- 1 B：我覺得你需要花時間去理解，因為你速成很簡單啊，
- 2 我就是丟一個文法規則給你，一個句型給你，你就造句，
- 3 東西填進去就速成了，我很快可以
- 4 看到成果。
- 5 R：克漏字之類的。
- 6 B：克漏字或者是說，我把該有的單字丟給你，你去組裝句子，組裝這個動作
- 7 是個速成的動作，但是這個過程當中你學不到任何東西，你不可能自己寫
- 8 出那樣的句子來，你最多就是停留在組裝跟複製，對，然後可是他是一個
- 9 速成，很快可以寫出一個句子，他覺得他好象有寫出什麼東西，還有學到
- 10 什麼，事實上他什麼都沒有學到，
- 11 對啊？

[English translation]

- 1 B: I think you need to spend time to understand – because quick achievement is
2 simple, I can just throw you a grammar rule, or a sentence structure, and you have
3 to make sentences accordingly, putting things together in [the sentence] and you
4 have a quick achievement, I can quickly see the improvement.
5 R: Like a cloze [test].
6 B: Cloze or like, I throw you all the vocabulary and you [use it to] assemble
7 sentences. Assembling is an action of quick achievement, but you can't learn
8 anything in this process. It's impossible for them to write a sentence themselves,
9 you can only stay at the stage of assembling and duplicating. He thinks he is
10 writing something, learning something, but actually he didn't learn anything,
11 right?

It is interesting to note that while grammar expertise is taken as an advantage or even a must-have for constructing her teacher identity, in the conversations in excerpts 1–3, Beth associates it with a negative practice here and distances herself from this practice. By saying “quick achievement is simple” (lines 1–2), Beth displays her capability in teaching English grammar in order to help students achieve the quick results they ask for. However, she refuses to do so because teaching only grammar and sentence structure will lead students nowhere, except to simply assemble and duplicate the sentences they are taught. That is to say, while being able to teach accuracy to students is an important qualification for a teacher of English writing in Taiwanese universities, merely teaching grammar is inadequate because students will not develop independent writing competence beyond the grammar rules taught and, therefore, will be unable to reach an advanced level of English writing. By relating teaching grammar to a negative teaching practice, Beth distances herself from the teacher who only teaches students grammar and sentence-level English, like the locally educated teacher she mentioned in excerpt 4.

In excerpts 1–3, Beth positioned Taiwanese teachers, including her, as better qualified writing teachers in the local context compared to expatriate or native-speaking teachers in her department in helping Taiwanese students acquire the language abilities they need. However, in this excerpt, Beth’s positioning has changed dramatically. While she still positions herself as competent in teaching English grammar, she does not align with her Taiwanese colleagues who only teach grammar, like the locally educated teacher she mentioned in excerpt 4.

In excerpt 6, Beth emphasizes that teaching to her does not refer to spoon-feeding students only grammar and writing templates. Rather, she states that *the process* of how students learn to write is her teaching priority. She elaborates on the “process of learning” in excerpt 6, where she further distinguishes herself from local teachers by foregrounding her English competence in teaching the English forms used in English-speaking countries.

[Excerpt Beth 6] Interview
June 12 (00:57:25–00:58:55)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R：所以你這個過程-
- 2 B：恩 (1.5), 過程- 應該是說,對,一個部分不是只有知道放什麼,而是要知道
- 3 為什麼要放這個...就是你能夠比較理解,為什麼他們要形容這件事,
- 4 就有一點去理解他的 context 這個不是只有,
- 5 應該說不是只有表面的知識,就是我們講所謂的文法,
- 6 字彙就是知識嗎,你具備這樣的知識,可是你需要有
- 7 那樣的 context 去用.
- 8 R: 恩恩恩.
- 9 B: 對,所以他們必須要理解這件事情,就是為什麼外國人會
- 10 這樣講.
- 11 R：恩恩恩恩.

[English translation]

- 1 R: You mentioned the process [of learning] –
- 2 B: Um (1.5) the process, it should be, right, one part is that, like not only to know
- 3 what things to put here, but also to understand why this is put here ... like you can
- 4 understand more easily why they want to describe certain things, like to
- 5 understand their context. This requires not only surface knowledge, like what
- 6 we said about grammar and vocabulary. You have this knowledge, but you need to
- 7 understand in what context you can use this knowledge.
- 8 R: Um huh huh.
- 9 B: Right, so they should understand this, like why English speakers say things this
- 10 way.
- 11 R: Um huh uh huh.

Beth defines the process of learning to mean that the students should “not only ... know what things to put here, but also ... understand why this is put here.” (line 3). She then relates this ability to know *why* as having the knowledge to understand “why they want to describe certain things” (line 4), “their *context*” (line 5), and “why English speakers say things this way” (line 9). The category “English speakers,” introduced in line 9, indicates that the third-person plural pronouns “they” (line 4) and “their” (line 5) refer to native English speakers. Accordingly, teaching English writing not only involves teaching “surface knowledge” like grammar and vocabulary (lines 5–6) but also teaching the pragmatic knowledge of how English speakers use this language in their own context. To give me a clearer idea of the “context” she mentions, Beth draws two examples of how English is used in England, the knowledge she learned during her study in the UK. It is when she talks about how English is used in the UK that Beth aligns herself to English native speakers and contexts, the identity category (i.e., expatriate teachers) she tried to distinguish herself from in excerpts 1–3.

The first example is demonstrated in excerpt 7 in which Beth explains the different ways of counting “floors” in Taiwan and in England.

6.4 “You should understand *their* context”

[Excerpt Beth 7] Interview
June 12 (00:59:29–01:01:45)

[Mandarin]

- 1 B: 我講個例子好了,就是像那個樓層,那我們的樓層是一樓二樓三樓,說我們
- 2 在三樓,現在在三樓,可是你如果在英國,我們現在在二樓,我們在
- 3 second floor.
- 4 R: 因為 ground floor, first floor 在英國是-
- 5 B: 對,就是他們沒有,他們是 ground floor, first floor, second, third, 所以
- 6 我們在 third-
- 7 R: 喔?
- 8 B: 可是中文裡面我們現在在四樓.
- 9 R: 對
- 10 B: 那你如果不知道為什麼,你會好難背,你會一直處在困惑
- 11 的狀態然後一直搞不清楚到底要加一
- 12 還是減一.
- 13 R: 恩恩恩.
- 14 B: 對,可是你如果知道他們怎麼算這個樓層,你就會知道,哦,原來是這樣.
- 15 因為我們是用地板算,他們是用樓板算.
- 16 R: ↑哦,是這樣子.

[English translation]

- 1 B: Let me give you an example, like floors, we have first floor, second floor and third
- 2 floor, say we are on the fourth floor, but if you were in England, we are now on
- 3 the third floor – subtract one number.
- 4 R: Because the ground floor, the first floor in England is called –
- 5 B: Right, they don't have – they have ground floor, first floor, second, third, so we
- 6 are on the third –
- 7 R: Oh?
- 8 B: But in Mandarin we'll say we are on the fourth floor now.
- 9 R: Right.
- 10 B: So if you don't know why, you would feel it's so hard to memorize and
- 11 understand, and you'll be really confused, always not clear if you add or subtract
- 12 one floor from where you are.
- 13 R: Um, uh huh.

14 B: Right, but if you knew how they count floors, you would know, oh that's how they
15 do it. Because we count floors by grounds, but they count floors by ceilings.
16 R: ↑Oh, I see.

In this conversation, Beth explains to me that in Taiwan, or among other Mandarin speakers, the first floor of a building is commonly called the “first floor,” while in England the same floor is called the “ground floor.” Beth and I were on the fourth floor when the interview took place. She says, “But if you were in England, we are now on the third floor – subtract one number” (lines 2–3). A second conditional, “if you were,” is often used to give advice. Through her use here of the second conditional, she presents her epistemic stance (Ochs, 1996) and positions herself as someone who has the knowledge of how British English should be used and thus is capable of giving advice about or explanation of that particular English usage. In my turn, I show some understanding of this particular language use in British English (line 4), but Beth continues to explain how floors are counted in England as if I have no knowledge about it (lines 5–6). Treating me as an unknower and explaining this particular English use to me, Beth again positions herself as an expert in British English in the conversation.

Although this cultural knowledge, how floors are counted in British English, can be accessed in many English textbooks and claimed by any English speakers including those who have never studied in the UK, Beth seems to position herself as an expert in this usage because of her life experiences in the UK. Associating her understanding of this particular usage in British English to her study experiences in England and positioning herself as a knowledge holder of British English, Beth is doing what Bucholtz and Hall (2004; see also, Bucholtz, 2003; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005) call *authentication*, an interactional process where speakers draw on discursive resources, among which include ideologies, to claim realness

and authenticity of identities. In this authenticating process, Beth draws on native-speakerism as a discursive resource in constructing herself as a legitimate English speaker/writer who understands how to use the language in an *authentic context*. Beth's association of how the English language should be used to the country "England" indicates that she takes up the ideology that the representativeness of English is often associated with the English-speaking West; English speakers or teachers who speak mainstream English own a certain degree of unquestioned legitimacy (Motha, 2014). Therefore, by displaying her language use and knowledge gained from the mainstream context "England," she constructs herself as a legitimate English speaker and teacher who knows and uses mainstream English. Through this authentication process, Beth constructs herself as a more qualified writing teacher than other Taiwanese teachers, who are only good at teaching grammar due to their lack of exposure to an authentic context in which to learn how British language should be used.

Excerpt 8 is another example in which Beth draws on her knowledge of British English to authenticate her identity as an English speaker and teacher. Prior to the conversation presented in excerpt 8, Beth talked about how intensive reading of academic papers during her graduate studies in the UK helped her improve her English writing. She told me that, because of the benefits she gained from this intensive reading, she tried to have her students read as much as possible in class, hoping to increase their level of writing skill as she did when studying in England. Excerpt 8 is an example of Beth demonstrating the "logic" in English writing that she learned from reading during her study in the UK.

[Excerpt Beth 8] Interview
June 12 (00:17:40–00:19:43)

[Mandarin]

1 B: 像之前我們就是看過一個很有趣的分析。他這個分析說,

- 2 比如說我們的報紙, 在報導上應該是一個事件, 他所用的那些字彙,
3 其實某一種程度表達了這一群人關心什麼... 那個例子是騷擾,
4 就是性騷擾, 在捷運站, 然後比如說像我們可能就會花很多的篇幅
5 去形容, 去形容他收入多少, 他學歷多高, 就是那個嫌犯被抓到了之後,
6 員警審問, 中文的報紙就會說, 其實他是博士, 然後他月收入很高,
7 可是他怎麼還會在捷運站去騷擾女生, 那這是中文的邏輯, 中國人的邏輯,
8 臺灣人的邏輯, 我們看的是這些東西. 可是同樣一件事情,
9 英國人寫這件事情, 他會寫很多, 他會花很多篇幅在形容他的衣服,
10 還會說他是一個穿著西裝, 拎著公事包, 衣冠楚楚的一個上班族. 那他怎麼
11 還會去騷擾女生.
- 12 R: 恩, 很有趣.
- 13 B: 對, 對啊, 就是每一群人, 就是你使用這個語言的人他的觀點是什麼, 他想
14 要看的東西是什麼, 他會在他的這些東西裡, 不管是什麼樣的形式的文章裡
15 面出現, 對, 那那個就是他們的 philosophy, 他們想要看的東西,
16 那如果說你今天寫出來的東西是要給他們看, 那你就得懂這件事情啊.
- 17 R: 恩:

[English translation]

- 1 B: Like we read a very interesting analysis before. The analysis is about – like when
2 reporting in a newspaper, the word choice actually to some extent represents
3 what this group of people cares about ... The example (in the analysis) is about
4 sexual harassment in a subway station. So for example, we will put a lot of
5 effort into describing like what his income is, how good his education is, like,
6 after the suspect has been arrested, the Chinese newspaper would say, actually, he
7 is a PhD and his income is pretty high, but why did he still harass woman in the
8 station. This is Chinese logic, Taiwanese logic, we focus on things like this. But
9 when it comes to describing the same thing, English people would write a lot
10 about his clothing, like he's in a suit, carrying an attaché case, a well-dressed
11 white-collar man, what made him to harass the woman.
- 12 R: Um, very interesting.
- 13 B: Right, so how language speakers think about things,
14 what they expect [of English writing] are presented in things like this, in any form
15 of writing, right, this is their philosophy, the things they want to see, so if now you
16 are writing something for them to read, you need to understand things like this.
- 17 R: Um:

In this account, Beth indicates that, by reading material like the articles or the English newspapers she read in her graduate program, one can learn “how language speakers think

about things” (lines 13) and “the things they want to see” (line15), because how British people write is presented in the materials mentioned here (line 14: “what they expect [of English writing] are presented in things like this,”). Although intensive reading like this can happen everywhere, the local category “England” where Beth was exposed to these written materials indicated in this conversation foregrounds the “authenticity” of the materials she read in her British graduate program that helped her improve her English writing. Again, taking her experiences in the “authentic” context, England, to authenticate her English competence, Beth constructs herself as one of the readers and writers who has been largely exposed to authentic materials and is thus equipped with content appropriateness and audience awareness of British English, the native-like pragmatic competence crucial to becoming an English writing teacher.

In excerpts 7 and 8, by highlighting her linguistic competence in British English, Beth constructs her competence in teaching English writing over that of local Taiwanese teachers. While she is equally competent in terms of grammar expertise as other local Taiwanese teachers, she is also competent in “how English is used in the UK,” the pragmatic knowledge she constructed as a basic qualification in addition to grammar to teach English writing in Taiwan.

In excerpts 1 through 8, I have shown how Beth positions herself as a better and more qualified English writing teacher compared to her NEST and locally educated NNEST colleagues. First, she aligns with her local Taiwanese colleagues and positions herself and her Taiwanese colleagues to be more qualified teachers than expatriate teachers in terms of ability to explain grammar when teaching English writing (excerpts 1–3). Then, she highlights her native-like English proficiency gained during her studies in the UK to distance

herself from her Taiwanese colleagues, who can only teach grammar and sentence structure. Beth's positioning in teaching English writing is contradictory, but it is in this conflict that she creates a third space (Bhabha, 1994) where she constructs her professional legitimacy teaching English writing in her department. According to Bhabha (1994), a third space provides the freedom to "continually negotiate and translate all available resource[s] in order to construct their own hybrid cultures and, consequently, reconstruct their own individual identities" (Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p. 124). Switching her association between native speakers and local Taiwanese teachers, Beth constructs her hybrid professional identities: She is neither-nor, but as an English writing teacher, she is competent in helping students develop both the descriptive (e.g., grammar rules) and pragmatic (e.g., how to write properly in a British context) knowledge of writing.

Beth's formation of this in-between identity that foregrounds both her "non-nativeness" and "nativeness" resonates with the experiences of those Western-educated teachers in Phan (2008) and Ilieva, Li, and Li's (2015) studies. To manage their struggles between the different professional identities they developed in their home countries (Vietnam and China) and in the West, where they gained their professional training (Australia and Canada), these Western-trained teachers created an in-between identity from which they developed a blended instructional method derived from the two cultures in order to maximize students' English learning. Similarly, Beth has created a hybrid identity with the professional strengths of both native and local teachers and has positioned herself as a legitimate writing teacher among others, someone competent to teach two important writing skills to students: grammar and pragmatics. Nevertheless, an analysis of Beth's identity construction process also indicates that the third space is not a power-free place, as suggested by Bhabha (1994, p.

4) as “[it] entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy,” allowing the marginal to develop controlling agency to disrupt power asymmetries rooted in colonial hierarchy and to construct their own individual identities (Kumaravadivelu, 2008). This third space indeed affords Beth a way to develop a counter-discourse (e.g., NNESTs are more qualified to teach English writing than NESTs) to resist the native-speaker-as-superior-English-teacher ideology that is often used to place NNESTs in an unfavourable position when it comes to teaching the language. In the process of identity construction, Beth also activates the ideology of native-speakerism as a resource in distancing herself from local teachers, particularly those educated locally who are constructed as only being capable of teaching English grammar due to their lack of immersion in authentic English contexts. Although this hybrid identity allows Beth to disrupt the power asymmetry between NESTs and NNESTs and to construct her own professional legitimacy over NESTs (e.g., grammar knowledge), at the same time she creates another asymmetry between herself and her locally educated colleagues. The view that a third space affords the marginalized to reverse “the effects of the colonialist disavowal” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 114) to construct empowering agency assumes that the power relations in ELT only exist between the dualities of the colonizer/colonized, the dominant/marginalized, or NESTs/NNESTs. However, the finding suggests that power is also at play *among* NNESTs, the colonized, or the marginalized, as we see that Beth could activate her near-native English competence earned from overseas studying experiences to belittle other NNESTs who were constrained to access to the same linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1986). Thus, it can be problematic to view in-between identity of the marginalized English teachers like NNESTs as purely a liberating and power-free terrain for constructing empowering identities in opposition to the native-speakerism

discourse. As Foucault has persuasively argued (1980), “power is exercised by people depending on how they are positioned in relation to each other” (cited in Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p. 129). More attention from research and teacher education should be paid to what resources are activated by NNESTs to construct their in-between identity in relation to *all* teachers from various social and cultural backgrounds in their teaching context. Neglect of the multiple power relations at play in constructing a teacher’s identity in a local context could put some local teachers (e.g., non-Western-educated) into a disadvantaged position in relation to their non-nativeness; this in turn helps reinforce the ideology of native-speakerism and perpetuates the superior status of NESTs in the teaching context.

In the next section, I move to discussing how these in-between identities reflect on the scoring rubrics Beth used to evaluate her students’ writing assignments and writing exams.

6.5 Teaching practice: Evaluation criteria

Throughout the semester, Beth used the same writing rubric to assess students’ writing assignments and exams. According to Beth, this writing rubric was developed based on one of her assignments from her graduate studies in the UK. It is a 4-point writing rubric with seven evaluation components. The complete rubric can be found in Appendix C. Table 6.1 shows the criterion for the highest score (4-Excellent). For the first two assignments, Beth guided the students through a reading of the rubrics and carefully explained every description. Each time, after giving the assignment to her students, Beth would remind them to read the rubrics before writing. Thus, the writing rubrics worked as the major discourse; Beth’s students were socialized into how English academic writing should be conducted. In

this section, I analyze how the discourses Beth used to construct her teacher writing identity during interviews are reified in the rubrics.

Table 6.1: *Beth's scoring rubrics*

Points Category	4- Excellent (3-proficient, 2- needs improvement, 1-inadequate)
Introduction	Introductory paragraph begins with a statement that draws the reader's attention. It also outlines what is going to be discussed in the essay.
Thesis Statement	Introductory paragraph contains a clear thesis of main idea with clear suggestions as to how the body of the essay will support this thesis.
Body	Body paragraphs provide clear evidence and ample examples to support thesis statement.
Conclusion	Closing paragraph contains a clear restatement of the main idea or thesis of the essay. It also provides a clear conclusion confirming author's position.
Organization	Writing shows high degree of attention to logic and reasoning of points. Unity clearly leads the reader to the conclusion and stirs thought regarding the topic.
Sentence Structure	All sentences are well constructed with very few minor mistakes. Complex sentence structures are used effectively.
Grammar & Spelling	Writing includes no or only very few minor errors in grammar and spelling.

First, the evaluation components of “introduction,” “body,” and “conclusion” indicate that Beth used the five-paragraph essay model to evaluate her students’ writing. According to Leki et al. (2008), the five-paragraph essay model advocates “[a] linear product which should be constructed through a logical step-by-step process of planning, outlining” (cited in Yamchi, 2015, p. 180) that present a form of logical thinking to the audience. Yamchi (2015) argues that the ideas of linearity and logical thinking embedded in the five-paragraph essay model

resonate with the deficiency theory used in contrastive rhetoric (Connor, 1996) to privilege English rhetoric over those of other languages. When it comes to English writing, there must be an introduction to “draw the reader’s attention” and a conclusion must restate the ideas mentioned in the body paragraphs. This model devalues the writing rhetoric of some writers from other cultures who might prefer to include body paragraphs before introducing the major points in order to make a more polite and sophisticated argument (e.g., Phan, 2011; Zhu, 2001). The scoring category “thesis statement” in the rubric is another example that promotes linearity and logical thinking, and that reinforces the superiority of English rhetoric.

Shi and Kubota (2007) further question the appropriateness of explicit instruction of the rhetorical conventions in the five-paragraph essay model. Their analysis of North American secondary school textbooks reveals a gap between the guiding rhetorical structure and the rhetorical patterns identified in actual reading materials in textbooks. They argue that this five-paragraph model and its implied value (e.g., being direct and logical) recommended in English academic writing instruction are ideologically constructed rather than reflecting objective reality. Therefore, they suggest that when someone says, “[English speakers] write and think directly,” (Shi & Kubota, 2007, p. 197), we, as writing teachers, need to guide students to ask “What [English speakers]? Writing what, and writing for what purposes?” (Casanave, 2004, p. 54), rather than asking them to follow the way “English speakers” write. Asking these questions would provide students, like those in Beth’s class, opportunities to examine and explore diverse styles other than the “preferred structure” (Shi & Kubota, 2007, p. 196), that are more purpose- and context-appropriate in cross-culture writing.

Beth took the word “logic” as the key resource in constructing her teacher identity in excerpts 6–8 (e.g., excerpt 8: line 8 “this is Chinese logic, Taiwanese logic”), and it appears in the description of the “organization” component in the rubric: writing shows a high degree of attention to *logic* and reasoning of points. It was unfortunate that I did not have the chance to ask Beth what she meant by “logic” in terms of organization. As Beth described in excerpts 7–8, “logic” refers to an ability to use the ways native English speakers speak and write. A reasonable interpretation is that she would use “English speakers say[ing] things this way” (excerpt 6, line 9) to evaluate the students’ organization of their essays.

The last two scoring criteria, sentence structure and grammar and spelling, are two rubrics frequently used to assess the writing of L2 writers. Here, they can also reflect Beth’s positioning as a better teacher than her native English-speaking colleagues because of her ample grammar knowledge and capacity to explain it to students (excerpts 1–3). Since having good grammar knowledge affords Beth the confidence to position herself as superior to native English speakers in terms of teaching, it becomes an essential competence for her students to acquire. When students can write with “very few minor mistakes” and “complete sentence structures,” they can be good English writers and teachers, even better than native English speakers. It is worth noting that, although grammar knowledge can provide the strength and confidence for non-native English writers to construct a positive English writer/teacher identity, the description “very few minor mistakes” foregrounds the importance of native-like accuracy and proficiency. In other words, for one to become a better writer or writing teacher than native English speakers, one should write error-free and native-like English. By emphasizing the importance of native-like grammar knowledge in learning English writing, Beth is promoting the ideology of native-speakerism in the scoring

rubric. Since this rubric was used throughout the semester as the essential means of demonstrating what constitutes a good English-writing essay, it is fair to assume that students may have been socialized into this native-speakerism discourse in this writing class.

6.6 Summary

In this chapter, I first demonstrated how Beth positioned NNESTs in her department, including herself, as more qualified than NESTs to teach English writing, given that they had better knowledge and skills to explain English grammar to students. I then discussed how Beth later highlighted her native-like English proficiency gained during her studies in the UK to position herself in a more privileged status in teaching English writing and to distance herself from her Taiwanese colleagues, who could only teach grammar and sentence structure. I demonstrated that by switching between NNESTs and NESTs, Beth created a third space (Bhabha, 1994) in which she constructed her professional legitimacy with advantages from both groups. I argued that viewing Beth's third space as purely celebratory space to construct empowering identity in opposition to native-speakerism discourse could neglect the power relations *among* NNESTs in regard to other social identities (e.g., educational backgrounds). This neglect could put other local NNESTs (e.g., locally educated Taiwanese English teachers) into a disadvantageous position in teaching English because of their *more* non-nativeness, and could thus perpetuate the ideology of native-speakerism in a given teaching context. Finally, I discussed how the discourse of native-speakerism used by Beth to construct her teacher identity was enacted in the scoring rubrics she used throughout the semester to evaluate her students' essays. I argued that her rubrics promoted English

rhetoric and Standard English, which might have become the dominant discourse students acquired in learning English writing and seeing themselves as English writers.

In the next chapter, I move to discussing Sarah's teaching of English writing in Taiwan and her writing teacher identity formation in relation to the discourse of native-speakerism.

CHAPTER 7: DEBUNKING NATIVE-SPEAKERISM: CHINESE ENGLISH IN SARAH'S WRITING CLASS

7.1 Introduction

Sarah earned her master's and PhD degrees from an American TESOL program in which both the teaching and research orientations emphasized critical issues related to language education. During her six years of study in the program, Sarah developed an awareness of issues such as the ideology of native-speakerism and the legitimacy of non-Anglophone varieties of English. As discussed in Chapter 5, Sarah's graduate program training was the basis of her identity development as a multilingual writer, in which she refused to see native-like English norms as the only legitimate forms of speaking and writing English. These training experiences, Sarah told me, motivated her to write a dissertation on multilingual ESL students' resistance to the ideology of native-speakerism in their English essays. As I discuss in this chapter, the influence of her training appeared to continue after she returned to Taiwan to teach English writing. I first discuss Sarah's attitude, expressed during our interviews, toward teaching written English in Taiwan. I then demonstrate how Sarah refused to take English native speakers and their English norms as the only criteria by which to evaluate her students' academic writing. Instead, she foregrounds her bilingual competence in Chinese and English as a valuable pedagogical skill that helps her understand and appreciate her students' Chinese-infused English writing. I then discuss how the counter-discourse Sarah develops in constructing her teacher identity is reflected in her classroom interaction with her students.

Yet, like Beth, the same ideologies (e.g., native speaker superiority) are activated by Sarah to foreground her native-like proficiency, which she uses to position herself as a better

qualified teacher than locally trained English teachers. By so doing, she constructs her professional legitimacy and value in her university, where Western-trained PhDs are more valued for their native-like English competence resulting from several years of exposure to English-speaking countries.

7.2 Questioning native-speakerism

Sarah's PhD training experiences and how they shaped her as an English writer and teacher are also reflected in her current teaching of English writing, as observed in several incidents throughout the course of this study. For example, as shown in excerpt 1, Sarah shows a higher degree of acceptance of students' grammatical errors. She often emphasizes in class that content is the priority for evaluation and grammar is secondary, as long as students can make the meaning of sentences clear and understandable. The talk shown in excerpt 1 took place right after the mid-term exam. At the beginning of the class, Sarah told the students that she had finished grading the mid-term analytical essays they wrote on "A person you admire." She encourages students to read some model essays written by their peers that she has put on the class website. While talking about these model essays, Sarah explains to students the component she deems the most important in English writing.

[Excerpt Sarah 1] Class observation
April 20 (00:03:45–00:04:33)

[Mandarin]

- 1 S: 你不一一定要寫到百分之百都正確的文章噢或是句子,但你必須
- 2 要讓人家能夠瞭解,正確的讓人家知道你在寫什麼,
- 3 不然這樣就沒有達到溝通的意義了. 所以呢這個部分
- 4 會放上來觀摩的都是,同學可能會覺得,怎麼文法都錯了還
- 5 那麼高分噢,不是因為這樣子,是因為他的句子大致上
- 6 還是能瞭解他的意思.

[English translation]

- 1 S: You don't have to write 100% correct essays or sentences, but you have to
- 2 make people understand, precisely have people understand, what you are trying
- 3 to write, otherwise the communication is not meaningful. So in those model
- 4 essays, you will probably think, oh, how can that person get that high a score even
- 5 though there're grammatical mistakes here and there. It is because his/her
- 6 sentences are mostly understandable.

In this talk, Sarah emphasizes that the key component that makes each of these exemplary essays a good piece of writing is not perfect grammar; it is that the essays have meanings and sentences mostly understandable to the reader (lines 5–6). In this class observation, although I did not observe whether Sarah's ideas about good English writing were taken up by her students, I observed that Sarah had brought her beliefs about English language that she had gained from her graduate programs (i.e., meaningful communication does not require 100% correct English or Standard English) into her teaching practices in Taiwan.

The idea that good English writing is not synonymous with perfect English grammar is also observed in the following interview conversations (excerpts 2–3) where we talk about the *problem* of students' translating from Mandarin into English when writing. In excerpt 2, I ask Sarah a question based on insights that I have gained from conversation with Beth, who stated that the major problem in her students' writing was their lack of "logic." At first, Sarah does not understand what I mean by "logic" (line 1). I then draw her student Zoë's direct translation from Mandarin to English in her writing as one example (line 2–4). In my question, I define this Chinese–English translation to "Chinese-style" English (line 4) and categorize it as problematic English (lines 2, 7). Yet, Sarah appears to refuse to see this

Chinese-influenced English as problematic and states that she will try to use Mandarin, the shared language between her and her students, to understand what the student is trying to say.

[Excerpt Sarah 2] Interview
July 12 (00:08:46–00:11:42)

[Mandarin]

- 1 S：邏輯是指什麼。
- 2 R：邏輯我覺得比較像你剛剛講 Zoe 的那個問題，
- 3 可能翻成中文就瞭解他在講
- 4 什麼，對，就是比較中式的。
- 5 S：喔，你是說語言方面常常會有中翻英的問題，
- 6 是不是。
- 7 R：這個問題大部分學生都會看到嗎。
- 8 S：我不太確定你說的邏輯，可是如果你說有沒有學生有
- 9 中翻英的問題，這個當然會有的。可是我不太會去說他們
- 10 這樣子是一個問題，還是什麼的，我會去看他們文法方面
- 11 會不會需要加強，或者是架構需要加強，可是我不會跟
- 12 他們說你這樣中翻英是不對的，我會跟她說要用英式的
- 13 邏輯方式來思考。可是，我不會說看不懂就會給他
- 14 很低的分數，我還是會去看他想要表達的
- 15 是什麼。
- 16 R：恩恩。
- 17 S：因為畢竟我也懂中文，就像 Zoe 那個，我會用我懂得語言，
- 18 去瞭解他想要講什麼。
- 19 R：恩::

[English translation]

- 1 S: What do they mean by logic?
- 2 R: Logic is, I think, more like the problem when you talked about Zoë's writing.
- 3 Like if it's translated into Mandarin you would understand what she's talking
- 4 about, right, more like Chinese style.
- 5 S: Oh, you mean the problem is they often translate Mandarin into English when
- 6 using the language, right.
- 7 R: Do you see this problem often happening with your students.
- 8 S: I am not quite sure what you meant by logic, but if you ask whether students
- 9 have a problem translating Mandarin into English, the answer is yes they do.
- 10 But I won't call it a problem – or anything like that. I will see if they can

- 11 improve their grammar or structure, but I won't tell them that translating
12 from Mandarin into English is wrong. I would tell them that they should
13 think in English when writing, but I won't give them a low mark if I don't
14 understand what they are writing. I would try to understand what they are
15 trying to say [in writing].
16 R: Um huh.
17 S: Because I also understand Mandarin, like in Zoë's case, I would use the language
18 I know to understand what they are trying to say.
19 R: Um::

In her response to my question (lines 8–15), Sarah explicitly refuses to take up the negative evaluation I have just made about Chinese-style English. She first states that the students indeed often translate from Chinese to English when writing their papers (lines 8–9). When it happens, “I won't call it a problem –” (line 10) and “I won't tell them that translating from Mandarin into English is wrong,” (lines 11–12). She further states that when she does not understand students' writing owing to unclear meanings caused by translation, she might try to help students to clarify their writing by polishing grammar or essay structure (lines 11) or by encouraging them to “think in English” (lines 11–13). However, she won't give a low mark for students' unclear writing (lines 13–14) simply because they have engaged in direct translation. Up to this point, Sarah once again emphasizes that having meanings clearly conveyed is more important than using correct grammar in writing. Moreover, by refusing to see students' English with Chinese features as something problematic, Sarah shows her positive attitude toward what I call ‘Chinese-style English’ such as that which Zoë writes (line 4). In lines 17 and 18, Sarah even makes relevant her Mandarin speaker identity “because I also understand Mandarin,” (line 17); here she invokes a bilingual identity, which enables her to understand her students' hybrid English. That is, given this bilingual competence, Sarah can follow the content in which students use Chinese

English to convey their thoughts. In this conversation, Sarah not only shows her acceptance of students' Chinese English in writing, but also constructs her bilingual competence as a professional advantage to understand this form of English.

In excerpt 3, Sarah provides a more specific example of the Chinese-influenced English in students' writing we have just talked about as she tells me a story about a student's direct translation from Chinese to English: “這部電影很瞎” or “this movie is blind” (meaning *ridiculous* in English). In this conversation, Sarah again highlights the ability to read students' Chinese English as an instructional advantage.

[Excerpt Sarah 3] Interview
July 12 (00:11:08–00:11:41)

[Mandarin]

- 1 S：對，我之前聽我的一個同事說，他也是給學生看了一部的電影，
- 2 讓他們去寫他們的感想，然後其中一個學生寫的是
- 3 this movie is blind，然後那個老師想了很久，
- 4 說這個學生到底在說什麼，什麼叫做 blind，後來他
- 5 自己就猜，哦原來是說這部電影很瞎。
- 6 R：(笑)
- 7 S：然後我說天阿，這個你也能猜的出來，真的很厲害(笑)
- 8 R：(笑)
- 9 S：當然這個太 over。他就是想了很久，就是不知道這個學生
- 10 到底在講什麼，後來知道，他說的是原來是這部電影
- 11 很瞎。
- 12 R：(笑)這個想像力很不錯，知道用英文去講很瞎。
- 13 S：我說天阿，這個太厲害。

[English translation]

- 1 S: Right, one of my colleagues once told me that he had students watch a movie
- 2 and asked them to write a reflection paper on that. One of the students wrote
- 3 “This movie is blind,” then the teacher spent a long time thinking about what the
- 4 student was trying to say, what was meant by “blind.” Then she guessed it,
- 5 oh, it means *hen xia*.

- 6 R: (Laughs)
7 S: Then I said, my god, you can guess it right, you are good. (laughs)
8 R: (Laughs)
9 S: Of course this is *tai over* [too over]. She spent lots of time thinking about
10 what the student was trying to say, but finally realized it meant this movie was
11 *hen xia*.
12 R: (Laughs) Very creative to find an English word for *xia*.
13 S: My god, this is really awesome (laughs)

This story is from a conversation between Sarah and her colleague. Once this colleague had her students watch a movie and later asked them to write a reflection paper in English about the movie. “This movie is blind,” (lines 3) was the phrase the student used in writing to describe the movie. Sarah’s colleague at first could not understand what the student meant by a “blind” movie. After pondering for a long time, she figured out that “blind” meant *hen xia* or 很瞎, a popular idiom used among young people in Taiwan to describe something as being clueless or being out of blue (line 5). Sarah goes on to give a compliment to her colleague: “I said, my god, you can guess it right, you are good” (line 7). This compliment indicates that Sarah sees this teacher’s ability and endeavour to understand her student’s phrase in a positive light.

Interestingly, in her next turn in line 9, Sarah herself uses the Chinese–English phrase *tai over* to describe her stance toward this “this movie is blind” phrase. *Tai over* or 太 over, literally means “too over,” another popular Chinese English phrase used among young Taiwanese people to describe things as being “over the top” or “outrageous.” By using *tai over*, Sarah suggests that the student’s use of this “movie being blind” phrase is too blurry, taking her colleague a long time to finally figure out the meaning (lines 9–10). Responding to Sarah’s somewhat negative evaluation of the student’s Chinese English, I first laugh (line 12) and then give a compliment, “very creative to find an English word for *xia*” (line 12), to the

student's use of Chinese English. With my positive stance toward the student's English phrase, Sarah then upgrades her colleague's capacity to understand students' Chinese English from "you are good" (line 7) to "this is really awesome" (line 13). This compliment upgrade confirms Sarah's view of her colleague's ability to figure out the meanings of "This movie is blind" as an advantage for teaching. To this point, Sarah has constructed not only herself but also her Taiwanese colleagues as bearing pedagogical strength given their bilingual competence to appreciate and understand students' Chinese-English writing.

Similar to the above excerpt that illustrates how the Chinese-English bilingual competence is taken by Sarah to construct professional strength among Taiwanese teachers, excerpt 4 demonstrates how Sarah foregrounds this strength to appreciate students' Chinese English to construct her professional legitimacy over her monolingual American colleague. The conversation in excerpt 4 occurred when we talked about the general challenges Sarah's students face in English writing. Sarah draws on the experience of one of the students, Mika, as an example to address the issue I pose.

[Excerpt Sarah 4] Interview
July 12 (00:04:12-00:06:22)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R：那大體上，你覺得你的學生寫作最大的問題是什麼。
- 2 S：每一個人都不一樣，很難去說。像 Mika，他的寫作的
- 3 修辭能力很強，他寫出來的句子都不是那種正常人會用的句
- 4 子，就是比較咬文嚼字的，但是他的架構就比較散亂，
- 5 比較沒有章法。像我們之前有個外師，他有上過他們的課，
- 6 他有跟我講過這些學生，他說那個 Mika 的文章完全不行，
- 7 不知道他在講什麼。
- 8 R：恩
- 9 S：可是我看過之後，我並不覺得，我覺得他的文筆很好，
- 10 只是他的架構不是很好，他的架構並不是西方的那種
- 11 academic 的架構。所以像那個美國的那個老師

12 在看的時候, 他就會看不懂. 但是我覺得他的文筆是很好的.

[English translation]

1 R: In general, what is your students' biggest challenge writing in English.

2 S: It's hard to say. every student is different. Like Mika, her rhetoric is pretty
3 strong, her sentences are not like any other students would write, like she tends to
4 use difficult words and phrases, but her writing is pretty scattered, like it does not
5 look organized. Like we've a foreign teacher, and he read their writing before
6 in another writing class. He once mentioned these students to me and said that
7 Mika's writing is totally unacceptable, not knowing what she is talking about.

8 R: Mm

9 S: But when I read her writing, I don't think this way, I think she has an eloquent
10 writing style. Her writing is not very organized, her organization is not like the
11 Western academic kind, so when the American teacher read her writing, he got
12 lost, but I think she writes really well.

Compared to her peers, Mika has a good knowledge of vocabulary and rhetorical skills. Yet, Mika seems to be weaker in organizing her ideas, making it hard for readers to follow the arguments she tries to make (lines 4–5). When talking about Mika's writing, Sarah mentions her colleague, a foreign teacher from the US (lines 5, 11), who once taught Mika in another English writing class. To this American writing teacher, "Mika's writing is totally unacceptable," (line 7) because Mika was not following the Western academic way of organizing her English writing. In another conversation that occurs later (Interview July 12, 2012, 06:27–06:36), Sarah elaborates that in the "Western academic way," an essay requires a proper introduction, body paragraphs, and a conclusion. At the paragraph level, a topic sentence, supporting ideas, and concluding sentences are all required to organize the writer's arguments, making it easy for readers to follow them. As Canagarajah (2013) notes, English academic writing is often closely associated with the values and interests of Anglophone communities. When learning to write academic essays, L2 students have to negotiate the differences in writing norms between their L1 and English. From this perspective, the non-

Western academic writing mentioned by the American teacher can refer to the student's Chinese-influenced organization used in English academic writing.

As indicated in the sentence "Mika's writing is totally unacceptable, not knowing what she is talking about," (line 7), Sarah seems to project this American teacher as a discouraging teacher as he tended to ignore any possible strength in students' writing if it did not follow the writing norms he expected (i.e., Western academic organization). Instead of aligning with her American colleague's evaluation of Mika's writing, Sarah shows an appreciation of Mika's writing as she says, "I don't think this way, I think she has an eloquent writing style," (lines 9–10). Evaluating Mika's writing in a positive light as "eloquent," Sarah at the same time rejects her American colleague's "Western academic way" as the only standard by which students' writing should be evaluated. Sarah also refuses to take her American colleague as the only expert and authority of English language capable of judging students' writing. This disalignment with her American native-speaking colleague serves not only to authorize Sarah herself as an expert over native speakers to evaluate students' English writing, but also to construct the Chinese English that her student wrote as a legitimate form of English to use in her class. By positioning herself as having sufficient expertise to judge and legitimize the Chinese English variety, Sarah constructs both herself and her students as owners of the English language, who have the right to use the language and judge its use on their own terms.

In line 10 to 11, Sarah goes on to state "her organization is not like the Western academic kind, so when the American teacher read her writing, he got lost." In this account, she implies that if this American colleague could read the student's work outside the norms of his "Western" standard, he would be able to follow this student's arguments in writing and

would realize that Mika actually has good English writing ability (line 12: “I think she writes really well”). Here, depicting the American colleague as not being able to follow students’ writing, Sarah constructs his being monolingual as a pedagogical disadvantage that prevents him from understanding and precisely evaluating students’ English writing. In contrast, displaying her understanding of Mika’s writing (line 12), Sarah again highlights her bilingual background to understand students’ use of Chinese English in their writing; the American teacher lacks this competence and therefore gets lost in his students’ writing. Up to this point, Sarah positions herself as a bilingual teacher who knows better about the students’ writing and who is able to assess precisely students’ writing, all of which is made possible by her willingness to take an alternative perspective in reading students’ non-Western writing in English.

From excerpt 1 through 4, Sarah first displays her positive stance toward her students’ use of Chinese English or non-Western English norms in their writing. She foregrounds her bilingual background and constructs it as her professional strength that enables her to understand and appreciate her students’ writing, which is characterized by features of Chinese English. Moreover, by refusing to accept her American colleague as an authority who can judge the appropriateness of her student’s English use, Sarah not only legitimizes Chinese-influenced English, or Chinese English, but she also constructs her students and herself as owners of the language, who have the right to use it and judge its use on their own terms.

In excerpt 5, I present a classroom interaction that I observed in Sarah’s class, to elaborate Sarah’s positioning in relation to native-speakerism discourse, as discussed in the interviews, and to show how this positioning creates a space in the class for alternative forms

of English to develop during the course of my research, I observed a very interesting classroom interaction pattern that occurred when Sarah needed to discuss her students' writing with them. That is, she often appeared to provide no correct answers to students when they were not sure about which words or phrases to use in their writing. Instead, she tended to keep silent or simply laugh, and she left students to negotiate the meanings of English usages and choose the words to put in their writing by themselves. I argue that Sarah's positioning herself in class not as an authority on the English language created a friendly environment in which students could use the language freely and comfortably; in this way, Sarah was able to provide opportunities for her students to construct for themselves a sense of ownership of the English language. The classroom interaction shown in excerpt 5 is one example. During the period when I observed this class, the class was learning citation skills to support their statements in an argumentative essay. For the homework, each student had to find a statement or fact said by an authority. After reading the statement, they paraphrased the sentence and provided a proper citation. In this classroom interaction, Sarah asks each student to write his/her paraphrased sentence on the blackboard and to read it aloud to the class; she then invited the whole class to discuss every sentence written by their peers. Excerpt 5 occurs when Ella is reading hers.

[Excerpt Sarah 5] Class interaction

May 04 (00:11:42- 00:14:09)

Sarah (S). Students: Ella (E) and Zoë (Z).

[Mandarin]

- 1 S: 好, 這句請 Ella 來幫我們念一下.
- 2 E: Adam Liptak, an author from NY Times magazine, says that a research has proved
- 3 that about 3 to 18 homicides will be save from each death penalty.
- 4 S: 好, 很好噢. 一樣我們來看, 人名, 他是紐約時報的作者,
- 5 他說了什麼呢. 他說研究指出, 大概有 3 到 18 個殺人犯,

- 6 will be save from each death penalty,
 7 什麼意思阿? (笑聲)
 8 (2.0)
 9 Z: (錄音模糊)
 10 S: (面向 Ella) (笑聲)
 11 E:我要講的是, murders are prevented, homicides are-
 12 (1.0)
 13 S: (看黑板) Prevented from (.)cri↑mes (2.0)記得噢
 14 不要詞不達意 (笑聲)
 15 E: 我用錯字了.
 16 S: (笑聲)
 17 E: Reach a crimes- reach a what-
 18 Z: 不應該用 homicide.
 19 (4.0)
 20 E: like each death penalty it will prevent (inaudible) a -
 21 S: (笑聲)

(10 到 16 行, Sarah 看著 Ella 解釋句子. Sarah 接著轉過去叫另一個學生上台寫他的句子. 同時, Ella 走上講台,擦掉 homicides 然後把它改成 lives).

- 22 E: Lives.
 23 S: Lives?
 24 E: 對.
 25 S: (看著黑板唸定正每後的答案)執行一次死刑就會
 26 有 3 到 18 個人的生命受救.
 27 E: 對.
 28 S: 喔:
 29 E: Like it can prevent these (pointing to blackboard).
 30 S: Okay, okay, 研究指出呢, 每執行一次死刑, 就會
 31 有 3-18 人的生命被解救, okay, 這樣子聽起來就比較(笑聲) make sense 了.

[English translation]

- 1 S: Okay, can we have Ella read this sentence for us.
 2 E: Adam Liptak, an author from NY Times magazine, says that a research has
 3 proved that about 3 to 18 homicides will be save from each death penalty.
 4 S: Very good. Let's take a look, there is a name (underlining the name). He is an
 5 author from New York Times (give parentheses to New York Times).
 6 What did he say. He said according to research, about 3 to 18
 7 homicides will be saved from each death penalty. What does it mean? (laughs)

- 8 (2.0)
9 Z: (inaudible)
10 S: (Looking at Ella) (Laugh)
11 E: What I meant is, um, murders are prevented – homicides are –
12 (1.0)
13 S: (Looking at the blackboard) Prevented from (.)cri↑mes (2.0) okay remember,
14 try to use the proper word to make meaning clear (laugh).
15 E: I used the wrong word.
16 S: (laughs)
17 E: Reach a crimes – reach a what –
18 Z: Shouldn't use homicides.
19 (4.0)
20 E: like each death penalty it will prevent (inaudible) a –
21 S: (laughs)

(From line 10 to 16, Sarah was looking at Ella when Ella was explaining her sentence. After the laughs in line 16, Sarah turned to the next student and asked her to write her paraphrased sentence on the blackboard. Meanwhile, Ella went up to the blackboard and erased *homicides* from her own sentence and then wrote *lives* instead.)

- 22 E: Lives.
23 S: Lives?
24 E: Right.
25 S: (Looking at the corrected sentence) For every death penalty
26 there will be 3 to 18 lives saved.
27 E: Right.
28 S: Oh:
29 E: Like it can prevent these (pointing to blackboard).
30 S: Okay okay, it says according to a research, for every death penalty, there will be 3
31 to 18 lives to be saved. Okay, this seems to make more sense now (laughs).

After Ella reads her sentence, Sarah gives a compliment first to Ella's paraphrased sentence and then goes on to read aloud the sentence again to the class. While reading the sentence, Sarah shows some difficulty understanding the meaning Ella tries to convey, as she asks "What does it mean?" (line 7). Sarah then looks at Ella and laughs (line 10). Ella then tries to explain what she means to Sarah; however, she still shows difficulty in clearly expressing her

meaning to Sarah. Sarah then suggests an alternative word “cri↑mes” (line 13) to Ella’s “homicides” (line 11), trying to help Ella make sense of what she is trying to say. Sarah then reminds the class that they should try to use proper words to make their meanings understood; this is followed by more laughter (lines 13–14). With this reminder, Sarah seems to indicate that Ella’s inappropriate word choice might be the factor that hinders comprehension of the meaning. Nevertheless, at this point, Sarah by no means provides the correct answer but has Ella figure out the word choice by herself. In line 15, Ella finally figures out that she might have used the wrong word: “I used the wrong word.” In line 16, Sarah again laughs as a response without giving explicit instruction for revising. In lines 17, 18, 19, Ella and another peer, Zoë, together try to re-paraphrase the sentence, followed by more laughter from Sarah in line 21. While Sarah is talking to another student, Ella then walks to the front, changing “homicides” to “lives” (line 22). After reading Ella’s revised sentence (lines 25–26), Sarah finally gives explicit and positive evaluations in line 28 “Oh:”, and 30 “Okay okay” and 31 “this seems to make more sense now.” In this excerpt, what interests me the most is Sarah’s laughing marks in line 10, 14, 16, 21 as responses to students’ actions.

Looking more closely, we find that a classroom interaction pattern “IRE” (Initiate, respond, evaluate) is present in this excerpt. That is, Sarah initiates the conversation by asking Ella to read the sentence (initiation, line 1). Ella then responds to the request by reading aloud her sentence (response, lines 2–3). Sarah then gives evaluation to the response in the form of a compliment (line 4). In line 7, Sarah initiates another turn “What does it mean?” Ella again responds with an attempt to re-paraphrase her sentences (lines 11, 15, 17, 20), with Zoë’s help (line 18). However, the evaluation turns uttered by Sarah in this sequence are laughter rather than direct evaluations. According to Schenkein (1972), laughter

in conversation often displays recipients' necessary background knowledge in understanding the prior utterance. In this excerpt, Sarah's laughter in her evaluation can be interpreted as her acknowledgment of inappropriate use in the student's sentence and probably also her knowledge of how to improve the sentence. However, she does not provide any explicit instruction for Ella. Instead, she laughs every time and positions herself only as a reader of Ella's writing or suggestion provider (line 13, cri↑mes). Positioning herself not as the authority with the answer but only a reader or suggestion provider, Sarah creates a space for the student to recognize the trouble source in her own writing (line 15), to negotiate the meaning with other peers (lines 17, 18), and finally to choose the word "lives" that she wants to use to express her meaning in the sentence (lines 22, 24). Sarah's positioning as such has created friendly conditions, allowing students to express meanings in their own ways and to construct ownership of their English writing.

The knowledge and ability to debunk the ideology of native-speakerism is at the heart of Sarah's construction of her professional identity for teaching English writing in her department. How Sarah sees herself as an English writing teacher is also reflected in her teaching practices, as she creates a friendly environment in the class for the students to negotiate the meanings of their English sentences, from which they develop ownership of English writing. Nevertheless, as I present in the next section, Sarah reinforces and reproduces the same ideology she tries to challenge in her own classroom when comparing herself with locally educated Taiwanese teachers. By so doing, she constructs her legitimacy for teaching English in her university, where Western-educated teachers are valued more for their native-like English competence.

7.3 Alignment with native speakers

Compared with the data presented in the last section that focuses on Sarah's teaching practices in her English writing classes, the data presented in this section foregrounds Sarah's perspectives on her role as a Western-educated teacher of English writing. In excerpt 6, I ask Sarah about her role as an American-educated teacher in teaching English writing in Taiwan (lines 1–2). She reports that her strength in contributing to English education in Taiwan is probably her overseas learning and life experiences, which appear to be interesting to her students. For example, there is an Amish cottage near Sarah's graduate school, which she often visited when studying in the US. Students often asked Sarah to share more about what she had seen in the cottage; this is a lifestyle students had never seen and thus found very interesting (lines 7–9).

[Excerpt Sarah 6] Interview
July 12 [00:38:13–00:39:23]

[Mandarin]

- 1 R：你是擁有美國碩博士經歷的，你覺得在這個在臺灣教英語教學，你的角色或
- 2 者你的貢獻是什麼。
- 3 S：對學生來說，他們會覺得我有國外的教育，他們會想知道我學了什麼，我
- 4 在那邊的經驗是什麼。
- 5 R：恩：
- 6 S：對啊，他們會感覺好像比較國際化(笑聲)他們經常說老師你
- 7 再說一下你在那邊的生活呀，什麼的。像我們那邊有那個 Amish，
- 8 然後我就跟他們講 Amish 是怎樣怎樣的，他們會覺得很特別，
- 9 就會很喜歡聽那個。

[English translation]

- 1 R: So – having studied in the US for a master's and PhD, what do you think about
- 2 English language education in Taiwan. What is your role and contribution?
- 3 S: To students, they think I have an overseas education, they want to
- 4 know what I have learned, what experiences I've gained there.

- 5 R: Um:
6 S: Right, to them. They think that it seems to be more international
7 (laughs) They say, teacher, please share some experiences living there,
8 like we have an Amish cottage there, and they feel excited when I talk about
9 what I saw in the cottage. It sounds special to them.

Having this cultural experience to share with her students, Sarah is positioned by her students as being “more international” (line 6). The quantifier “more” used by her students indicates that students are comparing Sarah’s experiences to those of other people or teachers in Taiwan. If teachers with overseas education and experiences to share with the class are considered to be “more international,” those without such experiences to share are “less international.” Therefore, it is fair to interpret this as meaning that the students are comparing Sarah with the locally educated teachers and positioning Sarah as a “more international” teacher. The idea of “being international” recalls my own observation from the websites of several universities and departments in Taiwan. For example, one department states on its homepage that “all the courses provided in our department are taught in English. Our goal is to escalate students’ English ability and international competitiveness.” Schools using this promotional language seem to me to be making a direct linkage between good English competence and international competitiveness. In excerpt 7, I ask Sarah to elaborate on the connection between “being international” and “English competence.”

[Excerpt Sarah 7] Interview
July 12 (00:43:32–00:44:38)

[Mandarin]

- 1 S: 會阿, 我們學校就會說, 我們學校的師資
2 都是從英美國家回來 (笑) 的博士。
3 (笑)
4 R: 喔, 真的嗎?

- 5 S：他們都是這樣的，而且真的也是他們幾乎不聘本土博士。
6 R：恩
7 S：他們都是聘國外的博士，然後把它跟國際化畫上等號。
8 因為大家好像就是說要國際化就是要會
9 講英文。
10 R：恩恩恩。

[English translation]

- 1 S: Yah, like our school would say, we – like they would say that all the school
2 faculty are hired from overseas, all PhDs (laughs) are back (laughs) from Britain
3 or the US.
4 R: Um – oh really?
5 S: They are all like that, and they really do – they barely hire local PhDs.
6 R: Uh huh huh.
7 S: Right, because it seems that everyone thinks being international means being able
8 to speak good English, and they make a connection between English and being
9 international.
10 R: Uh huh huh.

To respond, Sarah relates the connection between learning English and international competitiveness to a hiring policy at her school (lines 1–3). As Sarah says, her school explicitly states that “all the school faculty are hired from overseas,” particularly from Britain or the US (lines 2–3), and that they “barely hire local PhDs” (line 5). The two locations, Britain and the US, indicate that the overseas PhDs Sarah mentions here are teachers who have gained their PhDs from English-speaking countries, both native English-speaking teachers and Western-educated Taiwanese teachers. As Sarah continues to elaborate, the reason for this policy is “because it seems that everyone thinks being international means being able to speak good English,” (lines 7–9). This account suggests that overseas-educated teachers, including Sarah herself, are valued more by her school, because compared to their local PhD teachers, *overseas*-educated PhDs are deemed to have

better English proficiency, a critical competent for escalating students' English level to the "international" level⁸. By relating English-speaking countries and professional legitimacy to teaching English, Sarah seems to invoke the native-speakerism ideology to construct a professional hierarchy between Western-educated and locally educated teachers in her university. That is, relating "good English competence" to English-speaking countries (e.g., Britain and the US), she indicates that speakers from English-speaking countries are still the experts and the ideal teachers to upgrade students' English into "good English" (line 8). Western-educated PhD teachers, given their many years of exposure to native English-speaking environments, have developed a level of English competence and proficiency close to that of native speakers. Moreover, since native English speakers are the experts in the language, they know better how to teach it. Again, after many years of studying in education-related fields in English-speaking countries, Western-educated Taiwanese teachers are exposed to these West-based pedagogies. Compared to locally educated PhDs, who have had no access to native English environments in which to develop native-like English proficiency and West-based pedagogical skills, Sarah positions herself as a valuable English teacher with linguistic and instructional competences close to those of native English speakers.

Excerpt 8 is another example in which Sarah aligns herself with native speakers and constructs her professional legitimacy in teaching English in her university compared to locally educated PhDs. In excerpt 8, Sarah tells me that once she had a conversation with her husband, a locally educated engineering PhD teaching in a Taiwanese university, about

⁸ The idea of being international mentioned in this conversation is not clearly explained by Sarah. Nor did we continue this topic in earlier or later conversations to clarify its meaning. While the relation between the English language and being/becoming international is a very interesting and important issue to investigate further, what I focus here is how the term "being international" and its implied ideologies are used as discourse recourse for Sarah to construct her identity when talking about this topic.

discrimination in job advertisements. To her husband, explicitly stating in the hiring advertisement that native speakers or Western-educated PhDs are preferred is no different from gender discrimination in job opportunities (line 4).

[Excerpt Sarah 8] Interview
July 12 (00:45:11–00:46:35)

[Mandarin]

- 1 S: 就像我老公他是土博士,他會覺得這是歧視。
- 2 R: 恩:
- 3 S: 對(笑聲) 像有人在 hire 的時候,他寫限女性,他們就被告。我
- 4 說可是很多公家機關或者是一些補習班,他們在求職或者是求人才,他們都
- 5 會說限 native speaker,我說這也是歧視呀,可是這個不犯法。就
- 6 跟他們在網站上面征才,大學的網站就會說 native speaker,或
- 7 者是擁有國外學歷優先考慮,他會覺得這是歧視,不公平...
- 8 可是很現實的就現在大部分的人都會希望-
- 9 他們都認為你出國留學,倒不是說你有多國際化,
- 10 可是他們會覺得你的視野會比較廣你看的東西會比較多,
- 11 比較能夠把那邊的生活帶來進一步影響你的學生,
- 12 讓他們的視野也更開闊。
- 13 R: 恩。

[English translation]

- 1 S: Like my husband, he is a *tu-buo* (locally trained) PhD, he would see this as
- 2 discrimination.
- 3 R: Um:
- 4 S: Right (laughs) like he would say, when people are hiring, if they write “female
- 5 only” they will be sued. But I said when many government sectors or private
- 6 schools [for English education] are hiring, they all say native speaker only. I said
- 7 this is discrimination, but this is not against the law. Like when they are hiring on
- 8 the website, some university websites would say native speaker, or Western
- 9 diploma is preferred. He would see this as discrimination, unfair ... but in reality,
- 10 people would think that if you have studied abroad, at least they would
- 11 think you have more perspectives to view things, to pass on to your students and
- 12 broaden their horizons too.
- 13 R: Um

To respond to her husband's accusation, Sarah first displays her awareness that privileging native speakers and Western-educated teachers in government sectors (line 5), private schools (line 5), and universities (line 8) in the job hiring process is unfair to locally educated teachers and can be seen as discrimination (lines 8–9). However, linguistic (i.e., native/non-native speaker) and educational discrimination (i.e., Western diploma), as Sarah comments, is not against the law, unlike gender discrimination in the hiring process (line 7). As she continues, the preference for Western-educated teachers is desired by many people in Taiwan because it is believed that overseas-educated teachers can pass on their rich experiences and knowledge gained from overseas to students to broaden their horizons (lines 11–12). By defending native speakers and Western-educated teachers and casting both groups of teachers as having a positive influence on students' English learning, Sarah denies the accusation of her husband as a local PhD and frames the hiring process that favours native speakers and Western-educated teachers as a legitimate process.

It is worthy to note that while Sarah tries to interrupt the “native speaker privilege” in her writing class as shown in excerpts 1–4, she aligns here with native speakers and even defends their privilege and legitimacy over local PhD teachers in the job market in Taiwan, even though the ideology of native-speakerism is acted upon to favour those who have native or native-like English competence. It may be because only when native speakers are valued can Sarah's native-like linguistic and pedagogical competence, developed in an English-speaking context, be viewed with approval. This association to native speaker and context can be interpreted as serving to foreground her native-like English proficiency to distance herself from locally educated PhDs who have had no access to native-speaking contexts to gain equal linguistic capital. Aligning herself with native English speakers, Sarah constructs

her privilege and professional legitimacy through her perceived superior English proficiency over locally educated PhD teachers in her current university, where teachers' good English competence is required to advance students' English to the "international level."

As demonstrated in the analysis of excerpts 7 and 8, although her alignment with native English speakers allows Sarah to construct professional legitimacy in her university, it is in the process of associating her English competence with English-speaking countries and native English speakers that she reinforces the native speaker superiority and creates a hierarchy between NESTs and NNESTs. By relating the location categories "Britain" and "the US" to good English competence, Sarah seems to indicate that the mainstream English norms are associated with the English-speaking West and teachers (Motha, 2014). Therefore, English native speakers are positioned as the experts and authorities in the English language, from whom L2 speakers learn the language. Owing to her many years of exposure to English-speaking contexts, she has now become a native-like L2 learner whose English proficiency is good enough to teach in her university. Her native-like proficiency positions her as a better English teacher than locally educated English teachers. Moreover, taking nativeness or near-nativeness as the criterion by which to evaluate a teacher's professional legitimacy, Sarah simultaneously positions herself as a secondary English speaker and teacher to native English speakers. While Sarah narrates her role in teaching English writing in Taiwan, the ideology of native speaker superiority is activated to create a hierarchy between NESTs and NNESTs and also among NNESTs (the Western-educated and locally educated). In this hierarchy, native-speaking teachers are placed above Western-educated Taiwanese teachers, and Western-educated Taiwanese teachers are above locally educated Taiwanese teachers who have not had the opportunity to develop this native-like competence.

As discussed in the analysis from excerpts 1 through 5, Sarah interrupts the ideologies of ‘Standard English’ and ‘native speaker superiority’ in her own writing class. However, the analysis of excerpts 7 and 8 indicates that Sarah reinforces the same ideologies as to construct her teacher identity and legitimacy when comparing herself to locally educated English teachers, where she reproduces the hierarchy between NNESTs and NESTs she tries to disrupt in her writing classrooms. Similar to Beth’s stories of teacher identity construction, the findings in this chapter suggest that while Sarah shows her awareness of the unequal power relation between NNESTs and NESTs and has developed some wiggle room to legitimize the status of localized English and its speakers (i.e., both her students and herself), she shows less awareness of the power relation *among* NNESTs due to different perceived English levels in relation to their education. I argue that a “Western-educated teacher” is itself an identity category that embeds hegemonic meaning that promotes the ideology of native-speakerism, such as the superiority of native-like proficiency and English native speakers. More reflection on Western-educated teachers in relation to their Western professional credentials is needed for a more thorough development of socio-political sensitive ELT for teachers like Sarah, who strives to interrupt hegemonic discourses in her English classrooms. I will come back to this point in my discussion of pedagogical implications in Chapter 10.

7.4 Summary

In this chapter, I have reported on and discussed my analysis of Sarah’s identity construction as an English writing teacher and how her narrated identities are reflected in her classroom interaction with her students. Greatly influenced by her six years of graduate

studies in the US, where she developed an awareness of critical issues in ELT, Sarah demonstrated the establishment of counter-discourses in teaching English writing that go against the ideology of native-speakerism. For example, Sarah refused to take American colleagues as the only authority on the English language and the “Western” English standard as the only criteria by which to evaluate students’ academic writing. Instead, she foregrounded her bilingual competence as a pedagogical advantage that enabled her to better understand her student’s Chinese English writing. By rejecting her American colleagues’ judgment of her students’ Chinese English, Sarah not only legitimized Chinese English in her students’ writing but also constructed ownership of the English language for both her students and herself, and the right to use and judge the English language on their own terms. Space for constructing ownership of the language was also observed in Sarah’s writing class. When students came to choose the words or phrases to use in their writing, instead of giving the *correct* answers, Sarah allowed students to negotiate the meanings with their peers and let them each decide which words to use for their own writing. In other words, wiggle room was observed in Sarah’s English writing class where native English speaker’s norms were not the only legitimate standard to learn and to teach.

While Sarah endeavoured to interrupt the ideologies of “Standard English” and “native speaker superiority” in her own writing classes, she deployed these same ideologies to establish her own professional legitimacy among other faculty members. Sarah switched her alignment to native speakers and native-like English competence when she compared herself, a Western-educated teacher, to locally educated PhD teachers. The ideology of native-speakerism was reflected in Sarah’s giving greater legitimacy to herself, a Western-educated teacher, than to locally educated PhD teachers in order to construct her professional

legitimacy as an English teacher in her university. As suggested in the analysis of Sarah's narratives about her role as an English teacher, Sarah seemed to support the native-speakerist discourse in ELT, by which she created a hierarchy between NESTs and NNESTs as well as *among* NNESTs. I suggested that language teachers' reflections on power relations should go beyond the NEST/NNEST dichotomy and should focus more on the power relations among NNESTs to develop a thorough discourse for teaching English that counters the ideology of native-speakerism. Finally, I would like to emphasize that Sarah's identity construction was not constructed unilaterally but was worked up in interview interaction with me. Her accounts about her teaching and the role of teaching were designed in here-and-now interaction to articulate the identities she wanted to be heard by me, a Western-educated teacher and researcher. In other words, her accounts might differ on other occasions with different interlocutors; accordingly, different interactional resources (e.g., ideologies) might be taken to construct her professional identity that she wanted to be understood in the given interaction.

In the next chapter, I discuss another participant, Ava, and her teaching experiences after returning to Taiwan as well as the formation of her writing-teacher identity. I continue to investigate the transformative space of the local English class in teaching English that is counter to the discourse of native-speakerism.

CHAPTER 8: WESTERN-EDUCATED TEACHER AS CULTURAL SELF: AVA AND STUDENT-CENTERED PEDAGOGY

8.1 Introduction

Ava holds a master's degree in TESOL and a PhD in language and literacy education, focusing on composition study, from the same graduate program in the United States. When we talked about her experiences studying in an American graduate program, she often showed great appreciation for the student-centered teaching approaches she observed in friends' ESL classrooms or that her professors had used in her graduate programs. Returning to Taiwan to teach English writing, she tried to apply many student-oriented teaching approaches in the hope of developing autonomy and critical-thinking skills in her students. However, her attempts to put these teaching methods into practice met with some resistance from her students, who seemed to prefer teacher-centered methods. Through talking about her students' attitude as being against the approaches she applied in class, Ava made her Western-educated credential relevant a resource, positioning herself as a cultural Self (Pennycook, 1998) who had better pedagogical knowledge to teach the language and legitimize the teaching approaches resisted by her students. The image of cultural Self as superior in using and teaching the English language, the key discourse Ava used to form her teacher identity, was reproduced in writing conferences with her students.

I started the discussion with what Ava talked about, student-centered teaching methods, then followed with an analysis of how she constructed her writing teacher identity through talking about her students' resistance to these teaching approaches. I then demonstrate how the ideologies Ava used to form her identities are reproduced in writing conferences with students. The findings of this chapter also indicate that there is a

discrepancy between Ava's writer identity, demonstrated in Chapter 5, and her writing-teacher identity, discussed in this chapter; I examine this discrepancy at the end of this chapter.

8.2 Student-centered pedagogies

In an interview elsewhere (June 29, 00:28:40–00:29:23), Ava shared with me the story that in her own learning experiences in Taiwan from elementary school to university, most of the teaching took place through teacher-centered instruction. As she explained, in teacher-dominant classes where teachers were treated as the authority, she sometimes had to hold back the ideas she wanted to share with the class in order not to interrupt her teacher's talking. She described herself as someone who learned the best through talking through ideas to others; this teacher-centered pedagogical culture in Taiwan, as she stated, made her feel constrained and uneasy sometimes. She further stated that it was not until her study in her American graduate program where she was introduced to many student-oriented activities, that she developed the belief that learning can best take place when students are learning from each other through sharing ideas and thoughts. In this kind of learning environment, the teacher becomes a consultant rather than an authority. Therefore, when I ask her (excerpt 1) to comment on her role as a Western-educated PhD in teaching English writing in Taiwan, Ava responds that she hopes her overseas study experiences can help students "feel more comfortable using English in academic settings and daily life" (lines 4–5). To meet this end, she tries to be "more friendly" (line 6) to students by positioning herself as a consultant rather than an authority in the classroom (lines 6–7).

[Excerpt Ava 1] Interview
June 14 (00:47:23–00:51:02)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R: 還有一個問題是,你覺得你,你在美國拿 PhD 麻噢,然後那你現在回來
2 臺灣教寫作這一門 subject. 那你覺得 what is your role in teaching English
3 writing.
4 A: 我希望可以讓學生 feel comfortable to use English in academic setting and daily
5 life, 我覺得這個是最主要的. 所以我儘量就是我大概從態度當中,大概就是表
6 現一個比較友善的態度,讓他們就是覺得,我比較像是一個 consultant 這樣,而
7 不是說 authority 這樣,所以這就是為什麼,我不喜歡兩個小時課從頭到尾我一
8 直站在那邊講,我喜歡把我的部分,就是 teacher dominated lecture 把它縮短,所
9 以我有時候甚至縮到剩一個小時不到這樣,讓剩下時間可以多餘出來(讓學生
10 講)這樣子.

[English translation]

- 1 R: So, like, you've got a PhD from the States, now you've come back to Taiwan to
2 teach this subject, English writing. What do you think your role is in teaching
3 English writing.
4 A: I hope I can make students feel more comfortable using English in academic
5 settings and also in daily life, I think this is the key point. So I do my best to – I
6 probably in terms of attitude, I will be more friendly, let them feel that I am more
7 like a consultant but not an authority. So that's why I don't like talking for the full
8 two hours alone, I would love to have my part – to shorten the teacher-dominated
9 lecture part, sometimes even make it less than an hour, so there will be some time
10 left [for students to talk].

In lines 7–10, Ava explains that when she positions herself as a consultant, she can shorten the time allocated to lecturing (line 8) and leave more time for students to do some activities that require them to talk and think about their own learning (lines 9-10). In this conversation, Ava indicates that her Western-educated experiences have provided her with new pedagogical knowledge—a student-centered approach, which she justifies by saying that it benefits students and furthers their learning of English writing.

During the interview, I asked Ava to outline the student-centered methods she observed during her studying in the US and asked her to comment on the feasibility of these methods in the Taiwanese teaching context. In excerpts 2 and 3, Ava introduces two in-class activities, peer reviews and student-centered writing conferences, that she observed during her American graduate study and tries to apply in her own writing class.

In excerpt 2, Ava first talks about peer review and explains why she thinks it helps students to learn to write in English.

[Excerpt Ava 2] Interview
June 29 (00:16:15–00:17:36)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R：那你的目的是要讓他們學到什麼。
- 2 A：Peer review 其實就是讓他們就是從彼此之間去互相學習，因為我覺得畢竟我
- 3 只能，就是他們我變成為一個讀者，我希望他們能夠養成就是說，不要只是重視
- 4 說寫，只是純粹寫給老師看，因為其實我希望多培養他們有 audience
- 5 awareness 的觀念，就是希望說他們的 audience 的可能是更廣泛的。
- 6 R：恩恩所以希望他們去-
- 7 A：對對。對希望他們從彼此之間去互相學習到，原來我的同儕當中有
- 8 會寫這樣子的東西，然後人家有什麼長處，然後我有短處，
- 9 然後就希望他自己都可以引以為戒，或者說就是去多學習
- 10 這樣子。
- 11 R：恩恩恩。

[English translation]

- 1 R: What is your purpose of them doing this [peer review].
- 2 A: Peer review actually makes them learn from each other, because after all, I am
- 3 only – like I am the only reader for them, so I hope to have them not just writing
- 4 for the teacher and I hope I can help build audience awareness for them, so to let
- 5 them know that they have far more readers out there
- 6 R: Um huh so hoping them to –
- 7 A: Yah yah, hoping they learn from each other, like my peers can actually write
- 8 things like this, what advantages and shortcomings others have, and hoping they
- 9 reflect on their own writing by reading others', or to learn more about how others

10 write.

11 R: Um huh huh.

Ava explains that her students tend to view her as the only reader of their writing pieces, probably because she is the only gatekeeper of her students' writing (i.e., by grading papers). Peer review is helpful because it offers opportunities for students to write to multiple writers and thus helps raise their awareness that their future readers are not limited to teacher but that they have a wider audience (lines 2–5). As Ava continues, peer review also helps students to learn from each other's strength and weaknesses in writing; from this, they can reflect on their own writing and have it develop accordingly (lines 7–9). From this account, Ava appears to minimize her role in her students' learning of English writing. She seems to withdraw from an authoritative role and positions herself as a facilitator in her students' learning.

In excerpt 3, Ava introduces another instructional approach she learned in the US—the student-centered writing conference—and shares her thoughts about how this approach works to develop students' English competence. Again, this approach is used to reduce the teacher's role in the classroom in order to train students to become independent thinkers and writers.

[Excerpt Ava 3] Interview

June 14 (00:43:21–00:46:02)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R: 有哪些教法你會覺得比較適合在臺灣這個 context 的。
- 2 A: 如果時間允許的話我也很希望有真正像小組的,學生為主的小組的 writing
- 3 conference,讓他們小組,我就住在旁邊,他們可以 discussion, 很希望有類似像
- 4 這可是這個學生的 group writing conference,還沒有辦法實行,因為我覺得
- 5 跟他們目前這樣子的 passive learning behavior 的,讓我沒有辦法好好地,就是

- 6 可以進行,這樣子可以導致那個 classroom become chaos
7 這樣。
8 R: conference 大概是什麼樣。
9 A: 我很希望這樣也可以發生在大學部身上,比如說大家寫互相寫 paper,
10 大家互相加油,大家給意見,我覺得這種是最好的學習方式...如果可以我很喜
11 歡這種比較小組式的有一種比較像這樣, in-depth discussion 這樣子的
12 比較有深度一點的對談,然後討論這樣子,我覺得大家集思廣益,
13 比較可以知道說,看到哪裡有問題這樣子。我很喜歡這樣子,
14 可是環境不允許。

[English translation]

- 1 R: Is there any other teaching approach that you think fits the context in Taiwan.
2 A: If time allows, I also want to have them come to writing conferences in groups,
3 like student-centered writing conferences. So they can have discussion while I am
4 sitting next to them [and listening]. I really hope I can have this kind of [writing
5 conference]. But this can't work in my class yet, because for now they tend to
6 have passive learner behaviour, so I can't really – it can cause chaos in the
7 classroom.
8 R: What does that conference look like.
9 A: I really hope to apply it to my undergraduate students, like writing papers together,
10 supporting each other, giving comments to each other. I think this is the best way
11 to learn ... If I can, I like this kind of group discussion, like in-depth discussion
12 and conversation, I think when people share ideas with each other, they help
13 each other to figure out what the problems are. I really like this approach,
14 but the environment doesn't allow me to.

A traditional writing conference can be teacher-centered as the teacher comments on the student's writing. Ava indicates that she is eager to go beyond this traditional form of writing conference and to try "student-centered writing conferences" (line 3), where students can discuss each other's writing while she sits next to them and provides assistance when necessary (lines 3-4). Ava goes on to explain that this approach is beneficial because it creates a space for students "writing papers together, supporting each other, giving comments to each other" (lines 9-10), all of which help students learn to write more comfortably

without the teacher's interference. The in-depth discussion among students in this student-centered writing conference, as Ava explains, can help students realize each other's challenges in their English writing through "shar(ing) ideas with each other" (line 12). Given these benefits, Ava states that the student-centered writing conference is "the best way to learn" English writing (line 10).

Despite her great appreciation of these teaching approaches (e.g., peer review and student-centered writing conferences) she learned during her study in the US, Ava has not yet fully applied these methods in her writing class because her students "tend to have passive learner behaviour" (lines 5–6) and "the environment doesn't allow me to" (line 14). These complaints imply a certain degree of incompatibility between Ava's attempted pedagogies and her students' attitudes toward learning. In several other interviews, Ava mentioned that her students tended to be reluctant when she asked them to do in-class activities that involved peer discussion. From my observation (field notes, March 14, April 11), I also noticed that students at times showed indifference and impatience when being asked to do a peer review with their classmates. Two students who were sitting beside me complained quietly ("Again?", "Really don't know what this is for") when Ava had them to do this activity. Some students were reading other books or chatting with their peers during a group discussion activity Ava assigned them to do (field note, May 9). In another conversation (April 26, 00:19:29), Ava said that a few years earlier, a student had told her frankly that he actually did not like Western-educated teachers because they tended to use "Western" ways and methods like group discussion or asking students to speak up in the class. The student had told Ava that he preferred to sit and listen to teachers because this way he could learn more from the teacher. These anecdotes explain the incompatibility between

Ava's application of student-centered methods and her students' learning habits and attitude. Her students, who are used to teacher-centered teaching approaches, might find this "Western" method unhelpful in their learning. Ava's professional knowledge gained from her American graduate program seemed not to be appreciated by her students.

In the conversation discussed in the following section (8.3), Ava attributes the difficulties in implementing these attempted pedagogies in her current writing class to her students' attitudes toward learning. While talking about her students' resistance, Ava takes English native speakers as the authority on ELT pedagogies and makes relevant her Western-trained experience as a resource by which she aligns herself with the pedagogical knowledge of native speakers. By so doing, she validates the student-centered pedagogies she used in her writing class as well as constructs her legitimacy to teach English writing.

8.3 Legitimizing student-centered pedagogies and teacher identity

In excerpt 4, I initiate the conversation by asking whether Ava encountered any difficulty after coming back to Taiwan in terms of teaching English writing. Ava responds that students' attitudes toward learning (line 3), the factor that makes it difficult to put her preferred pedagogies into practice, is the biggest challenge she has encountered since coming back to teach in Taiwan.

[Excerpt Ava 4] Interview
April 26 (00:13:58–00:16:18)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R：你回來教寫作之後啊，你有遇到任何的挑戰嗎。
- 2 你覺得-
- 3 A：挑戰應該是學生的態度吧- 學習態度，還有你說 you observe
- 4 我的學生 quiet 這邊，對我覺得這邊其實：就是我覺得比較

- 5 挫折的吧。
- 6 R： 嗯：
- 7 A： 我的課基本上，兩小時的課，第一小時基本上我是在講解就是課文，
- 8 而且我都會就是基本上提示他們重點。照理說這個如果在國外的話，他們早
- 9 就都要提前先讀好了。
- 10 R： 嗯嗯嗯。
- 11 A： 然後來到課堂上應該就要開始開始直接 discussion 或是直接進入
- 12 activity 可是，我們學生<很懶>，然後而且非常的 passive 所以他們
- 13 都不願意做這樣子的
- 14 事情，所以只能夠... ㄟ那我再幫他們帶他們再導讀一次，帶他們導讀課文，因
- 15 為如果不做這些動作的話他們完全都不會去看。

[English translation]

- 1 R: Since you came back to teach, have you ever had any challenges? What do you
- 2 think-
- 3 A: Challenges are students' attitude – attitude toward learning ... and also you said
- 4 you observed my students were quiet right, I think this is actually, what makes me
- 5 upset.
- 6 R: Uh:
- 7 A: I always uh in my class, basically a two-hour class, it's always me lecturing for the
- 8 first hour, and also pointing out the key points for students from the textbook.
- 9 Theoretically, if this were in the US, they would read [the textbook] at home.
- 10 R: Um huh um huh.
- 11 A: So when they come to the class we can start right off with class discussion or do
- 12 an activity, but my students are <very lazy>, and also very passive, so they don't
- 13 want to read it themselves. So what I have to do is guide them to read it in class,
- 14 guide them, go through the textbook, because if I don't do this they are not gonna
- 15 read it themselves.

From lines 7 through 15, Ava explains that during a two-hour writing class, she spends much time, at least an hour, lecturing and pointing out the key points in the textbook for the students. She then compares her students with those in the US and says that in the US, students would need to preview the textbook before coming to class. If her students did the same as American students, she would not have to spend so much time lecturing, so the class could have more time for discussion or activities, the ideal teaching approach she wanted to

apply in her class. In contrast, her Taiwanese students are “very lazy” and “very passive” (line 12). They usually don’t read the textbook before class. It thus becomes Ava’s responsibility to guide them to read through the textbook, otherwise the students will never read it themselves, and they may end up learning nothing. This is challenging for her because the students seem very dependent on the teacher’s guidance, so Ava’s preferred student-centered pedagogies are hard to put into practice in her current writing classes. Right after this conversation, Ava reports a story she heard from her graduate students that supports her statement about her students being dependent, lazy and passive; this is shown in excerpt 5.

[Excerpt Ava 5] Interview
April 26 (00:16:21–00:18:03)

[Mandarin]

16 R：那你覺得為什麼會這麼被動。

17 A：因為我之前我有一門uh(.) 碩士課, 然後我的學生有uh外籍, 有native speakers
18 然後他們就是, 我有讓我的碩士班學生去observe writing上課過程, 還有一個
19 oral上課過程, 那兩個外籍那時候我教兩個外籍學生, 一個是美國來, 一個是
20 南非來, 他們就一直他們就是對於這這點就說, 他們很不能夠苟同台灣學生,
21 就是他們發現就是都非常的非常的被動, 然後就甚至很懶散, 他們覺得這樣
22 子的學習態度很不好, 然後他們就- 他們就說這樣子的學習態度其實是應該
23 跟- 可能這種中國文化是屬於那種, 孔子的文化, 所以就是學生習慣就是把
24 老師當成authority這樣。

25 R：恩

26 A：那學生就是覺得說他要去接受, 然後老師也必須要behave like a
27 authority這樣子。然後他說, 這跟他們就是在西方所接受的這種, 就是比
28 較uh Aristotle就是亞里斯多德啊, 蘇伯拉底啊蘇格拉底他們這樣子的那種雄
29 辯式的那種culture是不一樣的, 所以他說反應就會兩種, 他覺得就
30 是跟他們比起來, 我們的學生反應就是這樣
31 呆呆的坐著。

32 R：恩

[English translation]

16 R: So why you think they are being so passive.

17 A: Like before I’ve taught a graduate-level course, then there are uh foreign students

18 in my class – there’re native speakers. One is from the US and the other from
19 South Africa (.) and they have been – in terms of this aspect they say they can’t
20 really agree with Taiwanese students’ [attitude], like they found they are all being
21 very uh: very passive, and even very lazy. They think this kind of attitude toward
22 learning is not really good, then they say this kind of attitude might have
23 something to do with uh: probably this Chinese culture is part of Confucianist
24 culture, so like – students are used to taking teachers as the authority.
25 R: Um
26 A: So the students would think, they should take – and teacher should also behave
27 like an authority, so they don’t want to – and they say – this is very different from
28 what they received in the West, more like Aristotle or Socrates kind of – eloquent
29 culture. So uh: they said there’re two kinds of reactions, they think compared to
30 themselves, our students’ reaction is – like sitting there quietly, not thinking
31 anything.
32 R: Um

The two native English speakers mentioned in the above excerpt were Ava’s two graduate students from a few years earlier, one from the US and the other from South Africa. For research purposes, Ava had these two students observe her former writing and speaking classes. From their observations, the graduate students told Ava that they could not really agree with Taiwanese students’ attitudes toward learning, because they found them very passive and lazy in class (line 21). The graduate students then associated “being passive and lazy” and “having a bad attitude” to Chinese and Confucianist culture (line 23), where the students see the teacher as the authority and are dependent on the teacher’s guidance (lines 23–24). As Ava continues, to these two native English-speaking graduate students, this Chinese/Confucianist culture was very different from “the West” or the “eloquent culture” (lines 28–29) influenced by Aristotle and Socrates. This Aristotelian and Socratic academic culture is not fully elaborated here, but in another interview (June 14), Ava mentioned this culture as involving a lot of discussion and argumentation between the teacher and students. Unlike Confucianist culture, in which students always learn from the teacher and from

lectures without challenging their authority, Aristotelian/Socratic culture creates a space for teachers and students to debate and defend their own arguments. In the process of defense, students develop critical thinking and argumentation skills; learning thus takes place. On the contrary, Chinese students depend heavily on the teacher's guidance and become passive, lazy, and just "sitting there quietly, not thinking anything." (lines 30-31). Drawing on her graduate students to back up her statement she made in excerpt 4, Ava has constructed her students as being dependent, passive, lazy and lacking in critical thinking skills compared to those from Western culture.

Important to note in this conversation is Ava's use of footing (Goffman, 1981) as she reports her graduate students' observations. When reporting, Ava positions herself only as an *animator*, who merely produces the utterance and her native English-speaking graduate students as *authors*, the source of the uttered words. Taking her English-speaking graduate students as the source of the evaluation of her students' attitude toward learning, Ava positions them as the authority by which to judge any difference as an inferior Other, as people who "have problems with the autonomy, critical thinking and educational contexts necessary for effective language learning" (Holliday, 2013, p. 21). Taking her English native-speaking students as the authority to judge the value of difference between the Western/Aristotelian/Socratic and Chinese/Confucianist traditions of learning, Ava's interview accounts create a colonial image of cultural Self and Other, depicting the Western learning tradition as an active, eloquent, and superior cultural Self and the Chinese learning tradition as a lazy, passive, and deficient cultural Other. By constructing the cultural Self and Other in learning styles, Ava seems to reject her students' resistance against her student-centered method in learning English writing. That is, the difficulty in implementing these

student-centered pedagogies in class lies not in the nature of these pedagogies themselves, but in her students' "negative attitudes" toward learning, such as their dependence on authority and their passive attitudes toward their own learning. Through making this colonial image of cultural Self and Other, Ava legitimizes her professional knowledge (i.e., of student-centered approaches) she gained from the US, which allows her to carry out these advanced Western instructional approaches to improve the learning of her lazy and passive Taiwanese students. In other words, through her comments she also position herself as a cultural Self, like her native English-speaking graduate students, who had been trained in the Western tradition and who thus had the cultural Self knowledge to educate the cultural Others.

Excerpt 6 is another example in which Ava makes English native speakers the authority by which to legitimize her use of a teaching approach—the writing conference—as well as to legitimize herself as an English writing teacher. The conversation in excerpt 6 occurred in an interview toward the end of the semester. I asked Ava whether she had encountered any other challenges like those she shared with me in conversation excerpts 4 and 5. Ava then mentioned another teaching approach, the writing conference, that she had observed when she studied in the US. She tried to apply the same method to her students, but the result was different from what she had expected.

[Excerpt Ava 6] Interview
June 29 (00:08:27–00:10:59)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R: 那是一個, 那-
- 2 A: 還有另一個譬如說我有給學生 writing conference, 因為之前我有另外美國朋友, 他們就是在 writing center 上班, 他們叫我說以後你有空可以去看看, 我們
- 3 怎麼樣這樣子, 然後我看到同樣是 writing conference, 可是像我看到美國人
- 4

- 5 他們在跟學生諮詢,就是我跟我學生做的時候又會不一樣的狀況跑出來。
6 像我美國朋友他就會告訴我說,他們是絕對不會去告訴人家說你(文法)
7 哪裡錯,他們是不會去糾正
8 這些。
9 R: 恩恩恩
10 A: 他們是站在一個讀者的角度告訴你,我怎麼去想你這篇文章的內容,即使各個
11 不同領域的拿過來給他們諮詢。
12 R: 恩恩恩
13 A: 對,可是到了這邊之後,學生就會期待,就是希望老師是幫他改,就要更改他
14 哪裡文法錯誤,他才知道他錯在哪裡。
15 R: 恩恩恩恩
16 A: 然後這就是本來原先預設的 writing conference,還是都目標都會有落差。
17 R: 有點落差。

[English translation]

- 1 R: That's one example, then –
2 A: Another example is like I have writing conference with students, like before (in
3 the US) I had an American friend, usually there is a writing center in every
4 university, right, so they were working in the writing center. Sometimes they
5 invited me to see what their writing conference was like. The way they do it was
6 very different from what I do in my class, like my American friends told me that
7 when they did writing conferences, they would never correct writers'
8 grammatical errors.
9 R: Um huh um
10 A: They would position themselves as readers and say what they think about the
11 content to tutees, from all different disciplines.
12 R: Um huh huh
13 A: Right, but here students would expect teachers to correct them, to point out their
14 grammatical mistakes, so they would know where their mistakes are.
15 R: Uh huh um huh
16 A: So this is different from what I expected of writing conferences.
17 R: Different from what you expected.

Ava goes on to elaborate on the writing conferences she observed when studying in the US, and she compares American and Taiwanese students' different expectations of a writing conference.

Once, a friend of hers, who was working as a tutor in the writing center in the

American university where Ava was studying, invited her to observe her writing conference. During her observation, her American friends told her that with people from various disciplines, when the tutors gave feedback, “they would never correct writers’ grammatical errors” (lines 7–8). Instead, the tutors would position themselves as readers and pay attention to the essay content, such as whether the meanings were clearly delivered (line 10). However, the situation is different when she uses writing conferences in her current writing class. In Taiwan, the students expect the teachers to point out grammar errors and to correct every single mistake for them so they know where their mistakes are (lines 13–14). In line 16, Ava’s statement “this is different from what I expected of writing conferences” indicates that the ideal writing conference she would like to apply in her class is the kind she observed in the US—a writing conference that focuses on clarity of content, not grammar correction. Yet, given the different expectations of her students, who request corrective feedback, she cannot put this writing conference inspired by her American friend into practice in her current class, because the students still depend heavily on her for correcting their grammatical errors.

Important to note in this conversation is that here again Ava positions the American, or the native English speaker, as the author and herself as only the animator of the utterance (e.g., lines 6–7: “my American friends told me that when they did writing conferences ...”). Taking the American tutor as the author and source of the utterance of how writing conferences should be carried out (e.g., no corrective feedback), Ava is also positioning the writing tutors in the American university as English language authorities and experts in teaching approaches who know best how to improve students’ writing. In line 7, Ava uses an extreme case (Pomerantz, 1986) “never” to emphasize that American tutors would “never” point out tutees’ grammatical errors in a writing conference. According to Pomerantz (1986),

an extreme case often works to defend against or to counter challenges. The extreme case “never” can be used by Ava to counter her students’ resistance against the writing conference without corrective feedback Ava applied in class. That is, what her students ask her to do for grammatical rectification is not an appropriate way to improve their writing, because American tutors, the language experts, *never* do that in a writing conference. In a similar way to excerpt 5, Ava seems to take English native speakers as authorities in English and how to teach it. By so doing, she legitimizes the writing conference that she uses but which is resisted by her students, who expect more corrective feedback.

The image of colonial Self and Other in ELT is constructed again here, though quite implicitly. By constructing the American tutors as gatekeepers in English and experts in English teaching pedagogy, Ava has privileged the status of English native speakers in ELT who have better pedagogical knowledge to improve the writing competence of her Taiwanese students, the cultural Other. Moreover, by showing her access to the writing center in the US, Ava is *authenticating* herself as a cultural Self who holds the same legitimate pedagogical knowledge to teach English writing (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004, 2005). According to Bucholtz (2003) authentication is a discursive practice achieved in interaction to assert “one’s own or another’s identity as genuine or credible” (p. 408). By showing her exposure to the “authentic” context—an American writing center—to observe how native English speakers conduct writing conferences, Ava is constructing herself as a credible teacher who has acquired teaching expertise as the cultural Self.

In the process of legitimizing the student-centered teaching pedagogy she uses in her writing class, Ava shows her dependency on “the notion of ‘native speaker’ legitimacy in knowledge and work practice” (Widin, 2010, p. 119) to validate her teaching practices and

teacher identity. This dependency, according to Kumaravadivelu (2016), works to endorse centered-based pedagogical epistemology that privileges “the native speaker’s presumed language competence, learning styles, communication patterns, conversational maxims, cultural beliefs, and even accent as the norms to be learned and taught” (p. 73). In turn, this dependency derogates and marginalizes the local pedagogical culture (i.e., teacher as the major transmitter of knowledge to students) and traditional way of learning (i.e., students learn from the authority). As Kumaravadivelu (2016) argues, the hegemonic control of the dominant group cannot be achieved, had the dominated group not consent to and accept the dominant power, and continue to use it to define themselves and their own teaching; hence, the dominated group is “complicit in its own marginalization” (p. 77). Ava’s dependency and *consent* to the superiority of Western-based pedagogical epistemology makes her an accomplice in the marginalization of the local ways of teaching English writing, thereby helping to sustain the dominant control of Western-based orthodox in local ELT (Kumaravadivelu, 2016).

The image of cultural Self and Other that Ava uses to construct her teacher identity is reproduced in several conversations with her students during writing conferences, which I will now turn to discuss.

8.4 Reproducing colonial Self and Other in the writing conference

One of the requirements of Ava’s writing class was to write an argumentative essay in the final exam. To familiarize her students with the genre, a few weeks before the final exam, Ava asked students to write an argumentative essay on the topic *Individuals under the age of fourteen charged with crimes should not be tried as adults*. After Ava graded the

assignment, each student had to make an appointment with her for an individual writing conference to talk about his/her paper. At the beginning of each conference, Ava would ask the student to read through the comments she had given. The students would then ask questions about their concerns related to their writing. Excerpts 7–10 shown below are from two writing conferences with two different students. Although Ava had talked in class about the necessary elements of an argumentative essay, including arguing point, counter argument, and refutation, many students still did not know how to refute in their argument. Ava categorizes writing without refutation as Chinese practice that should be avoided in English writing. Student 1 (S1), presented in excerpts 7, is one who did not present a refutation.

[Excerpt Ava 7] Writing conference – Student 1
June13 (00:14:04–00:16:03)

[English original]

1 A: So this is why I feel in such cases that it will confuse readers. In such cases I will
2 say this kind of – if you did not try to argue back, it looks similar to Chinese
3 writing. You know what Chinese writing is like, we don't want to be so strong in
4 the voice, right?

5 S1: Uh

6 A: So that's why we say uh like this one you think there is something good,
7 something good is that because you are still immature, so that's why you think
8 they should not be treated the same as adults. However, other people might also
9 say that we should treat them like an adult because you know, um, it's not related
10 to age but related to what kind of crimes they did and also for ... so conclusion, no
11 matter what this issue has both pro side and con side, we will feel there is no
12 conclusion. It's circular.

13 S1: Um huh

14 A: It's circulating only. So this is why this is somehow I need to point out to you
15 here.

16 S1: Um huh

17 A: Yes yes. As long as you can argue back, then that it really becomes an English
18 essay.

19 S1: Um huh

As Ava explains to the student, she indeed has her argument (lines 6–7: agreeing that juvenile criminals should not be tried as adults because of their immaturity) and her counter argument (lines 9–10: age is not related to crime, so juveniles should be tried as adult criminals). Yet, the fact that she does not restate her stance in the conclusion makes the argument confusing (line 1). Ava relates this no-refutation essay to Chinese writing (lines 2–3), and associates this type of writing with being “circular” (line 12) and “circulating” (line 14). In comparing refutation in English and Chinese argumentative writing and categorizing Chinese ways of writing as circulating, circular, and confusing, Ava indicates that English writing is linear, direct, and logical. This comparison resonates with the rhetorical hierarchy suggested in traditional contrastive rhetoric (Connor, 1996; Kaplan, 1966; see also Kubota & Lehner, 2004). Initiated by Kaplan and later developed by Connor, contrastive rhetoric research explores “a link between culturally specific logic or thought patterns and paragraph structures in English essays written by nonnative English-speaking students” (Kubota & Lehner, 2004, p. 8). Its pedagogical implication is that an L2 student’s English writing is hindered by his/her L1 rhetorical conventions. Advocates believe an understanding of contrastive rhetoric can help L2 writers achieve English rhetorical norms by avoiding their L1 cultural inference in their English essays. While an understanding of different rhetorical patterns can help to facilitate the development of L2 writing, contrastive rhetoric has received massive critique for creating a rhetorical hierarchy, viewing English as linear, direct, and logical and other languages as circular, digressive, or non-logical (Kubota & Lehner, 2004). By constructing a deterministic and static view of other languages, contrastive rhetoric reinforces the colonial image of the superiority of English rhetoric and the deficiency of L2 writers who inevitably transfer their L1 rhetorical patterns to their

English writing (Kubota & Lehner, 2004). The pedagogical objective of contrastive rhetoric is thus to guide L2 writers to avoid their L1 interference, the non-logical and digressive and thus deficient norms, when writing in English. Ava views Chinese and English as having unique sets of rhetorical patterns in argumentative writing. By depicting argumentation without refutation as circular, digressive, and Chinese, Ava is reinforcing the superiority of English-style writing, which includes a refutation to make the essay logical and clear.

Ava's practice of contrastive rhetoric in her writing classroom is another example of her "consent" to the privileged status of the dominant group, in this case, English native speakers' ways of writing. By privileging English ways of writing over those of Chinese and depicting the former as direct, clear, and logical and the latter as backward, unclear, and illogical, Ava reproduces the hegemonic hierarchy between the West and the rest in her English writing class. The student's responses "um huh" in lines 13, 16, and 19 indicate that this hierarchical relation between English and Chinese writing may be taken up by the student. Now, not only does Ava depict the student as a deficient L2 writer, but the student also accepts the inferior identity imposed by Ava based on the dominant Western-based epistemology with regard to English writing. In order to write a "real" English essay (line 17), the student needs to follow the native speaker's rhetorical norms. The hegemonic structure in ELT is used not only to construct Ava's teacher identity as she did in excerpts 5 and 6. It could be also taken up by the student to construct her own writer identity. Ava is complicit in establishing the unequal relationship between her students and native English speakers when writing English, thus helping sustain the hegemonic structure in English writing education in her teaching context. It is fair to assume that the student will avoid this circular way of writing in order to write "real" English in the final exam.

A similar ideology, in that English rhetoric is viewed as superior, is observed in excerpts 8 and 9, a writing conference Ava has with another student (S2). Excerpt 8 takes place when Ava and S2 negotiate the meaning of the unclear sentence “there is an old saying that there is a reason for everything” in the essay shown in Figure 8.1.

[Excerpt Ava 8] Writing conference – Student 2
June 13 (00:57:04–01:02:26)

[English original]

- 1 A: So for example –
- 2 S2: Mm =
- 3 A: = There is an old saying that there is a reason for everything. What do you want to
- 4 say here.
- 5 S2: Uh (laugh) uh:
- 6 A: Yah, because usually when you say like this old saying, then kind of should – then
- 7 the next sentence, okay which means we already can guess from the next sentence
- 8 you are going to talk about.
- 9 S2: Uh
- 10 A: Yah, about a reason for everything, but then you jump to you know the traumatic
- 11 childhood may be one of the factors to cause their crimes. Then I feel how is this
- 12 sentence related to a reason for everything.
- 13 S2: Uh (laugh)
- 14 A: Yah.
- 15 S2: I – this is one of the reason.
- 16 A: O:kay, in such case, uh uh, then you can say take one instance, okay so uh like-
- 17 S2: (one reason)

Figure 8.1 Essay of Ava's Student 2 (Appendix D for full essay)

need clearer. ^{You need a clear topic sentence.} Another argument point is that the adult court ^{The fact} (don't) have a variety of flexible ^{regulation related to your claim of teenagers' immature mentality?} sentences like juvenile court do, ^{may cause juvenile delinquents under 14} the teenager is subject to more severe sentence in adults ^{relative if they are fined as} court. (There is an old saying that there is a reason for everything) The traumatic childhood ^{related to your argument? Make your sentences coherent.} might be one of the factors to cause their crimes. According to the research, the family is ^{what research? Don't fake a research. Cite the source} may ^{that} be the ^{top factor} to cause the juvenile crimes. Most juvenile criminals come from an unusual ^{come} family, ^{what do you mean by "unusual family"?} and the parents may have delivered false and distorted values. But the children ^{are} still young, they should be given chances to introspect. However, ^{if the teenager criminal} was judge by juvenile court, they can obtain the guidance and treatment. They ^{should be give} can have ^{unclear sentence. what do you mean here?} chances to correct their errors and make a fresh start. I firmly believe that the young ^{for a restant of their lives} perpetrator should be nurtured with ^{positive energy} Hence, they would have less ^{what do you mean by "positive energy"?} ^{This allows them to}

As shown in Figure 8.1, Ava gives many comments like “what do you mean here?”, “unclear sentence,” and “this sentence is awkward” (this comment appears on another page of the same essay) on this student’s essay. In the writing conference, the student asks Ava to give more guidance for improving this unclear writing. Ava then focuses on one sentence “There is an old saying that there is a reason for everything” (indicated by an arrow in Figure 8.1) as an example of a sentence that requires explanation. Ava asks the student to elaborate on what she is trying to say by “there is an old saying that there is a reason for everything” (line 3). Ava then points out that what makes it difficult for her to understand is that she cannot see the coherence between this sentence and the subsequent sentence “The traumatic

childhood may be one of the factors to cause their crimes” (Figure 8.1). After reading “There is an old saying that there is a reason for everything,” Ava expects the reasons in “there is a reason for everything” to be explained in the following sentence (lines 6–8). However, the student just “jump(ed) to the traumatic childhood may be one of the factors to cause their crimes” (lines 10–11) without further explaining the previous sentence. This disconnect between these two sentences confuses Ava, and she asks the student to elaborate. At Ava’s request, the student explains that “the traumatic childhood” in the following sentence is one of the reasons for “there is a reason for everything” (line 15).

It is helpful to note here that, as the student mentioned, “there is a reason for everything” is an old saying. It is a direct translation of an old Chinese idiom “事出必有因” which is still widely used in modern Chinese to describe the fact that everything happens for a reason. Chinese speakers often use old sayings and proverbs as authoritative sources to support their arguments, in both speaking and writing. Understanding this old saying in this way, it might not be difficult to see the coherence between the two sentences. That is, there is no cause–effect relation between these two sentences; rather, the old saying is used here as an authoritative voice to support the argument that “The traumatic childhood may be one of the factors to cause their crimes.” That is, juvenile crimes do not just happen all of a sudden; a young person’s upbringing can be one of the factors that cause the misbehaviour. However, Ava shows her difficulty understanding this old saying written by her student and deems it “unclear” and in need of revision. Even after the student explains, Ava still does not understand what the student is trying to say and thus asks her to explain it in Chinese so the student can fully express her intention in writing this sentence (excerpt 9).

[Excerpt Ava 9] Writing conference – Student 2
June 13 (00:57:04–01:02:26)

[English original]

(Lines 18–21 omitted)

22 A: What – okay sorry so what do you want to say in Chinese maybe say to me, that
23 would be easier.

24 S2: 阿,就是像小孩,像小孩童年有陰影就比較容易犯罪.

(Uh, like children, like if children have traumatic childhoods, they tend to commit crimes)

25 A: ↑Oh okay so uh take one instance uh people who are coming from some problem
26 like growing background, you can you know do more explanation by yourself,
27 coming from you know certain family background, um, have a higher tendency to
28 commit crimes, so then I can understand okay there is a reason for everything, this
29 reason is for example, some you know like some problematic or you know like
30 some specific family background and then cause the children you know to commit
31 crimes. Yah then in that case I can you know.

32 S2: Oh.

33 A: Make connections, yes.

After the student’s explanation in Mandarin (line 24), Ava finally understands what the student is trying to express and suggests to the student that she should “do more explanation” (line 26) such as “people who are coming from some problem like growing background,” (lines 25–26) or “coming from certain family background, um, have a higher tendency to commit crimes,” (lines 27–28). These explanations can help the reader make the connection and understand the reason why children commit crimes. If we read Ava’s comments presented here more closely, the problem that hinders Ava from understanding the student’s writing is not the statement “there is a reason for everything” and its obscure coherence with the following sentence. Instead, it is a need to develop and elaborate on the phrase “traumatic childhood” in subsequent sentences to fully explain the reasons for juvenile crime. Therefore, the statement “there is a reason for everything” needs no further revision. My interpretation

of why Ava commented on this old saying as being awkward and unclear is probably because it is *too Chinese* in characteristic to include in an English essay.

Probably because Ava cannot understand until the student explains her sentence in Chinese, the student interprets her failure to convey her meanings as resulting from her “always writing by Chinese thinking.” (excerpt 10, line 34).

[Excerpt Ava 10] Writing conference – Student 2
June 13 (00:57:04–01:02:26)

[English original]

- 34 S2: I think – I always write by Chinese thinking. (laughs)
35 A: Yah (laughs) yah I think all of us are like that because no matter what, we are
36 native Chinese writers so –
37 S2: Um um
38 A: But I guess you know basically like in English, as we said, we really care so much
39 about being clear, right, okay?
40 S2: Um
41 A: Especially like whether or not the idea flow is smooth, so that’s why when you
42 wrote there is an old saying there is a reason for everything – take the child crime,
43 for example, many cases are actually caused by their growing family background
44 or certain family background, something like that, and then you explain more,
45 okay?
46 S2: Um
47 A: So like people coming from abuse, oh, like children okay suffering from child
48 abuse, domestic violence are usually found, you know, higher tendency to commit
49 crimes, something like this. Then it’s kind of like you have this one and then go
50 deeper and after that go much deeper. That’s why it’s more straightforward, yah.
51 S2: Oh, not circular.
52 A: Yah yah yah, not circular.

The student shows some degree of embarrassment, as she laughs when saying “I always write by Chinese thinking” (line 34). In the following sentence, Ava casts both herself and her student as “native Chinese writers” (line 36), who inevitably use Chinese thinking in their English writing. She then reminds the student that “being clear” is very

important in English writing (lines 38–39); this is followed by her suggestions to guide the student to revise her paper so that her argument can be stated more clearly (lines 41–45; lines 47–50). For example, Ava suggests to the student that she should fully elaborate on one point before jumping to the next (lines 49–50: “you have this one and then go deeper and after that go much deeper”), so as to make her argumentation “more straightforward” (line 50). By associating the characteristics “being clear” and “being straightforward” with English writing, Ava’s comments on this student’s writing not only depict Chinese ways of argument as unclear and circular, but also position “Chinese writers” (line 36) as secondary to “English writers,” the ideal writers to follow when conducting argumentative writing in writing.

The student’s reply “Oh, not circular” (line 51) not only shows her understanding of Ava’s suggestion for improving her writing, but also shows that she might have taken up the inferior identity of the Chinese writer, who makes an argument in an unclear and circular manner. In this conversation with S2, Ava’s comments again reproduce the discourse of native-speakerism that favours Western communication patterns in English writing. This in turn creates a rhetorical hierarchy between English and Chinese ways of making arguments in writing, thus positioning Chinese speakers as less efficient writers than native English speakers. Moreover, this inferior identity, that of a Chinese writer, as suggested in the analysis, is taken up by S2 to evaluate her English writing and to view herself as an English writer. It is reasonable to assume that, in her future writing, the student will avoid phrases that involve “Chinese thinking,” such as “there is an old saying ...” that she used in this assignment, in order to produce a clear and straightforward English essay and to become a “good” English writer.

8.5 Summary

In this chapter, I have discussed how Ava constructed her professional legitimacy through negotiating with her students' resistance to the student-centered teaching approaches she used. When talking about her students' resistance to the teaching approaches she used, Ava made her native-speaking graduate students and American friends working in an American writing center the authorities by which to judge her students as lazy, passive, dependent, and lacking in critical thinking skills. Depicting her students as having a negative attitude toward learning, Ava legitimized the teaching methods she used. That is, the difficulty she had in implementing these student-centered pedagogies lay not in these pedagogies per se, but in her students' attitude toward learning, which kept them from seeing the benefits of student-centered teaching methods. I have argued that as Ava took native English speakers to be superior (i.e., Western as active and autonomous) and judged any difference as an indication of an inferior other (i.e., Chinese as passive and dependent), a colonial image of the cultural Self and cultural Other in ELT was activated, validating the Western-based teaching approaches she used. Ava made her Western-educated experience (e.g., exposure to "authentic" writing conferences) relevant to the interview conversation as a resource to position herself also as a *cultural Self* who knew the Western ways of teaching English writing and thus had the authority to teach it. The hierarchical image of the cultural Self and Other, the main discourse Ava aligned with to construct her teacher identity and teaching legitimacy, was also observed in Ava's interaction with her students in writing conferences. Using two writing conferences as examples, I showed how the hierarchical relation between Western/English and non-Western/non-English was reproduced in

teacher–student interaction and was taken up by the students to conduct their English writing and to construct their identities as English writers. In order to write a real English argumentation essay that can be characterized as straightforward, logical and direct, they needed to avoid Chinese English or Chinese ways of arguing such as being circular, digressive, and illogical in their English essays.

One finding in this chapter also indicated a conflict between Ava’s identities as an English writer, discussed in Chapter 5, and as an English writing teacher, discussed in this chapter. As a student writer studying in an American graduate program, Ava showed her agency in resisting the native-speakerism ideology prevalent in the program, which categorized her as an incompetent English writer who needed to follow Anglophone English writing norms. Instead, Ava constructed a legitimate non-native English writer identity whose English writing did not follow Anglophone English norms but yet was legitimate and valuable. However, as demonstrated in this chapter, the ideologies of the native speaker as superior and of English norms as the only standard were nonetheless foregrounded in the process of constructing Ava’s professional identity and in the writing conferences. As an English writer herself, Ava rejected the “dominant ways of seeing” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 237) of her American peers and professors as a way of identifying herself as an English writer; she instead saw her non-native or non-Anglophone way of writing as legitimate and valuable. Yet, as an English teacher, she aligned with the dominant way of seeing and seemed to offer few opportunities for her students to construct the same writer identity that she did as a student writer. My interpretation of the discrepancy between Ava as an English writer and an English teacher in relation to the discourse of native-speakerism is that native-like or Standard English was still viewed as the goal to achieve and English native speakers were

considered the most legitimate teachers when teaching English in Taiwan (Liao, 2015).

Therefore, to be a good and legitimate English teacher in that local context, Ava chose to follow the ways in which English native speakers teach English and to teach only Standard English, not other localized forms.

Now, I move on to the last finding chapter of this dissertation and to a discussion of Nita's teacher identity construction and her teaching of English writing in another Taiwanese university.

CHAPTER 9: NITA AS A PRODUCER OF GOOD TEST TAKERS

9.1 Introduction

Nita earned her master's degree in linguistics in the United States and her PhD in curriculum studies in New Zealand, specializing in second language writing. After graduating from her PhD program, Nita taught mainly English writing for 13 years in several universities in Taiwan. Despite the negative writing experiences Nita had in her graduate program (see Chapter 5), she showed a positive attitude toward the overall professional training in her graduate studies in New Zealand. As shown in excerpts 1 and 2, this professional training, particularly knowledge of the Western ways of teaching, gave her the confidence to teach after returning to Taiwan. Based on her writing and teaching experiences as well as her professional training in the United States and New Zealand, Nita developed the teaching belief that focusing too much on accuracy or grammar hinders English writers from expressing their ideas smoothly. In her teaching, therefore, she appeared to emphasize fluency more than accuracy, and she stated that this teaching approach could help students better express their ideas in writing. Nevertheless, her professional knowledge and legitimacy was challenged by a student and her department head for not meeting the student's needs in learning English—passing standardized tests (e.g., TOEIC, IELTS). The contradiction between the student's and her department's expectations of her teaching and her own teaching beliefs and philosophy caused Nita to lose her passion for teaching English writing. Nita's case indicates that language teacher identity construction is highly dependent on context (Duff & Uchida, 1997; Varghese et al., 2005). Students' and administrators' expectations and the ideologies they hold about how English should be taught all play vital roles in constructing language teacher identity and teaching practices.

In this chapter, I first discuss how Nita views herself as an English writing teacher in relation to her Western-educated background (excerpts 1 and 2). I then present the student's complaints about Nita's teaching methods (excerpts 3 and 4) and Nita's response and defense in view of these complaints (excerpts 5 and 6). In excerpts 7 to 9, I discuss how Nita has been positioned by her student, department and university. Finally, I report Nita's decision to take a break from teaching writing as a result of the conflict between her professional identity and the expectations of her students and department (excerpt 10).

9.2 Constructing professional legitimacy from “洋墨水” or “West-ink”

As seen with Beth and Sarah in Chapter 7, Nita's Western-educated experiences afford her to construct an in-between identity. The professional knowledge, such as teaching methods, she obtained during several years of immersion in Western education is the primary qualification she takes to distinguish herself from locally educated and native English-speaking teachers and to construct her professional legitimacy compared to these groups of teachers.

At the beginning of this conversation, I ask Nita to comment on the influence of her Western-educated experiences on her teaching of English writing in Taiwan. She responds that it gives her more confidence compared to other teachers because she “was really immersed in the West-ink” (line 5).

[Excerpt Nita 1] Interview
July 26 (1:12:30–1:14:09)

[Mandarin]

- 1 R: 你從美國拿到 MA, 然後從紐西蘭拿到 PHD, 有這個身份之後,
- 2 你覺得你的(.) 角色是什麼. 尤其是在台灣教寫作這一塊的角色

- 3 是什麼。
 4 N: 這個學位是讓我對外比較可以 confident 的,等於是我是真的有去混過
 5 洋墨水的。
 6 R: 恩
 7 N: 挖米西臺式。(台灣國語)
 8 我不是台式的所以請你相信我。(笑)
 9 R: (笑)不是臺式的。
 10 N: 我的意思是說我那個也是有經過碰過洋墨水的,我的意思就是我不是在臺灣
 11 土法煉鋼,就是可能可以給我這種 status 拉。
 12 R: 恩:

[English translation]

- 1 R: You've got a MA from the US, then PhD from NZ. So having diplomas from
 2 overseas, what do you think (.) your role is (in) teaching English writing in
 3 Taiwan.
 4 N: This diploma makes me more confident than others, like I
 5 was really immersed in the West-ink.
 6 R: Uh
 7 N: I am not Taiwanese style. (Taiwanese-accented Mandarin), I am not
 8 Taiwanese style so please believe in me. (laughs)
 9 R: (laughs) Not Taiwanese style.
 10 N: I meant I had been in West-ink, what I meant is I am not trained in Taiwanese
 11 traditional ways, so it can probably give me this kind of status.
 12 R: Uh:

In this account, Nita introduces a very interesting phrase, “洋墨水” or “West-ink” (line 5). 洋 refers to “West” and 墨水 means “ink.” Drinking or being immersed in “West-ink” is a term originally used to describe Chinese students studying in English-speaking countries back at the time when people were still using paper and ink to write for communication. This phrase is still very often used among Chinese speakers to refer to students studying in Western countries, particularly those developed English-speaking countries with cutting-edge technology and at the forefront of scientific knowledge. Therefore, people who have been “drinking West-ink” or have been “immersed in West-ink”

are those Western-educated returnees who bring back these most advanced skills and knowledge to contribute to their home country. By using this phrase, Nita positions herself as one of these contributors, who has obtained the innovative Western knowledge needed to contribute to English education in Taiwan.

Given that she was immersed for several years in “West-ink,” she was not trained “in Taiwanese traditional ways” (line 10–11). Therefore, she is now “not Taiwanese style” (line 7). In addition to “West-ink,” Nita introduces two characters here to construct her professional identity: “I am not Taiwanese style” (line 7) and “I am not trained in traditional Taiwanese ways” (lines 10–11). Particularly, in the utterance “I am not trained in Taiwanese traditional ways” (lines 10–11), Nita invokes another group of teachers, “local teachers trained in Taiwanese ways” to the conversation and distances herself from them. Although not much detail is provided about the Taiwanese “ways” or “styles” mentioned here, as a Taiwanese myself, I interpret Taiwanese “style” and “ways” to mean traditional methods of learning and teaching English often used in Taiwan, such as teacher-centered approaches and the grammar-translation method. More interestingly, Nita uses Taiwanese-accented Mandarin to utter the phrase “Taiwanese style” in line 7. In Taiwan, Taiwanese-accented Mandarin is often used by older people who have received little formal education. The accent is often associated with speakers who are less educated, traditional, or even vulgar and backward. Therefore, Nita’s use of Taiwanese-accented Mandarin when uttering “Taiwanese style” depicts the Taiwanese traditional ways of teaching and learning as backward and somehow problematic in teaching and learning English. Meanwhile, by constructing “West-ink” as advanced and well-educated and Taiwanese style as backward and less educated, Nita’s comments position herself as a more privileged teacher than the locally trained

teachers, whose professional knowledge might be too traditional, backward, and thus limited in its ability to contribute to English education in Taiwan. In this conversation, the “Western styles and ways” that she was trained in for several years in the West are taken as important capital to construct her professional legitimacy: she is not only a “confident English writing teacher” with this advanced knowledge gained from the West, but also a “better English writing teacher” compared to the domestically trained teachers without this pedagogical knowledge.

The pedagogical knowledge Nita obtained during her study in New Zealand is not only taken as capital to distinguish herself from locally educated teachers. As shown in excerpt 2, it is also used to construct her legitimacy of teaching English writing when comparing herself to native English-speaking teachers.

[Extract Nita 2] Interview
July 26 (1:14:11–1:15:18)

[Mandarin]

13 R: 恩

14 N: 因為還是會有一些迷思, 就是覺得 (3.5) 好像

15 洋人比較會教吧. 然後不過 writing 這塊我常常會強調就是

16 說有經過訓練的知識- 有專業知識的人比較會教.

17 這個的話(1.3) 我是 non-native speaker 我可能在教,

18 我可以贏過你[native English speakers].

19 R: 恩

20 N: 我寫我不一定可以贏過 native speaker. 會讓我-

21 我有去學, 當然我也去過國外, 會讓我比較有

22 信心吧, 阿別人對我也比較有信心吧.

[English translation]

13 R: So – um:

14 N: Because there are still some myths, like that (3.5) native speakers are better at

15 teaching. But in terms of writing, what I often emphasize is that people

- 16 who have knowledge gained from training – with professional knowledge – are
17 better at teaching. From this perspective (1.3) I am a non-native speaker, I am
18 teaching, and I can teach better than you [native English speakers].
19 R: Uh
20 N: Speaking of writing, not necessarily I can write better than native speakers.
21 It makes me – I learned, and of course I went overseas for study, this makes
22 me feel more confident, and make others show more confidence in me too.

Although people in Taiwan often hold the myth that native English speakers can teach English better (line 14), Nita does not agree, as shown in this conversation. In terms of writing competence, she might not be better than native speakers (line 20). Yet, when speaking of teaching competence, Nita shows confidence that she can do better than native English speakers who have no professional training in ELT or second language writing (lines 20–22). Although Nita does not specify particular kinds of teaching knowledge, the pedagogical knowledge she gained from her Western-educated training has no doubt endowed her with confidence as well as a sense of legitimacy in teaching English writing compared with native English-speaking teachers.

As shown in excerpts 1 and 2, Western professional training and instructional knowledge are both crucial forms of capital Nita uses to distinguish herself from locally educated and native English-speaking teachers. Like Beth and Sarah, the Western training experiences creates a third space (Bhabha, 1994) between native-speaking and non-native-speaking colleagues for Nita to construct her sense of legitimacy and confidence to teaching English writing in her university. Nevertheless, Nita's confidence and professional identity are not ratified by her student and department head. During the semester when the data was collected, Nita received several letters of complaint from one student, accusing her of using inappropriate teaching methods that neglect students' learning needs—specifically, to achieve high scores on standardized tests like the TOEIC. While negotiating challenges from

this student and her department head about the instructional methods she believed to be the most beneficial to students, Nita gradually lost her sense of legitimacy in teaching English writing.

9.3 Being positioned as an unprofessional teacher

The writing class Nita taught was a year-long class. This study was conducted in the second term. During the first term, Nita asked the students to write an argumentative essay on topics she suggested herself. Not long after I started observing the class in the second term, Nita received negative feedback from a student about the criteria she used to assess these essays, and about not receiving enough corrective feedback from Nita throughout the course. The comments were posted on the campus online platform, where students could give suggestions anonymously about the classes they were taking. The online evaluations were then sent via email to the instructors who had received students' feedback. Nita sent this anonymous feedback to me by email as soon as she received it. The feedback is presented in excerpts 3 and 4.

[Excerpt Nita 3] Email correspondence with Nita
March 11

[Mandarin]

- 1 ST: 就愚生觀察,有些同學所寫的文章
- 2 非常優秀,除了文章結構完整,文法錯誤
- 3 也較少.有些同學所寫之文章即使字數很多,
- 4 但在"品質上"跟前述同學相差甚遠,
- 5 但老師所給之分數似乎"以量致勝",而較少著
- 6 重於"品質上"以致於同學間分數都差不多,
- 7 這是愚生為身旁同學抱不平的.

[English translation]

- 1 ST: According to my observation, essays written by some classmates were pretty
- 2 outstanding. They not only had coherent organization, they also contained few
- 3 grammatical errors. Some may write many words, however, the “quality”
- 4 is far from those written by the classmates I have just mentioned. However, your
- 5 evaluation criteria seemed to be based on “quantity over quality.” As a result,
- 6 every classmate received a very similar score, which I think very unfair to the
- 7 classmates who I know can write well.

In this evaluation, the student is challenging Nita’s assessment criteria, in which she emphasizes quantity (i.e. word count) over quality (i.e. proper organization and grammar) (line 5). The student considers this quantity-oriented criterion unfair because those who worked hard on coherent organization (line 2) and proper grammar (line 3) received the same scores as those who did not pay attention to these writing features. It is worth noting that this student categorizes those who can use proper grammar and coherent organization as “outstanding students” (line 2). This indicates that the student takes accuracy as the most important component to develop in his writing. Nita’s focus on fluency (i.e. quantity) for assessment is criticized in that it neglects the student’s learning needs to become an “outstanding student.”

The same student made another comment in the same evaluation form about the use of peer review in Nita’s class, which is presented in excerpt 4.

[Excerpt Nita 4] Email correspondence with Nita
March 11

[Mandarin]

- 1 ST: 就同學feedback而言,因為同學間程度參差不齊,
- 2 能給的feedback有限,能指出同學寫作上的錯誤及建議也有限.
- 3 認真的同學寫好了文章,但還是覺得自己所寫文章稍嫌不足,
- 4 也不知道怎樣才能讓自己的文章變得更完整除了自己

- 5 文法句型的熟練度不夠,句型應用上的合適性不了解外,
- 6 若有專業之老師每次的修改,指正和建議相信會更加進步.
- 7 藉此,除了讓同儕之間在錯誤中成長,也可從別人犯之
- 8 寫作錯誤警惕自己!更希望老師可以多上一些,
- 9 如:同學常犯寫作毛病解析,寫作常用句型分析等等
- 10 愚生認為這樣對我們幫助會較大的.

[English translation]

- 1 ST: Speaking of peer feedback, given discrepant competence among us,
- 2 we can provide very limited helpful feedback to point out the errors and give
- 3 suggestions to our peers. When the hardworking students finish writing,
- 4 they often have no idea about how to improve their writing into more mature,
- 5 grammatical sentences and appropriate sentence structure. If there were a
- 6 professional teacher to point this out ... and suggest how to improve, there would
- 7 be progress. Therefore, besides learning from peers and from each other's
- 8 mistakes, I hope ... you can talk more about the commonly used sentence
- 9 structures and the errors often made by students. I believe the analysis of
- 10 these (language issues) will benefit us more.

The student is talking about the limited benefits peer feedback can bring to students' writing. His concern is that in a class where students have different levels of proficiency in English, peer feedback is not helpful for advanced students, because the less competent students are not able to point out grammatical errors to improve their writing (lines 3–5). In this evaluation, correct grammar and sentence structure are again mentioned as the goal for students' learning. Yet, Nita's teaching approach, peer review, cannot help the students to achieve their learning goal. The student goes on to say that what students need is “a professional teacher” (line 6) to point out grammatical errors and provide suggestions for revision. By depicting a professional teacher with the qualities such as “pointing out students' errors” and “giving answers and suggestions for revision,” this student categorizes Nita as an “unprofessional teacher” who practices peer feedback and does not provide enough

corrective feedback to improve her students' writing. At the end of the feedback, the student suggests to Nita that she talks more in class about sentence structure and grammar in order to improve students' writing ability (lines 8–9).

In the student's evaluation presented in excerpts 3 and 4, Nita is positioned as an “unprofessional teacher” who does not provide enough grammar instruction in class or on essays, and who does not care about her students' learning needs in English writing. Nita appeared to be upset by this evaluation and decided to bring this issue to the class in the following week. Nita asked me not to attend the class for observation because she felt embarrassed to have me there. Instead, Nita shared with me the letter she sent to the class before their conversation. Excerpt 5 is a part of Nita's letter.

[Excerpt Nita 5] Nita's email to the class
March 11

[English original]

1 N: My teaching approach of “fluency” first does not mean that students' grades
2 depend on their essay length. It is impossible for me as a professional writing
3 teacher to do so. To ask students to write more words is to encourage students
4 to practice without being hindered by grammar. If grammatical difficulties stop
5 students writing, then students eventually cannot write. The score I gave is to
6 encourage your performance, instead of judging your achievement. If one does
7 not write well but I still can see the effort, the score should not discourage the
8 student's hard working

In this letter, Nita first states that her evaluation approach is fluency-based rather than length-oriented (lines 1–2) with an aim to encourage students to express their ideas and thoughts without worrying too much about grammar. Nita further elaborates that if grammar is prioritized, it might stop students from freely expressing their ideas (lines 4–5). When ideas cannot be fully and clearly expressed, writing would not take place; students thus cannot

really learn how to write in English (line 5). In this email, Nita positions herself as a teacher who cares about students' struggles with English grammar when writing and who hopes students will write more and freely without carrying too many of these emotional burdens. With this positioning, Nita rejects the label of "unprofessional teacher" who does not care about her students' writing improvement and learning needs, as the student accused her in the evaluations. The emphasis on being able to express ideas over writing correct grammar when writing indicates that Nita seems to accept, if not encourage, alternative English forms used in students writing as long as they can express their ideas clearly. As Nita continues in excerpt 6, she gives students the rationale for her weighting fluency over accuracy; here, she redefines the meanings of "good English writing" and "professional teacher," as a response to the student's complains.

[Excerpt Nita 6] Nita's email to the class
March 11

[English original]

- 1 N: To know grammar is one thing, to learn how to write is another, which needs
- 2 to cover more aspects. Good grammar does not necessarily make good writing,
- 3 just as long essays do not necessarily get good grades. Good writing needs at
- 4 least three aspects: grammar, content, and organization ... Please trust me.
- 5 What I have done is what I think the best for you ... As a professional
- 6 teacher, I learn to listen to what students say. Please learn to (listen to) what
- 7 the teacher say at the same time.

In this excerpt, Nita explicitly displays her professionalism in teaching English writing. First, she states her teaching philosophy that "to know grammar is one thing, to learn how to write is another" (line 1). She goes on to elaborate that good writing requires not only grammar but also content and organization (line 4). What Nita has done by showing her professionalism here is not merely to redefine what constitutes "good English writing

competence” but also to reconstruct herself as “a professional writing teacher.” That is, while the student takes grammar knowledge as the only goal for learning English writing and uses this aspect to accuse Nita of being an unprofessional teacher, Nita redefines good English writing as a means to convey and organize one’s ideas. Nita thus positions herself as a professional writing teacher who knows how to improve students’ writing in ways that extend beyond grammar knowledge. Again, not taking grammar or accuracy as the only component to teach and learn in her writing class, Nita renders a possibility for learning and writing English in pluralized forms as a meaningful means for expressing and exchanging ideas. At the end of the letter, positioning herself as a “professional teacher” (lines 5–6) who knows what works the best for students to learn English writing (line 5: “what I have done is what I think the best for you”), Nita explicitly refuses to take up the “unprofessional language teacher” identity her student projects on her owing to her use of proficiency-over-accuracy teaching approaches.

In the process of negotiating with her student’s complains, by displaying her professional knowledge about fluency-oriented teaching approaches and by redefining that good English writing requires not only grammar knowledge but also ideas and organization, Nita constructs herself as a professional and legitimate teacher who has knowledge and competency to develop students’ English writing proficiency. However, as shown in next section, her professional knowledge is again challenged by the same student and even by her department head and university president for not being able to help students reach high scores in standardized tests. The discrepancy between her professional identity and the teacher role expected by her students and department head has made Nita lose her sense of professional legitimacy.

After the semester had ended, Nita received another negative evaluation of her teaching. This time, the complaints were sent directly to the department head and later handed to Nita; they are presented in next section (excerpts 7 and 8).

9.4 Teacher as a producer of good test takers

Although it was anonymous, from the tone and invocation, Nita said that she got the sense that the complaint was from the same student. Because of the constant complaints she had received throughout the semester, this issue had also been brought up in several departmental meetings, and the faculty members had discussed how to tackle similar complaints. Nita also had several conversations with her department head to discuss how to improve future students' writing ability after receiving the complaints. Nita expressed that what really upset her was that many of her colleagues aligned with the student and suggested that all English writing teachers in the department should make a greater effort to address students' grammatical errors, so as to avoid similar complaints. This no doubt challenged Nita's professional legitimacy and discouraged her from using the same approach to teach English writing. When this happened, I had already finished data collection and had left the research site. With all the distress and discouragement, Nita emailed me four months later for a Skype meeting to express her stress about the student's further complaints (excerpts 7 and 8).

Excerpt 7 took place when Nita read the letter of complaint to me in the Skype interview. In the letter to the departmental head, the student provides two examples of how his friends benefited from their writing teachers at another university to express his dissatisfaction with Nita's teaching.

[Excerpt Nita 7] Skype interview
November 18 (00:16:25–00:17:02)

[Mandarin]

- 1 N: 他的同學考 955, “文理[大學]的老師是一步一步
- 2 教導學生, 親自改作文. 最後那個非英文系
- 3 的同學, 也只是輔系英文, 竟然贏了阿. 我想
- 4 我沒有比較不用功, 或不配合老師.” 然後呢,
- 5 他有講”大二時我們班有兩個轉學生, 他們都
- 6 不是英文系, 但他們的英檢成績卻比我們高很多.
- 7 那現在大三了, 我乾脆自己提升我自己的英文成程度,
- 8 大量做題目, 閱讀. 我的英文程度也在半年之後自行
- 9 提升了很多.” 然後他最後有一句, “我真的要
- 10 很感謝我的高中老師以及
- 11 自己進修.”
- 12 R: ↑阿

[English translation]

- 1 N: His non-English major friend got 955. “The teachers at his university
- 2 teach them step-by-step, grading the paper by themselves. At the end, that non-
- 3 English major friend won [by scores]. I think I am making no less effort than
- 4 him, or not following the teacher’s instruction for learning.” Then, s/he also
- 5 mentioned that “there were two students in our writing class who just
- 6 transferred to this university. Both were non-English majors, but their test
- 7 scores were <much higher> than ours. So now I’m in junior year, I decided to
- 8 upgrade my own English level, do lots of exercises and reading. My English
- 9 ability [indicated in another TOEIC test he took later] has improved a lot
- 10 after half a year.” Then he has a final note, “I really need to thank my high school
- 11 teacher and my effort to self-study.”
- 12 R: ↑Ah

First of all, compared to a friend studying at another university, the TOEIC score of the student making this complaint was far lower. While the friend achieved a score of 955 out of a possible 990, this student only scored 750 (interview: November 18, 00:18:07).

According to this student, the primary factor helping his friend to achieve a high score is that she had teachers who taught her “step-by-step” and that the teachers “grade[d] papers by themselves” (line 2). Indexed by “teach[ing] step-by-step” and “grad[ing] papers by themselves,” this student implicitly attributes his low TOEIC score to Nita’s unsuccessful teaching, which focuses on fluency rather than on step-by-step grammar explanation, and which has the students review each other’s papers instead of the teacher giving detailed corrective feedback.

The student compares his TOEIC score with those of another two students in the same writing class to emphasize his dissatisfaction with Nita’s teaching (lines 5–7). These two students had recently transferred from another university to Nang University, where Nita was teaching. Although they had majored in departments unrelated to English before studying at Nang University, the two students’ TOEIC scores were higher than those of Nita’s current students (lines 6–7). Drawing on his low TOEIC score compared with those of other students, this student underscores Nita’s inability to teach English efficiently. Interestingly, although there is no writing section in the TOEIC test, this student blamed Nita, a writing teacher, for his low score on the TOEIC.

Because his test scores did not improve after Nita’s writing class, this student decided to study alone by doing exercises and reading intensively on his own (lines 7–8). After half a year, he took another TOEIC test and his score improved enormously (lines 8–9). This student attributed his achievement to “my effort to self-study” and “my high school teacher” (line 11). The absence of gratitude to Nita confirms the student’s dissatisfaction with Nita’s teaching, which the student felt did not provide the corrective feedback that he needed to get

a high TOEIC score. In excerpt 8, Nita goes on to elaborate on her student's comparison between her and the high school teacher.

[Excerpt Nita 8] Skype interview
November 18 (00:17:05–00:17:56)

[Mandarin]

- 13 N: “主任,靜宜英文是靜宜的招牌,而我所考的英檢成績,”
14 齣,又是英檢成績。
15 R: 恩
16 N: “大家以為是南大,”他現在要講的是,
17 “大家以為是南大教出來的,但背後是我
18 那默默跟我一樣(.)大學學歷,高中老師
19 教出來改出來的.為什麼,”最後一個
20 句子是,“<how ironic it is>”

[English translation]

- 13 N: “Dear department head, the English department is the signature of Nang
14 University. However, the test score I've got”, oh, the test score again.
15 R: Mm
16 N: “People would think it's because of Nang University.” What he is trying to say
17 is, people would think it (his TOEIC score) is a result of learning from
18 Nang University, but actually “it should go to my high school teacher who
19 holds a bachelor's degree just like me. Why?” The last sentence is,
20 “<how ironic it is>”

In the letter of complaint, the student said to the department head, “the English department is the signature of Nang University.” (lines 13–14). However, the TOEIC grade he got was not the result of the teaching he received in the department (lines 17–18); rather, it was his high school teacher, who had only a bachelor's degree but who gave him the solid foundation he needed to get a high TOEIC score (lines 18–19). In Taiwan, English education in high school is exam-oriented. Students learn English as a subject in order to get good

scores for university admission. High school teachers are strict in training students to memorize enormous lists of English vocabulary or do a lot of grammar exercises. The student expresses that he finds very ironic (line 20) because he seems to have learned more from his high school teacher with only a bachelor's degree than from his university teachers, including Nita, with PhD degrees. Despite Nita's several years of graduate training in TESOL and L2 writing, Nita is now positioned by the student as less capable in teaching English than even the student's high school teacher, simply because she does not put enough emphasis on grammar learning in her writing class.

It is worth discussing the word “招牌” or “signature,” in line 13, which the student uses to describe the English department where Nita is teaching (line 13: “English department is the signature of Nang University.”). A 招牌 or *signature* originally refers to the most popular dish from a restaurant. In Taiwan, it is also very commonly used to describe the most noticeable product of a company, or the most valuable character that makes a person noticeable. Nang University has long been known nationwide for its English department and its students' outstanding English competence. It is this reputation that attracts students to study at Nang University and the English department. By relating the English department to a *signature*, the student seems to suggest that English competence is treated as a means by which the university's reputation is maintained, and by which new students are recruited. From the letters of complaint, it is not hard to see that this student views standardized tests such as the TOEIC as indicators of good English competence. In this sense, the higher the scores achieved by students on standardized tests, the better the university's reputation and the more students it can attract. Conversely, the fame of the university is also beneficial to students, as it enables them to get better jobs after graduation.

The word choice of “signature” connotes English competence as a commodity (Kubota, 2011; Park, 2010, 2011), indicating that it can bring material returns both to the university (e.g., reputation) and to the students (e.g., jobs). If students’ English competence is the selling point of the department and university, the teacher is responsible for producing students’ competence, the capital by which the university and English department are made a competitive brand. From this perspective, teaching is also commodified. Teachers are positioned as service providers, working for the students and the university—responsible for producing and maintaining the signature—students’ English competence and high test scores. For the student, English competence refers to good grammar knowledge to get high scores in standardized tests. Therefore, Nita, as a service provider, is responsible for helping students with grammar learning in order to achieve high scores in tests, so as to maintain the signature of the university. The student has positioned Nita as an inefficient service provider who is unable to advance his grammar ability and who fails to produce good test takers, the valuable capital for the university to maintain its reputation and competitiveness. This service-provider identity projected by her student runs counter to Nita’s own teacher identity, as she endeavours to help students learn English writing beyond the grammatical level and to learn to express ideas more freely and fully in English writing.

Nita appears to be upset when she finds that her department and university also tend to evaluate teachers’ teaching upon their ability to establish students’ grammar ability and achieve high scores in the TOEIC. Nita told me in another interview (November 10, 2012, 00:23:45) that the university president had recently received complaints from several employers (e.g., publishers, international trade companies) about the inadequate English competence of the department’s graduates (e.g., several verbs together in one sentence or no

verb in one sentence) in the workplace. After these complaints, the university president suggested that Nita's department head initiate a curriculum reform by adopting teaching methods from the Foreign Language Teaching Center, the institution in the university that takes charge of the English learning of non-English majors, who seems to do well in helping students get good grades in tests like TOEIC or GEPT⁹. When I was on site, the curriculum reform was still under discussion. However, this possible reform, as discussed in excerpt 9, seems to impact on how the department is going to evaluate the teachers' role and teaching performance.

[Excerpt Nita 9] Skype interview
November 18 (00:21:14–00:23:34)

[Mandarin]

- 1 N: 我跟你講,教學中心他們那邊
- 2 有一套, 那校長壓力給系主任,就希
- 3 望他也搞一套出來拯救我們英文系的.
- 4 R: 恩恩恩恩
- 5 N: (inaudible) 就是翻譯出來的那種,
- 6 亂七八糟的阿.他們有好多套,叫他們通過
- 7 GEPT, 他有業績的這種績效阿,實施起來,從可能
- 8 只有百分之十的人有,之後就百分之三十的人通過,
- 9 什麼什麼的, 哪一級哪一級這種的阿.對,他們那邊是有績效的阿.
- 10 R: 恩

⁹ General English Proficiency Test, a similar test to TOEIC designed and developed by Taiwanese test writers. Different from TOEIC is that in addition to listening, speaking and reading sections, GEPT includes writing section in the test.

[English translation]

- 1 N: Let me tell you, there is a set of methods in the Foreign Language Teaching
2 Center¹⁰, and the president put pressure on our department head, like hoping he
3 adopts similar methods to solve the problems in our English department.
4 R: Mm huh mm huh
5 N: (Inaudible) like grammar-translation method, pretty messy you know. They
6 have many methods, like helping students to pass GEPT. They [the Foreign
7 Language Center] evaluate teachers by their business performance. Like there
8 was only 10% at the beginning but they ended up with 30% of students
9 passing the exams, like which levels students achieved, something like that.
10 R: Mm

Like many other Asian countries (e.g., Korean and Japan; see Kubota, 2011; Park, 2011), an increasing number of companies in Taiwan nowadays require their potential employees to reach minimum scores on the TOEIC or GEPT. To this end, the Foreign Language Teaching Center designs “a set of methods” (line 1) to help non-English majors to reach high scores in these tests (line 6). Because of the complaints from the employers of the department’s graduates, the university president suggested that the department head follow the methodologies used in the Foreign Language Teaching Center to increase students’ English proficiency and test scores (lines 2-3). One of the methods mentioned in this conversation is the grammar-translation method (Line 5). How the grammar-translation method can help students to obtain high scores in these tests is not explained by Nita. My interpretation is that this is because the TOEIC, GEPT, and other standardized tests (TOEFL, IELTS) rely heavily on multiple-choice items to assess test takers’ vocabulary and grammar knowledge. The grammar-translation method, which is designed to teach L2 learners grammar rules, is thus considered an efficient method to acquaint students with the grammar

¹⁰ The Foreign Language Teaching Center is an institution of Nang University where non-English majors can take English courses.

knowledge they need to pass the exams. Now, not only Nita's student but also her department head and university president have all positioned her as a producer of good test takers in standardized tests whose responsibility is to enhance students' grammar ability to perform well in these tests.

In line 7, Nita describes how the teachers in the language center are evaluated according to their "business performance," that is, by how many students in the class have achieved the required GEPT scores (intermediate level for non-English majors; equivalent to TOEIC 550). For example, if there is a 20% increase in the number of students who pass the exam after taking the course, the teachers are highly evaluated (line 8). Relating the teachers' teaching to "business performance" and "sales revenue" (10% to 30% of students passing exams), Nita indicates that the Foreign Language Teaching Center treats the teacher as a "salesperson" who is evaluated according to sales revenue (e.g., a 20% increase in the number of students passing the exams) he or she has achieved. The more students can pass the exam, the more valuable the teacher is. Unfortunately, when the English department adopts the methods the language center is using, the teachers in the department, including Nita, will also be evaluated by their "sales revenue"—the numbers of students passing the tests.

Through excerpt 1 to 9, Nita's student has shown strong resistance to Nita's use of peer review and her fluency-over-accuracy approach toward teaching English writing. Nita has been accused by this student of not being able to provide adequate instruction in grammar and of failing to advance her students' English competence sufficiently to obtain high scores on standardized tests like the TOEIC. The student's concerns about Nita's teaching reflect the concerns of the department and university, which have been planning a

curriculum reform for the department to enhance students' writing ability, particularly in grammar knowledge to obtain good scores on standardized tests. Although viewing and presenting herself as a professional English writing teacher (excerpts 5 and 6) with the confidence (excerpts 1 and 2) to improve students' English writing beyond the grammatical level, Nita's professional identity seems to be compromised as teaching in this exam-oriented institution where the students and department head position her merely as a producer of good test takers and even a salesperson whose major responsibility is to increase students' grammar knowledge and their test scores.

Standardized tests such as the TOEIC and GEPT have created negative washback not only on Nita's professional identity construction but also on Nita's practices of teaching English writing. Positioning herself as a "professional English writing teacher" (excerpt 5, lines 2–3), she believes that learning writing takes place only when students can fully express their ideas in writing (excerpt 5, lines 4–5: "If grammatical difficulties stop students writing, then students eventually cannot write"). Emphasizing students' idea expression and fluency rather than on grammatical accuracy, Nita tried in her class to encourage students to freely express their ideas without being hindered by other psychological burdens such as thinking about grammar rules. Nevertheless, the student and department's focus on students' performance on standardized tests has placed the writing teacher as a "service provider" who is responsible for producing as many as good test takers and even as a "salesperson" working for the student and for the university, whose value is calibrated according to the number of students who pass certain tests. Being positioned as such, Nita's professional knowledge and legitimacy that she constructed as displayed in excerpts 1, 2, 5, and 6 are being denied. In order to be a professional and legitimate teacher in her department, she has to shift her

instructional focus from encouraging students to freely and fully express their ideas in writing to building students' strong grammar knowledge so that they can get the right answer in multiple-choice questions on standardized tests. The contradiction between her professional identity and that expected by her students, the department, and the university makes Nita inclined to give up teaching English writing and even to leave the university, as demonstrated in excerpt 10.

[Excerpt Nita 10] Skype interview
November 18 (00:18:33–00:19:46)

[Mandarin]

- 1 N: 如果都是用這樣(要老師改)錯誤,用眼睛來放大 writing 老師,我就說-
- 2 我不教了(CAP).
- 3 R: 恩
- 4 N: 甚至因為這樣子,我也不想在南大了.
- 5 R: Mm
- 6 (0.3)
- 7 R: ↑阿: 那麼嚴重?
- 8 N: (Inaudible) 國中大家分數一下來,然後大家要來看
- 9 哪一班考幾分這種事情,我已經是 PhD 了耶,
- 10 還不是就是不要這樣子的這種.
- 11 R: 恩

[English translation]

- 1 N: If using (ability to correct) mistakes to evaluate writing teacher, I said – I
- 2 DON'T WANT TO TEACH. (writing)
- 3 R: Mm
- 4 N: Because of this, I don't want to teach at Nang University.
- 5 R: Mm
- 6 (0.3)
- 7 R: ↑Ah: that serious?
- 8 N: (Inaudible) like in high school people compare which class got the highest
- 9 score after each exam, I am already a PhD eh:

10 What I want to do is to avoid things like this.

11 R: Mm

Nita complains that if the people in the department keep judging teachers by the extent to which students' grammatical mistakes have been corrected (line 1), then she does not want to teach English writing (lines 1–2). As indexed in the louder volume “I DON'T WANT TO TEACH” (lines 1–2), Nita is getting emotional and upset about how she has been treated by the student and the university. Even though she is a PhD with professional training in English language education, she is expected to act like a high school teacher, teaching only for high scores in tests (lines 8–10). Her professional knowledge, including that which she gained from the Western graduate programs (e.g., peer review and fluency-oriented methods) she takes as crucial capital to construct her professional legitimacy and her contributions to students' learning are denied by her student and the department. This denial even makes Nita think about leaving the university, as she says “I don't want to teach at Nang University” (line 4). In a casual conversation after this study had ended, I learned that Nita had stayed in the same department. However, she decided to take one-year break from teaching English writing before she was ready to adjust herself to meet the expectations from the students, the department and the university, and the influence they could bring to her teaching practices and choices.

As Jenkins (2013) observes, standardized tests and their preparation materials are still native-speaker-based and tend to promote “native English normativeness” (p. 57). It is fair to argue that the closer to native-like proficiency, the higher the scores one can get in any of these standardized tests. In other words, native English speakers and their English norms still hold privileged status in Nita's department, at least for English writing education. When English is taught as a commodified entity and standardized set of knowledge, Nita's role as a

teacher is to be a productive producer of good test takers who is able to use efficient teaching methods (e.g., the grammar-translation method or teacher's corrective feedback) to bring about students' native-like competency to get high scores in tests. Yet, the teacher role expected by Nita's student and department contradicts Nita's identity as one who considers that the fluency-over-accuracy method benefits students' writing development the most. Given these conflicts and the lack of support from her department, Nita lost her motivation to teach English writing in the department, and decided to take a short break before again teaching any writing courses. The ideology of native-speakerism embedded in the test-oriented English teaching in Nita's department devalued the expertise Nita gained from her graduate training in the West and many years of teaching experience. This not only jeopardized Nita's construction of herself as a legitimate English writing teacher, but also interrupted Nita's use of the fluency-oriented teaching method that could render transformative room for developing pluralistic forms in English writing.

Kumaravadivelu (2006, 2012a, 2016) and other TESOL scholars (Barnawi & Phan, 2015; Chowdhury & Phan, 2008) argue that the promotion of Western-based pedagogies, such as communicative language teaching (CLT), in various non-English-speaking countries has helped reinforce the ideology of native speaker supremacy in terms of English competence, learning styles, and communicative patterns (Kumaravadivelu, 2012a). Nita's case has illustrated that local traditional teaching approaches, such as the teacher-centered, grammar-oriented method that is used for exam-oriented English education, has also helped sustain the superior status of Standard English and thus sustains the ideology of the supremacy of native speakers in the local context. Teaching methodology no doubt can work as "the engine that propels the hegemonic power structure" (Kumaravadivelu, 2012a, p. 13)

in that it determines curricular plans, material design, testing criteria, and teacher preparation. However, Nita's case suggests that in terms of English writing education, it is not necessary that only "Western-based" methods play a role in sustaining this hegemonic power in local ELT; any teaching methods with the agenda to promote native speakers' ways of speaking and writing can do the same.

9.5 Summary

In this chapter, I first discussed how Nita positioned herself between locally educated and native English-speaking teachers. The professional knowledge she gained from her graduate studies was taken as an important qualification in constructing her sense of legitimacy in teaching English writing as compared to locally educated and native English-speaking teachers. Based on her expertise as an L2 writing scholar and her experiences as an L2 writer, she emphasized fluency over accuracy in her writing class in order to encourage students to express their ideas more smoothly without thinking about grammar. This fluency-over-accuracy orientation that focused on idea expression rather than grammar accuracy when writing in English indicated that Nita allowed students to write non-Standard English forms in essays as long as they stated their ideas clearly. However, Nita's professional knowledge and the transformative possibility for alternative forms in English writing were denied when Nita's teaching approach was challenged by one of her students, and later by her department head, for not efficiently helping students score high on standardized tests. While positioning herself as a L2 writing expert with professional teaching knowledge to help students develop writing competence beyond grammar skills, she was positioned by her student, the department head, and the university's president as only a producer of good test

takers, whose main responsibility was to establish students' grammar knowledge. Given this discrepancy between her own professional identity and the identity as a producer of test takers projected by her student and the department, Nita lost her motivation to teach English writing as well as her sense of legitimacy and decided to take a year off from teaching English writing. The findings of this chapter suggest that teacher identity construction is highly contextualized (Duff & Uchida, 1997; Varghese et al., 2005). Although Nita viewed herself as a legitimate and professional English writing teacher, her identity construction was negatively affected by the ideologies and expectations of how English writing should be taught from her students and the department.

CHAPTER 10: CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

10.1 Introduction

Language teacher identity is a central topic of investigation in English education because how teachers identify themselves as English speakers, writers, and teachers is considered closely linked to what and how they teach in language classrooms (Cheung et al., 2015; Morgan, 2010; Motha, 2014; Phan, 2008; Varghese et al., 2005). From a social constructionist perspective, this present study investigated four Western-educated Taiwanese teachers' identity-in-discourse and identity-in-practice, trying to understand how teachers' identity construction can potentially create a space to transform ELT in Taiwanese universities by deconstructing the dominant discourse of native-speakerism. Two research questions have guided this study: (1) How do the participants view themselves as English users and writers in light of the discourse of native-speakerism? In particular, how do the participants' Western-educated experiences play a role in constructing their identities as English users and writers?; and (2) How do the participants construct their writing teacher identities in light of the discourse of native-speakerism after they return to Taiwan to teach English writing?

This chapter presents a summary and principal findings of this study. The theoretical, pedagogical, and methodological implications this present study has made will also be outlined. I will close this dissertation with suggestions for further research.

10.2 Summary of principal findings and further discussion

The findings were presented from Chapter 5 to Chapter 9. I answered my first research question in Chapter 5 by reporting and discussing four participants' narratives about

their writing experiences during their graduate study overseas and how they discursively constructed their writer identities through telling these stories to me in the interviews. I addressed my second research question from Chapters 6 through 9. I reported on each participant's teaching practices in individual chapters and discussed how each constructed her writing teacher identity through talking about her teaching and through interacting with her own students and class. In this section, I first summarize and recapitulate the principal findings in each chapter. I then discuss further the implications of the participants' identity formation to the transformative potential of teaching English writing as a global language.

10.2.1 Summary

In Chapter 5, I analyzed how the participants constructed their writing identities through talking about their writing experiences when studying in the West. The findings suggested that each participant, to some extent, perceived that she was initially positioned by members of her Western graduate programs as an “incompetent L2 English writer” because of her inability to achieve the writing norms required in the program. Analyzing the negotiation of each participant with the incompetent L2 English writer identity imposed by her graduate program, I showed how each participant constructed her writing identity in relation to the discourse of native-speakerism.

First of all, Beth was asked by her professor to rewrite an assignment, because, like many other Chinese writers, she tended to present her arguments obliquely, which made her writing hard to understand. After several years of studying and writing in British graduate school, she said that she finally learned to write in the ways her professors required her to write. To Beth, a “good English writer” referred to someone who could master the

Anglophone English writing norms; Beth positioned herself as such a writer.

Sarah was significantly influenced by her graduate program with its critical orientation toward English language teaching. She showed to be empowered by the scholarly knowledge she gained from the program and positioned herself as a multilingual writer who had a richer linguistic repertoire, both Chinese and English, to enhance her English writing. By positioning herself as such, she refused to orient to the negative L2 English writer identity I had projected as someone who had a hard time mastering the Anglophone English writing norms expected in her graduate program.

Nita's dissertation external examiner asked her to revise and edit her dissertation even after it had been proofread by her other two English native-speaking committee members. Instead of taking up the negative L2 writer identity imposed by the external examiner, Nita treated the negative comments as a biased judgment against her racial or linguistic background rather than against her language competence per se. Treating the external examiner's comments as discrimination, Nita resisted the negative L2 writer identity projected by the external and constructed herself as a legitimate English writer who had no difficulty writing a proper dissertation in English.

Finally, Ava was positioned as an incompetent English writer by the negative feedback given by her American peers in a peer review activity. Instead of taking up that negative identity, Ava attributed the negative feedback to her American peers' tendency to give harsh and discouraging feedback, thereby ignoring any positive aspects of her English writing. By depicting her American peers' feedback as too discouraging and even condescending, she formed herself a legitimate English writer identity in the graduate program. That is, had her American peers possessed sufficient cultural awareness to realize

that Asian students prefer more positive feedback, they would have seen Ava's writing in a more positive light. Moreover, by constructing American-style peer review as a somehow inappropriate teaching pedagogy that could discourage students from learning and writing, Ava also showed her agency to refuse to rectify the "errors" pointed out in the negative feedback from her American classmates. By so doing, she seemed to construct her non-nativeness in her writing not only as a legitimate form of English writing but also a form that should have been appreciated by her American peers and professor.

As shown in Chapter 5, except Beth, Sarah, Ava, and Nita all developed a counter-discourse to resist the negative writing identity projected by their professors or peers, or by me as an interviewer, based on the ideology that Anglophone English norms are the only standard for L2 writers to follow in order to become legitimate English writers. For instance, both Sarah and Ava refused to take Anglophone English writing conventions as the only venue to construct themselves as legitimate English writers. Instead, Sarah foregrounded her multilingual English writer identity and took her bilingual linguistic repertoire as an asset to enhance her English writing. Ava even took a further step to argue that if her American professor and peers had gained some cross-cultural knowledge, they could have learned to appreciate the English writing of writers from non-Anglophone cultures. Nita also rejected the ideology, as displayed by her external examiner, of non-native English writers as always deficient in their writing skills; by doing so she identified herself as an English writer capable of writing a proper dissertation in English.

If how teachers see themselves as English speakers, writers, and teachers is closely linked to what and how they teach their students in their own language classrooms (Varghese et al., 2005), then the writer identity constructed by participants through this counter-

discourse should shed light on their teaching of English writing against the native-speakerism ideology, a focus of the next four chapters.

Chapters 6 through 9 moved to discuss how each participant (Chapter 6: Beth; Chapter 7: Sarah; Chapter 8: Ava; Chapter 9: Nita) constructed her writing teacher identity after she returned to Taiwan, teaching English writing in relation to the discourse of native-speakerism. In Chapter 6, I first discussed how Beth positioned herself as neither a non-native English-speaking teacher nor a native English-speaking teacher but created an in-between identity, which enabled her to identify herself as a competent English writing teacher who held advantages found in both groups. With this in-between identity, Beth somehow resisted the ideology of native-speakerism, which was often used to place NNESTs as less competent in teaching English compared to NESTs. Positioning NNESTs, including herself, as more capable of explaining English grammar, knowledge she considered crucial to teaching English writing, she identified herself as a *more* qualified English writing teacher than NESTs. However, it was also in this in-between identity where Beth undervalued locally educated NNESTs, who had no access to the authentic context and materials to acquire native-like English proficiency, another component she identified as a necessary qualification to become an English writing teacher. I then demonstrated how Beth's in-between identity was also reified and intertwined in the scoring rubric she used to evaluate students' English writing throughout the semester. The discourse of native-speakerism was promoted by Beth through the use of scoring rubrics that privileged Anglophone English rhetoric to evaluate her students' English writing.

In Chapter 7, I discussed Sarah's teaching practices and how she positioned herself as an English writing teacher in her university. Greatly influenced by her six years of graduate

training in the United States, where she developed critical awareness of politics and inequality in ELT, Sarah strived to challenge the ideology that native speaker English norms are the only standard to learn in her own English writing class. For example, when talking about her students' writing, she refused to take native English speakers (i.e. her American colleagues) as the only authority and the "Western" English standard as the only criterion by which to evaluate her students' academic writing. Rather, she foregrounded her bilingual competence in Chinese and English as a valuable pedagogical skill that helped her understand and appreciate her students' Chinese-infused English writing (e.g., "this movie is blind"). By refusing to use native English speakers' norms as the sole criterion to judge her Chinese students' writing in English, Sarah constructed herself and her students as owners of the English language, who had legitimacy and right to judge and use English on their own terms (i.e., Chinese English). In her writing class, instead of correcting students' incorrect English and giving the "correct" answers for students to follow, Sarah created a space for students to negotiate the meaning of their own sentences that helped students construct the ownership of English language. While she managed to interrupt the ideology of native-speakerism in her writing class, Sarah, like Beth, formed an in-between identity in which she reproduced the same ideology to foreground her superiority as a Western-educated teacher compared to her locally educated colleagues to construct her teaching legitimacy in her department.

Chapter 8 reported how Ava constructed her writing teacher identity when negotiating students' resistance against her use of the student-centered teaching methods she adopted from her overseas graduate study. In the process of constructing her writing teacher identity, Ava took her studying experiences in the West as a resource and aligned herself to

the cultural Self who knew the Western superior ways of learning and teaching English writing. With this cultural Self identity, she legitimized the student-centered teaching methods she used and positioned herself as a legitimate English teacher with good knowledge to develop her students' English proficiency. The image of cultural Self as advanced and cultural Other as deficient was reproduced in Ava's writing conferences with students. Analyzing the teacher–student interaction, I illustrated how the hierarchical relation between cultural Self and Other was being reinforced in the writing conferences and was taken up by the students to construct their identity—that of deficient Chinese writers who needed to avoid Chinese ways of arguing in order to write clear and logic English essays. I argued that as Ava depended on Western epistemology (Kumaravadivelu, 2012a) to construct her legitimacy to teach English in the local context, she also served as an accomplice in maintaining the hierarchical structure between Western Self and non-Western Other in local ELT. The findings in this chapter also indicated a dramatic conflict between Ava's identity as an English writer as demonstrated in Chapter 5 and her identity as an English writing teacher as discussed in the current chapter. The cultural Self identity Ava constructed in Chapter 8 was exercised to deride the local pedagogical culture and non-Anglophone English norms. This identity was in contrast to the counter-discourse she constructed to resist the American-style peer feedback that positioned her as a less competent English writer, where she constructed herself as a legitimate non-native English writer even though she did not rectify her writing to meet Anglophone English norms. I argued that the discrepancy between Ava's English writer identity and English writing teacher identity was probably because native-like or Standard English was still viewed as the goal to achieve, and because English native speakers were considered the most legitimate teachers when it came

to English education in the department where Ava was teaching. To be a good English teacher in that context, Ava chose to follow the ways English native speakers teach English and to teach only so-called Standard English.

In Chapter 9, I reported the analysis of Nita's teacher identity construction and teaching practices. With a PhD degree focused on L2 writing, Nita showed confidence about her professional expertise in teaching English writing. She used the fluency-over-accuracy method in her writing class for maximizing students' learning of English writing. This fluency-oriented approach that focused on meaning-making rather than grammatical accuracy in students' writing seemed to create a space for dismantling the ideology of Anglophone-English-as-the-only-standard in Nita's writing class. However, this teaching method was severely questioned by one of her students, by the departmental head, and even by the university president for failing to help students achieve high scores on standardized tests. Teaching in a context where reaching high scores on standardized tests was the only learning goal, Nita was positioned by her student as merely a "service provider" who was responsible for using grammar-oriented pedagogy to produce as many good test takers as possible. Nita was even positioned by her university as a "salesperson" whose value was calibrated according to the number of students who passed certain tests. Given this discrepancy between her own teacher identity (i.e., teaching English writing beyond grammar) and the teacher identity projected by her student and department, Nita lost her motivation to teach English writing and decided to take a year off from teaching English writing. I argued that the test-oriented teaching and learning in Nita's department had reinforced the ideology of native-speakerism in that it foregrounded the importance of native-speaker English norms. This ideology prevalent in the department had also negated

Nita's construction of teacher identity as it denied Nita's professional expertise incompatible with the test/grammar/accuracy-oriented approach.

Finally, it is important to recognize that the participants' identity construction in relation to native-speakerism discourse, as understood in this study, were not produced unilaterally but were worked up in interaction with me, as an interviewer or an observer in classrooms. The participants' accounts of their teaching and the role of teaching were designed in here-and-now interaction to articulate the identities they wanted to be heard by me (e.g., also a Western-educated teacher and researcher). In other words, their accounts might differ in other occasions with different interlocutors; accordingly, different discursive resources (e.g., ideologies) could be deployed to negotiate their professional identities that they wanted to be understood in another conversations or classrooms. Therefore, the participants' stories presented in this study do not represent the objective truth of their experiences, but only one possible version of "collective representations" (De Fina, 2013a, p. 45) of the story being told.

10.2.2 Further discussion: The "wobble room"

By investigating how four Western-educated Taiwanese teachers constructed their identities as English writers and teachers, the present study was looking for transformative potential in teaching English writing as a global language—deconstructing the dominant discourse of native-speakerism and reconstructing the legitimacy of local English varieties, knowledge, culture, and pedagogies in local English writing classrooms. So, was any transformative potential or "wobble room" found in the participants' teaching practices in respect to teaching English as a global language? The findings suggest that there exists such

potential yet limited. As represented in the analysis, the four participants either depended on (Ava, Beth, and Sarah) or were influenced by (Nita) the ideology of native-speakerism to shape their teacher identities and teaching. For example, the participants foregrounded their Western-educated experiences to construct professional legitimacy when compared to their locally educated and native-speaking colleagues (Beth and Sarah) or when encountering students' resistance to their teaching methods (Ava). Their Western credentials and training experiences that allowed them to acquire native-like English proficiency and to access Western pedagogical knowledge were taken as the critical components to validate their qualification as English writing teachers. According to Kumaravadivelu (2016), when language teachers depend on native speakers or native-speaker competence and knowledge to define who they are or to validate what they do, they are "buying into what was offered by the dominant stakeholders [native speakers], dismissing their own expertise and indigenous knowledge, engaging in the practice of self-marginalization" (Widin, 2010, p. 60). Despite the fact that these Western-educated teachers were highly skilled and privileged professionals in their local ELT context, they surrendered to the voice and visions of the center or to native speakers to validate their own work and identities. When positioning themselves as Western-educated teachers who had closer access to native teaching knowledge and ways of writing/speaking, therefore more legitimate teachers, they simultaneously self-marginalized themselves as "the next best" to a native English speaker (Golombek & Jordan, 2005, p. 522).

This "next best" identity as English writers and teachers was observed to link to Beth and Ava's teaching practices, in which they reinforced the importance of native-like proficiency in learning English writing, perpetuating the prestigious status of NESTs and the

secondary position of themselves and their students. For example, Beth made relevant the native-like proficiency she developed during her study in British graduate school to position herself as a more qualified teacher than locally educated teachers. Her knowledge of how native speakers write and speak, the key capital to make her a qualified teacher, was reified in the scoring rubrics she used to evaluate her students' writing, where she reinforced the superiority of English rhetoric over those of other languages. Another example was Ava, who depended heavily on the expertise of her English native-speaking students and American colleagues working in the university writing center to validate her use of student-centered teaching methods. The native speaker's knowledge that played a big part in constructing her teaching legitimacy was also observed in Ava's writing conferences with her students, where she privileged English ways of argumentation over those of Chinese, and was also complicit in shaping her students' writing identity as an inferior Other to native-speaker Self. Viewing Beth and Ava's experiences of identity construction and instructional practices, the wiggle room for teaching English against native-speakerism discourse in the context under study seemed dim. What made it even dimmer was when Nita's fluency-over-accuracy teaching approach, a potential space for developing alternative English varieties (e.g., Chinese English), was denied by her students and department head. Although Nita was confident about her professional expertise and her ability to develop students' writing competence beyond the grammatical level (e.g., to enable them to express their own ideas more freely), her sense of legitimacy and teaching practice were denied and compromised in the teaching context where native-speaker English variety was prioritized for good results on standardized tests.

Out of this fog, Sarah's positive attitude toward students' Chinese English sheds

some light on deconstructing the hegemonic power structure persistent in ELT in Taiwan. Greatly influenced by her professional training in an American TESOL program (e.g., enormous amounts of reading about the works of critical TESOL scholars, her professors' positive attitude toward different English varieties and culture, and dissertating on the topic of World Englishes and the L2 writer's identity), Sarah developed critical awareness about the inequalities existing in today's ELT caused by the ideology of native-speakerism. Grounding herself in critical epistemology toward ELT, she constructed for herself a multilingual/multi-competent writer identity; despite having different ways of writing English from English native speakers, she was by no means an inferior English writer because she had a richer linguistic repertoire (i.e., English and Mandarin) with which to express herself freely in writing. This critical awareness remained after Sarah came back to Taiwan to teach English writing. In her English writing class, she refused to take English native speakers as the only arbitrators and the "Western" English standard as the only criterion by which to evaluate students' writing performance. Instead, positioning herself as a bilingual teacher who also understood her students' first language, Sarah tried to appreciate her students' Chinese English and viewed alternative varieties of English as creative and legitimate means for communication. A transformative space was created in Sarah's class, in which native English speakers' norms were not the only legitimate norms to learn. Sarah's Western-training experiences played a key role in developing her ability and willingness to re-interpret what English language and teaching are; it is from this point that she created some wiggle room to teach English writing in opposition to the dominant discourse of native-speakerism (Morgan, 2010). If the mission of today's ELT is to create more transformative spaces in the same way that Sarah has done, teacher education is the key switch to turn on

the light of the wiggle room.

10.3 Implications

The study has made a few implications relating to theory, pedagogy, and methodology, particularly for those who work with language teacher identity and development in relation to teaching English as a global language.

10.3.1 Theoretical implications

In a recent article, Kumaravadivelu (2016) asked why after over two decades of fighting against the discourse of native-speakerism in our field, the discourse on marginalization of the NNES(T)s, localized English varieties, and local knowledge of teaching still has a firm grip over theoretical principles and classroom practice. He suggests that if the TESOL profession is serious about “helping its professionals generate sustainable knowledge systems that are sensitive to local historical, political, cultural, and educational exigencies” (Kumaravadivelu, 2012a, p. 24) in this globalized world, it is necessary and urgent to examine “what the native speaker/nonnative speaker discourse has achieved, where it has fallen short, why it has fallen short, and what needs to be done” (Kumaravadivelu, 2016, p. 70). The present study has made a contribution to answering some of these theoretical questions by presenting the stories of four Western-educated Taiwanese teachers’ identity construction and their local teaching practices in relation to discourse of native-speakerism.

In particular, based on these participating teachers’ experiences, this study has provided an explanation for why the project of deconstructing native-speakerism discourse

has fallen short in the teaching context of Taiwan. That is, some teachers have shown a tendency to depend heavily on Western-oriented center-based knowledge system (i.e., native-speaker English standards and Western-based teaching methods) to validate their own identity and teaching practices. This dependency has worked to reinforce the supremacy of English native speakers, their English norms, and their teaching episteme, and it has prevented these teachers from seeing the value of indigenous knowledge and culture in their English writing classrooms. Kumaravadivelu (2012a, 2016) called this dependency *self-marginalization*; he contends that it has helped to perpetuate the inferior status of local teachers and learners whose determinate goal was to teach and learn like a native speaker. Breaking this epistemic dependency on center-based ELT is essential and urgent for creating a more socio-cultural and socio-political sensitive ELT for local teaching contexts like Taiwan.

This current study also furthers scholarly discussion of English teacher professional development in the nexus of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992) and linguistic instrumentalism (Wee, 2008). According to Park and Wee (2012), it is the discourse of neoliberalism that makes teaching English as a global language more complex than ever before. As they rightly point out:

While imperialist relations in which powerful state actors and global institutions of the center exert control over military action remain real, today's imperialist structures for the most part no longer have a center in the sense that the Empire has no limits or outside, and the mechanisms of control have become essentially immanent in local social and political relations. In this context, it is increasingly difficult to see English

as an imposition from an imperial center or an external target of resistance, a significant shift from the way English was recognized in the colonial era. (p.5)

From Nita's stories about teaching English in Taiwan, we see that the ideology of native-speakerism is no longer fostered in a top-down fashion whereby the privileged status of native English speakers and their English norms, as Phillipson (1992) states, is promoted by English-speaking countries to maintain power and resources in order to consolidate their dominant role around the world. Rather, the discourse of native-speakerism that was established in the last century is now observed to be bolstered through the discourse of linguistic instrumentalism (Wee, 2008). The discourse that privileges native English speakers and their English norms is exercised and reinforced by the local actors, for example Nita's student, department head, and university president, who view English language skills to be a commodified entity and a standardized set of knowledge for exchanging economic interests and social motilities. This study has also shown how the ideology of linguistic instrumentalism has negatively impacted on the language teacher's construction of professional identity and legitimacy (i.e., Nita being positioned as a producer of good test takers). Further research on English teacher development in non-English speaking countries in relation to teaching English as a global language needs to account more for how the discourse of instrumentalism has an impact on language teachers' identity development, in order to better understand the transformative potential of the teachers to go counter the native-speakerist discourse.

10.3.2 Pedagogical implications

The study also has pedagogical implications, especially for teacher education, Western or local. Sarah, the only participant in this study who managed to teach against the dominant discourse of native-speakerism, had raised her critical awareness against the hegemonic power structure of ELT during her professional training in an American graduate program. Through intensive reading of critical TESOL scholars' works (e.g., Canagarajah, 1999, 2005; Kubota, 2001; Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1998, 2001), class discussion about controversial issues in ELT like NNEST/NEST construct and legitimacy, and engagement in research projects, including her own dissertation on the issue on L2 learners' identity and World Englishes, Sarah developed a multilingual/multicomponent English writer and teacher identity that guided her to view non-native English norms as legitimate forms to use and L2 speakers and writers as owners of English language who had the right to use and teach the language for their own purposes. Sarah's experiences confirmed the endeavour that many TESOL programs have made to create a space for more critical reflection on today's ELT and helped reconstruct the sense of legitimacy of many NNESTs (see sections 3.2.1 and 3.3.2). This positive finding of this study encourages language teacher educators and teacher education programs to continue to provide such spaces for all language teachers in order to cultivate more *agents of change* (Morgan, 2010) like Sarah.

From Sarah's stories, we have also learned that while Sarah tried to intervene the discourse of native-speakerism in her own writing class, she reproduced the same ideology to discount the legitimacy of locally educated Taiwanese teachers in teaching English. Thus, I suggest that in addition to critical examination of the power relation between the dichotomies

such as NEST/NNEST, West/East, or Standard English/non-standard English that exist in English language education, opportunities should also be provided in teacher education programs for student teachers to critically reflect on their positioning with their own social, cultural, linguistic, economic, and educational backgrounds and how these might influence not only their pedagogical practices, but also language education as a whole in their local teaching context.

While Sarah's case gave us some light to see the possibility for disrupting the negative effect of native-speakerism in local English classrooms, the other three participants, Ava, Beth and Nita, were reproducing (i.e., Ava and Beth) or were being forced to reproduce (i.e., Nita) the supremacy of English forms and teaching knowledge of native speakers in their writing classes. It is particularly interesting to see that both Ava and Nita created a counter-discourse to resist the negative L2 writer identity their Western graduate program had imposed on them; and yet this counter-discourse did not follow through to their teacher identity construction after they returned to Taiwan to teach. Although there are many possible factors to explain the non-transmission of their linguistic identity to their professional identity, it is legitimate to ask what could have been done by their teacher education programs to help transform the empowering identities (linguistic or professional) they constructed when studying in Western programs into their teaching practices in their local teaching context. A similar discrepancy between pre-service teachers' identity development established during professional training and during their actual teaching was found in Lee's (2010) study on Hong Kong writing teachers' experiences. As Lee observed, the key factor that prevented those teachers from bringing the learned knowledge to their own English classrooms was that idealism (what they had learned from TESOL programs)

conflicted with realism (contextual factors in their classrooms, teaching institutions, and policies). To solve the problem, Lee asked her student teachers to conduct a mini research project, which required the student teachers to implement newly gained theories and pedagogies in actual classrooms. This learning-by-doing project enabled the student teachers to realize the challenges they might face when they brought their learned theories to real classrooms. They then brought back the challenges they found in real classes to their TESOL program and elicited possible solutions from their professors and peers. The idea of a mini research project, or similar internship project, seems to be a positive choice for any teacher education program that wishes to better prepare its student teachers to bring the counter-discourse against native-speakerism they have learned or experienced during professional training to their actual classrooms. If Nita had had the chance to know her student and department's reaction to her fluency-over-accuracy teaching method during her professional training, she might have been able to consult her professors or peers; she might have been able to mediate her teaching approach to meet her student's learning expectations while retaining her professional beliefs and identity. The mini research project suggested by Lee could not only help better prepare student teachers to balance theory and practice, it could also benefit teacher education programs in terms of curriculum design and adjustment with a better understanding of the context, situation, and challenges of local ELT.

10.3.3 Methodological implications

Many scholars (Cheung et al., 2015; Morgan, 2010; Motha, 2014; Phan, 2008; Varghese et al., 2005) have emphasized the fact that language teachers' identities are closely linked to their teaching practices. This present study has demonstrated a methodological

approach to investigate the *link* by analyzing the interaction between teachers' identities and their classroom practices. By analyzing the participants' stories generated from interview interaction, this study has shown how the teachers draw different ideologies about English language teaching through deploying nuanced and latent discursive resources to construct their identities as English writers and teachers. By demonstrating how these ideologies and identities constructed in interview interaction are enacted in these participants' classroom practices, this study also shows how teacher identities interact with their instructional choices and practices. According to Lee (2013), teacher identity and practices are inseparable entities because "while practice helps foster and develop identities, the emerging identities in turn shape teachers' changing classroom practices" (p. 332). By demonstrating both identity-in-discourse and identity-in-practice, the current study has demonstrated a helpful methodological alternative to other researchers who are interested in gaining a richer understanding of the relationship between teacher identity and their teaching practices.

10.4 Suggestions for future study

Through an understanding of these Western-educated teachers' linguistic and professional identities in relation to the discourse of native-speakerism, the overarching purpose of this study is to seek some transformative potential, or in Morgan's (2010) term the "wobble room" for local language teachers and learners to comfortably and confidently teach and learn English as a meaningful communicative means for various local and global purposes. The findings of this study demonstrate both positive and negative light in respect to deconstructing the stubborn grip of native-speakerism discourse in English writing education in Taiwan's universities. These successful and discouraging stories from these

teachers in this specific EFL context urge us to continue to search for more space and possibilities for local English norms and teaching knowledge and pedagogies to grow. To this end, I provide a few possible directions for future investigation, with a focus on Western-educated teacher identity and professional development.

As many teacher educators (Holliday, 2005; Ilieva, 2010; Liu, 1999; Llurda, 2005; Phan, 2008; Polio, 1994) have noted, compared to the studies conducted in Western TESOL programs to understand international pre-service teachers' professional development, little is known about how these teachers' identities, teaching, and experiences continue to develop after they return to their home countries to teach English. Although increasing scholarly attention has been paid to this group of teachers (see section 3.4), we are still at a very initial stage of understanding the possible influence of training in Western TESOL programs on these teachers and their professional development in relation to native-speakerist discourse in local teaching contexts. More research on Western-educated teachers' professional development in their home countries, particularly how they interact with the dominant discourse of native-speakerism, is desperately needed, especially in contexts similar to Taiwan, where increasing number of Western-educated English teachers have returned and are teaching English in various venues.

One possible research direction of this type could be a longitudinal study that follows the same group of student teachers both during their study in Western TESOL programs and after they return and teach in their home countries. The researcher could first focus on these teachers' professional development in Western TESOL programs, including the development of their critical awareness of the politics in ELT as well as their identity and agency developed to deconstruct the inequalities relating to English varieties, English speakers and

teachers, and English pedagogies. The researcher could then follow these teachers *after* they go back to their home countries and start teaching in the local English classrooms. The focus of this research phase can be on the contextual factors (e.g., school policy or students' attitude) that either allow or disrupt the teachers' development of critical awareness and agency to tackle the ELT politics in the local English classrooms. A longitudinal research project like this would allow the researcher to investigate the interaction between idealism (what they learned in TESOL programs) and realism (what happens in their actual teaching contexts) (Lee, 2010) and would provide constructive pedagogical suggestions to Western TESOL programs to improve their curriculum design to better prepare international English teachers to act against the discourse of native-speakerism in the local teaching context.

Another area of interest in future study of Western-educated teachers would be how their linguistic and professional identity development impinge on their students' identity construction and English learning, and vice versa. As evidenced in Ava's case, how she saw herself as an English teacher (e.g., teacher as cultural Self) could impact on how she taught the language (e.g., viewing Chinese English as deficient) as well as how students saw themselves as English users and writers (e.g., deficient English writers due to Chinese interference). From Nita's case, conversely, we learned that students' attitudes and expectations of English learning (e.g., getting good scores in tests) could have a significant impact on how teachers position themselves in teaching and on their instructional choices. Therefore, more understanding of how language teachers and students shape each other's identity, teaching and learning will help us understand more about the role Western-educated teachers could play in teaching English in local ELT contexts.

Last but not least, as evidenced in the current study, Western-educated teachers could

create an in-between identity or third space (Bhabha, 1994) to construct their professional identity and legitimacy compared to NESTs and locally educated NNESTs. The findings showed that the idea of third space on one hand created possibility to debunk the unequal relation between the dominant and the dominated (i.e., NESTs vs. NNESTs); on the other, celebrating a third space as a power-free venue for empowering NNESTs could make us oblivious to unequal relations of power among different groups of English teachers, for example among NNESTs. As Foucault has persuasively argued (1980), “power is exercised by people depending on how they are positioned in relation to each other” (cited in Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p. 129). Power was exercised by the Western-educated participants to downgrade the value of locally educated NNESTs in order to foreground their near-nativeness gained from the West to construct their professional legitimacy. The neglect of power relations among NNESTs might help reinforce the ideology of native-speakersim and widen the unequal relation between the dominated and the dominant. Therefore, the power relations among NNESTs in a given teaching context deserve more scholarly attention. One possible research direction could be an investigation into how locally educated NNESTs construct their identities in relation to Western-educated teachers, regarding the discourse of native-speakerism.

10.5 Conclusion

The entire journey of my doctoral study, as well as the writing of this dissertation, have constructed the wiggle room for me to consider alternative perspectives toward teaching English writing and English language in general in this globalizing world. The journey is not always smooth. I often heard challenging questions from other researchers, peers, and local

teachers about the idea of localized Englishes and pedagogies and their feasibilities in local teaching environments. I sometimes self-doubted the legitimacy of doing this research when I realized that achieving native-like proficiency was not merely a goal but also a hope for many Taiwanese students and teachers. The doubt only grew when Nita told me her unfortunate story of how her professional identity was denied by her students and department head. Despite these challenges and discouragement, I did not lose my aspiration to search for more transformative possibilities for local ELT. Sarah's experiences taught me that there is always a small but powerful space, like classroom conversation, to construct the subjectivity of local English teaching and learning. It is not my intention to suggest that we avoid any native-speaker English forms or Western-informed teaching knowledge in local English classrooms. I am fully aware that this might be unrealistic in real teaching situations, and it could contrarily disempower learners from the local context who need to master English for a better life (e.g., to enter universities and companies). The message I hope to deliver by this study is to create more space like that in Sarah's English writing class for local teachers and students to teach and learn the language more confidently and comfortably. It is also my hope that this study contributes to expanding the wiggle room for the discussion of teaching English as a global language for the TESOL profession and that it inspires more researchers and teachers to create their own.

REFERENCES

- Abasi, A. R., Akbari, N., & Graves, B. (2006). Discourse appropriation, construction of identities, and the complex issue of plagiarism: ESL students writing in graduate school. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*, 102-117.
- Alvesson, M., & Sköldberg, K. (2009). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. London, UK: Sage.
- Amin, N. (1997). Race and the identity of the nonnative ESL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 580–583.
- Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, UK: Verso.
- Antaki, C., & Widdicombe, S. (1998). Identity as an achievement and as a tool. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.). *Identities in talk* (pp. 1-15). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Ed.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bamberg, M. (2004). Form and functions of “slut bash- ing” in male identity constructions in 15-year-olds: “I know it may sound mean to say this, but we couldn’t really care less about her anyway. *Human Development, 47*, 331–353.
- Barnawi, O. Z., & Phan, L. H. (2015). From western TESOL classrooms to home practice: a case study with two “privileged” Saudi teachers. *Critical Studies in Education, 56*, 259–276.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bianco, J. L., Orton, J., & Yihong, G. (Eds.). (2009). *China and English: Globalisation and the dilemmas of identity* (Vol. 6). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Block, D. (2009). Identity in applied linguistics: The need for conceptual exploration. In L. Wei & V. Cook (Eds.), *Contemporary applied linguistics* (Vol. 1, pp. 215-232). London, UK: Continuum.
- Block, D. (2013). The structure and agency dilemma in identity and intercultural communication research. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 13*, 126–147.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- Bolton, K. (2005). Where WE stands: Approaches, issues, and debate in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 24, 69–83.
- Bolton, K. (2012). World Englishes and linguistic landscapes. *World Englishes*, 31, 30–33.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York, NY: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bowden, D. (1995). The rise of a metaphor: “Voice” in composition pedagogy. *Rhetoric Review*, 14, 173–188.
- Braine, G. (1999). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77–101.
- Brutt-Griffler, J., & Samimy, K. K. (1999). Revisiting the colonial in the postcolonial: Critical praxis for nonnative-English-speaking teachers in a TESOL program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 413–431.
- Bucholtz, M. (2000). The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1439–1465.
- Bucholtz, M. (2003). Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7, 398–416.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004). Language and identity. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 369–94). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7, 585–614.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2005). Reconstructing local knowledge, reconfiguring language studies. In A. S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice* (pp. 3–24). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Casanave, C. (2002). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Casanave, C. (2004). *Controversies in second language writing: Dilemmas and decisions in research and instruction*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Casanave, C. (2009). Training for writing or training for reality? Challenges facing EFL writing teachers and students in language teacher education programs. In R. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 256–277). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Chang, Y. J. (2014). Learning English today: What can World Englishes teach college students in Taiwan? *English Today*, 30(1), 21-27.
- Cheung, Y. L., Said, S. B., & Park, K. (Eds.). (2015). *Advances and current trends in language teacher identity research*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Chowdhury, R., & Phan, L. H. (2008). Reflecting on western TESOL training and communicative language teaching: Bangladeshi teachers' voices. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 28, 305–316.
- Clarke, M. (2008). *Language teacher identities: Co-constructing discourse and community*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, V. J. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. *Language Learning*, 42, 557–591.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 185–209.
- Cross, R. (2010). Language teaching as sociocultural: Rethinking language teaching practice. *Modern Language Journal*, 94, 434–452.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- De Fina, A. (2009). Narratives in interview — The case of accounts: For an interactional approach to narrative genres. *Narrative Inquiry*, 19, 233–258.
- De Fina, A. (2011a). Discourse and identity. In T.A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp.263—282). London, UK: Sage
- De Fina, A. (2011b). Researcher and informant roles in narrative interactions: Constructions of belonging and foreign-ness. *Language in Society*, 40, 27–38.
- De Fina, A. (2013a). Positioning level 3: Connecting local identity displays to macro social processes. *Narrative Inquiry*, 23, 40–61.

- De Fina, A. (2013b). Narrative as practices: Negotiating identities through storytelling. In G. Barkhuizen (Ed.), *Narrative research in applied linguistics* (pp. 154–175). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- De Fina, A., & Georgakopoulou, A. (2008). Analysing narratives as practices. *Qualitative Research*, 8, 379-387.
- De Fina, A., & Georgakopoulou, A. (2011). *Analyzing narrative: Discourse and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- De Fina, A., Schiffrin, D., & Bamberg, M. (2006). Introduction. In A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin & M. Bamberg (Eds.), *Discourse and identity* (pp. 1-26). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3 ed., pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Diallo, I. (2014). Emirati students encounter Western teachers: Tensions and identity resistance. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives*, 11(2), 1-14.
- Dobinson, T. (2014). Occupying the “third space”: Perspectives and experiences of Asian English language teachers. In K. Dunworth & G. Zhang (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on language education: Australia and the Asia Pacific* (pp. 9–27). New York, NY: Springer.
- Duff, P. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Duff, P. (2012). Issues of identity. In A. Mackey & S. Gass (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 410-426). London, UK: Routledge.
- Duff, P., & Uchida, Y. (1997). The negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities and practices in postsecondary EFL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 451-486.
- Fan, C. (2011, Dec. 22). 外師駐花女, 全英文練口語 [Hualien Junior High hires native speaking teacher; English-only environment to reinforce students' English proficiency]. 花蓮女中校園新聞 [Hualien Junior High Campus News]. Retrieved from <http://www.hlgs.hlc.edu.tw/2010/modules/tadnews/index.php?nsn=2866>
- Finlay, L., & Gough, B. (2003). *Reflexivity a practical guide for researchers in health and social sciences*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum Publishing.

- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Golombek, P., & Jordan, S. R. (2005). Becoming “black lambs” not “parrots”: A poststructuralist orientation to intelligibility and identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 513-533.
- Goodwin, C. (2007). Interactive footing. In E. Holt & R. Clift (Eds.), *Reporting talk: Reported speech in interaction* (pp. 16–46). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2008). The constructionist mosaic. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Handbook of constructionists research* (pp. 3-12). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Guo, Y. (2006). Between the worlds: Searching for a complete voice. In G. Li, G. H. Beckett & S.G. Lim (Eds), *“Strangers” of the Academy: Asian women scholars in higher education* (pp. 211-232). Virginia, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Hall, S. (1996). The west and the rest: Discourse and power. In S. Hall, D. Held, D. Hubert & K. Thompson (Eds.), *Modernity: An introduction to modern societies* (pp. 184-228). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Heller, M. (2010). The commodification of language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39, 101–114.
- Hirvela, A., & Belcher, D. (2001). Coming back to voice: The multiple voices and identities of mature multilingual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 83-106.
- Hirvela, A., & Yi, Y. (2008). From expectations to empowerment: how a mentor and dissertation writer negotiated the intricacies of a qualitative results chapter. In C. Casanave & M. Swale (Eds.), *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders’ reflections on academic enculturation* (pp. 121-133). Michigan, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, 60, 385–387.
- Holliday, A. (2013). Native speaker’teachers and cultural belief. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (Eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education* (pp. 17-26). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Holliday, A. (2015). Native-speakerism: Talking the concept forward and achieving cultural belief. In A. Swan, P. Aboshiha & A. Holliday (Eds.), *(En) Countering native-speakerism: Global perspectives* (pp. 11-25). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2003). Active interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Postmodern interviewing* (pp. 67–80). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2011). The constructionist analytics of interpretive practice. *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, 4, 341-358.
- Houghton, S. A., & Rivers, D. J. (Eds.). (2013). *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Malden, MA: Polity.
- Ilieva, R. (2010). Non-native English-speaking teachers' negotiations of program discourses in their construction of professional identities within a TESOL program. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66, 343–369.
- Ilieva, R., Li, A., & Li, W. (2015). Negotiating TESOL discourses and EFL teaching contexts in China: Identities and practices of international graduates of a TESOL program. *Comparative and International Education/Éducation Comparée et Internationale*, 44(2), 1-16.
- Ilieva, R., & Waterstone, B. (2013). Curriculum discourses within a TESOL program for international students: Affording possibilities for academic and professional identities. *TCI (Transnational Curriculum Inquiry)*, 10(1), 16-37.
- Inoue, N., & Stracke, E. (2013). Non-native English speaking postgraduate TESOL students in Australia: Why did they come here? *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 8, 29–56.
- Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discursual construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins.
- Ivanič, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 3-33.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language: New models, new norms, new goals*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 157–181.

- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2013). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Johnson, G. C. (2006). The discursive construction of teacher identities in a research interview. In A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin, & M. Bamberg (Eds.), *Discourse and identity* (pp. 213–232). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, K. E. (2006). The sociocultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 235–257.
- Jørgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London, UK: Sage.
- Kachru, B. B. (1986). The power and politics of English. *World Englishes*, 5, 121-140.
- Kachru, B. B. (1990). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1997). World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 66-87.
- Kachru, B. B. (2005). *Asian Englishes: Beyond the canon*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, 16, 1-20.
- Kasper, G., & Prior, M. (2015). Analyzing storytelling in TESOL interview research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49, 226-255.
- Ke, I. (2016). Deficient non-native speakers or translanguagers?. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 26, 280-300.
- Kim, M. (2015). *Learning to be students again: Second language socialization of graduate students in a Canadian university* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved January 14, 2017 from <https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses/24/items/1.0167198>
- Kramsch, C., & Uryu, M. (2012). Intercultural contact, hybridity, and third space. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 211-225). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kubota, R. (2001). Discursive construction of the images of U.S. classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 9-38.

- Kubota, R. (2002). Marginality as an asset: Toward a counter-hegemonic pedagogy for diversity. In L. Vargas (Ed.), *Women faculty of color in the white college classroom* (pp. 293-307). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Kubota, R. (2011). Questioning linguistic instrumentalism: English, neoliberalism, and language tests in Japan. *Linguistics and Education, 22*, 248–260.
- Kubota, R. (2013). “Language is only a tool”: Japanese expatriates working in China and implications for language teaching. *Multilingual Education, 3*, 1–20.
- Kubota, R., & Lehner, A. (2004). Toward critical contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 7-27.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*, 537–560.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*, 59-81.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2008). *Cultural globalization and language education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012a). Individual identity, cultural globalization and teaching English as an international language: The case for an epistemic break. In L. Alsagoff, S. McKay, G. Hu, & W. Renandya (Eds.), *Teaching English as an international language: Principles and practices* (pp. 9–27). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012b). *Language teacher education for a global society: A modular model for knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2016). The decolonial option in English teaching: Can the subaltern act? *TESOL Quarterly, 50*, 66–85.
- Kuo, S. (2002). From solidarity to antagonism: The uses of the second-person singular pronoun in Chinese political discourse. *Text and Talk, 22*, 29-55.
- Lai, H. (2008). English as an international language? Taiwanese university teachers' dilemma and struggle. *English Today, 24*(3), 39-45.
- Lee, I. (2010). Writing teacher education and teacher learning: Testimonies of four EFL teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*, 143–157.

- Lee, I. (2013). Becoming a writing teacher: Using “identity” as an analytic lens to understand EFL writing teachers’ development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 330–345.
- Leki, I. (1992). Building expertise through sequenced writing assignments. *TESOL Journal*, 1(2), 19-23.
- Leki, I. (1995). Coping strategies of ESL students in writing tasks across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 235–260.
- Leki, I., Cumming, A., & Silva, T. (2008). *A synthesis of research on second language writing in English*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Leontiev, A. N. (1981). The problem of activity in psychology. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 37–71). Armonk, NY: M.
- Li, X. (1999). Writing from the vantage point of an outsider/insider. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. (pp.43-56). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Liao, P.-C. W. (2015). *The professional legitimacy of the Taiwan-educated versus US-educated Taiwanese English teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved January 14, 2017 from <https://dlib.lib.washington.edu/researchworks/handle/1773/33141>
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lin, A., Wang, W., Akamatsu, N., & Riazi, A. M. (2002). Appropriating English, expanding identities, and re-visioning the field: From TESOL to teaching English for globalized communication (TEGCOM). *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 1, 295-316.
- Lin, C. (2012). 臺灣 [英語熱] 現象的知識社會學分析-M. Apple 理論觀點 [The analysis of sociology of knowledge about the phenomenon of “English fever” in Taiwan —M. Apple’s viewpoint]. 國立中興大學, 未出版碩士論文, 台灣台中 [Unpublished master’s thesis, National Chung Hsing University, Taichung Taiwan].
- Liu, J. (1999). Nonnative-English-speaking professionals in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 85–102.
- Liu, Y. (2008). Taiwanese students’ negotiations with academic writing: Becoming “playwrights and film directors”. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 86-101.
- Llurda, E. (2005). Non-native TESOL students as seen by practicum supervisors. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 131-154). New York, NY: Springer.

- Llurda, E. (2005). *Non-Native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Luke, A. (2004). Two takes on the critical. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 21–29). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Matsuda, A. (2003). The ownership of English in Japanese secondary schools. *World Englishes*, 22, 483–496.
- McArthur, T. (1998). *The English languages*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Medgyes, P. (1994) *The non-native teacher*. London, UK: Macmillan.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. London, UK: Sage.
- Ministry of Education (2002). *Challenge 2008: National Development Plan; 2002~2007: e-generation manpower*. Taipei, Taiwan. Retrieved October, 2016, from http://www.edu.tw/Content_List.aspx?n=FB01D469347C76A7
- Ministry of Education (2009). *Plan for Enhancing National English Proficiency*. Taipei, Taiwan. Retrieved October 2016, from http://www.edu.tw/Content_List.aspx?n=FB01D469347C76A7
- Ministry of Education (2011). *Aim for First-Class Universities and Top-Level Research Centers* (2011). Retrieved October 2016, from <http://edu.law.moe.gov.tw/SearchAllResultList.aspx?Keyword=邁向頂尖大學計畫&Cur=L>
- Morgan, B. (2004). Teacher identity as pedagogy: Towards a field-internal conceptualisation in bilingual and second language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7, 172-188.
- Morgan, B. (2007). Poststructuralism and applied linguistics: Complementary approaches to identity and culture in ELT. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 1033–1052). New York, NY: Springer.
- Morgan, B. (2010). Fostering conceptual roles for change: Identity and agency in ESEA teacher preparation. *Kritika Kultura*, 15, 34-55.
- Morgan, B. (2016). Language teacher identity and the domestication of dissent: An exploratory account. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50, 708-734.
- Motha, S. (2006). Racializing ESOL teacher identities in US K-12 public schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 495-518.

- Motha, S. (2014). *Race, empire, and English language teaching: Creating responsible and ethical anti-racist practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Nayar, P. B. (1994). Whose English is it. *TESL-EJ*, 1(1), 1-7.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. London, UK: Longman.
- Norton, B. (2001). Non-participation, imagined communities and the language classroom. In M. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research* (pp. 159-171). Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. J. Gumperz & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 407-437). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Connor, P. E. (1994). You could feel it through the skin: Agency and positioning in prisoners' stabbing stories. *Text*, 14, 45-75.
- Ortega, L. (2009). Studying writing across EFL contexts: Looking back and moving forward. In R. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 232-255). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Park, G. (2012). "I am never afraid of being recognized as an NNES": One teacher's journey in claiming and embracing her nonnative-speaker identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46, 127-151.
- Park, G. (2015). Situating the discourses of privilege and marginalization in the lives of two East Asian women teachers of English. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 18, 108-133.
- Park, J. S.-Y. (2009). *The local construction of a global language: Ideologies of English in South Korea*. New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Park, J. S.-Y. (2010). Naturalization of competence and the neoliberal subject: Success stories of English language learning in the Korean conservative press. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 20, 22-38.
- Park, J. S.-Y. (2011). The promise of English: Linguistic capital and the neoliberal worker in the South Korean job market. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14, 443-455.
- Park, J. S.-Y., & Wee, L. (2012). *Markets of English: Linguistic capital and language policy in a globalizing world*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Pavlenko, A. (2003). "I never knew I was a bilingual": Reimagining teacher identities in TESOL. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 2, 251–268.
- Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). The myth of English as an international language. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. 90-115). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Phan, L. H. (2008). *Teaching English as an international language: Identity, resistance and negotiation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Phan, L. H. (2009). Strategic, passionate, but academic: Am I allowed in my writing? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 8, 134-146.
- Phan, L. H. (2011). The writing and culture nexus: Writers' comparisons of Vietnamese and English academic writing. In L. H. Phan & B. Baurain (Eds.), *Voices, identities, negotiations, and conflicts* (pp. 23-40). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (2007). English, no longer a foreign language in Europe? In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 123-136). New York, NY: Springer.
- Phillipson, R. (2008). The linguistic imperialism of neoliberal empire. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 5, 1–43.
- Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Piller, I., & Cho, J. (2013). Neoliberalism as language policy. *Language in Society*, 42, 23-44.
- Polio, C. (1994, March). *International students in North American MA TESOL programs*. Paper presented at the 28th Annual Convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human Studies*, 9, 219–229.

- Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2008). Discursive constructionism. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Handbook of constructionist research* (pp. 275-293). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Pratt, M. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession*, 91, 33–40.
- Prior, M. (2016). *Emotion and discourse in L2 narrative research*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Prodromou, L. (2008). *English as a lingua franca: A corpus-based analysis*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Pu, H., & Pawan, F. (2014). *The pedagogy and practice of western-trained Chinese English language teachers: Foreign education, Chinese meanings*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ramanathan, V., & Morgan, B. (2007). TESOL and policy enactments: Perspectives from practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 447-463.
- Ramanathan, V., & Morgan, B. (2009). Global warning? West-based TESOL, class-blindness and the challenge for critical pedagogies. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 153-168). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters
- Rampton, B. (1990). Displacing the “native speaker”: Expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, 44, 97–101.
- Reis, D. S. (2010). *Non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) and professional legitimacy: A sociocultural theoretical perspective on identity realization* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.
- Reis, D. S. (2011). Non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) and professional legitimacy: a sociocultural theoretical perspective on identity transformation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 208, 139-160.
- 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), 33–58.
- Richards, K. (2003). *Qualitative inquiry in TESOL*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Roberts, C. (2001) ‘Critical’ social theory: Good to think with or something more? In N. Coupland, S. Sarangi & C. Candlin (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and social theory* (pp. 323–333). London, UK: Longman.
- Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Vintage.

- Samimy, K., Kim, S., Ah Lee, J., & Kasai, M. (2011). A participative inquiry in a TESOL program: Development of three NNES graduate students' legitimate peripheral participation to fuller participation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 558–574.
- Schenkein, J. N. (1972). Towards an analysis of natural conversation and the sense of heheh. *Semiotica*, 6, 344-377.
- Schegloff, E. (2007). Introduction to sequence organization. In *Sequence organization in interaction: Volume 1: A primer in conversation analysis* (pp. 1-12). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S., & Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 3-31.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 133-158.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209-239.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT journal*, 59, 339- 341.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2009). Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes*, 28, 236-245.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Sharifian, F. (2009). English as an international language: An overview. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 1-18). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Shen, F. (1989). The classroom and the wider culture: Identity as a key to learning English composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 40, 459- 466.
- Shi, L. (2003). Writing in two cultures: Chinese professors return from the West. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 59, 369–392.
- Shi, L., & Kubota, R. (2007). Patterns of rhetorical organization in Canadian and American language arts textbooks: An exploratory study. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26, 180-202.
- Shin, H., & Kubota, R. (2008). Postcolonialism and globalization in language education. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 206-219). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, 23, 193-229.

- Simon, S. (1997). Translation, postcolonialism and cultural studies. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 42, 462-477.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Phillipson, R. (1994). Linguistic human rights, past and present. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson & M. Rannut (Eds.), *Overcoming linguistic discrimination* (pp. 71-110). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Song, C. (2003, May, 26). 英語焦慮與文化霸權的問題. [Anxiety for English and the issue of cultural hegemony]. 智邦公益電子報 [Zhi-Bang Enews]. Retrieved from <http://enews.url.com.tw/enews/19608>
- Spivak, G. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. (2003). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (pp. 134-164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stier, J. (2004). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: Idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 2, 1–28.
- Stokoe, E. (2012). Moving forward with membership categorization analysis: Methods for systematic analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 14, 277–303.
- Swan, A., Aboshiha, P., & Holliday, A. (Eds.). (2015). *(En) Countering native-speakerism: Global perspectives*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Talmy, S. (2010). Qualitative interviews in applied linguistics: From research instrument to social practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 128–148.
- Talmy, S. (2011). The interview as collaborative achievement: Interaction, identity, and ideology in a speech event. *Applied Linguistics*, 32, 25–42.
- Talmy, S., & Richards, K. (2011). Theorizing qualitative research interviews in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 32, 1–5.
- Tran, L. T. (2011). In L. H. Phan & B. Baurain (Eds.), *Voices, identities, negotiations, and conflicts* (pp. 59-74). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Tsai, C. (2002). 從英語外籍教師文化優勢現象看台灣英語教育—以文化全球化面向討論之. [An observation of English Education through the Phenomomon of the Superior of English Foreign Teacher.] (Unpublished Master's thesis). Nang Hua University. Chiayi, Taiwan.

- Urciuoli, B. (2008). Skills and selves in the new workplace. *American Ethnologist*, 35, 211-228.
- Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. A. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 4, 21-44.
- Viète, R., & Phan, L. H. (2007). The growth of voice: Expanding possibilities for representing self in research writing. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 6(2), 39-57.
- Wang, M. (2011). Chinese postgraduate students learning to write in English. Toward an understanding of L2 academic writing. In L. H. Phan & B. Baurain (Eds.), *Voices, identities, negotiations, and conflicts* (pp. 41-58). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Wee, L. (2008). Linguistic instrumentalism in Singapore. In P. K. W. Tan & R. Rubdy (Eds.), *Language as commodity: Global structures, local market places* (pp. 31-43). London, UK: Continuum.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wernicke-Heinrichs, M. (2013). Authenticating “non-native speaker teacher” professional identity in FSL education (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved October, 16, 2016 from <http://circle.ubc.ca/handle/2429/45145>
- Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Widin, J. (2010). *Illegitimate practices: Global English language education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Willig, C. (2012). Perspectives on the epistemological bases for qualitative research. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, K. J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol 1: Foundations, planning, measures, and psychometrics* (pp. 5-21). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (2000). Warranting in discourse analysis. In *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text* (pp. 163-178). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wooffitt, R., & Widdicombe, S. (2006). Interaction in interviews. In P. Drew, G. Raymond & D. Weinberg (Eds.), *Talk and interaction in social research methods* (pp. 28-49). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wortham, S., Mortimer, K., Lee, K., Allard, E., & White, K. D. (2011). Interviews as interactional data. *Language in Society*, 40, 39-50.

- Yamchi, N. (2015). 'I am not what you think I am': EFL undergraduates' experience of academic writing, facing discourses of formulaic writing. In A. Swan, P. Aboshiha & A. Holliday (Eds.), *(En) Countering native-speakerism: Global perspectives* (pp. 177-193). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan
- Yan, C., & Su, R. (2008). 探討台灣英語教育的迷思與爭議. [Discussing myth and issues of English education in Taiwan]. *興大人文學報 [Journal of Humanities, College of Liberal Arts National Chung Hsing University]*, 41, 201-214.
- Zhu, W. (2001). Performing argumentative writing in English: Difficulties, processes, and strategies. *TESL Canada Journal*, 19, 34-50.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

RESEARCH QUESTION 1	
<p>How do the participants view themselves as English users and writers in light of the discourse of Native-Speakerism? In particular, how do the participants' Western-educated experiences play a role in constructing their identity as English users and writers?</p>	
1	<p>Background information: age, hometown, institution of teaching; Which school did you go for your bachelor degree in Taiwan? Which school did you gain your degree from in the Anglophone country? How many years have you been teaching in Taiwan.</p> <p>背景問題：年齡，家鄉，教學地點；大學念那一間學校？研究所念那一間學校？回台灣教書幾年了？</p>
2	<p>Can you talk about the writing experiences in the TESOL program? What kinds of assignments or papers you needed to write? What were the biggest challenges and struggles for you?</p> <p>可以談談你在TESOL系上求學過程中的寫作經驗嗎？什麼地方是特別困難的？</p>
3	<p>What kinds of comments did you get for your writing? Were you happy with the comments and grades? If you don't feel happy about the comments, how did you do with it?</p> <p>你還記得那裡的老師給過你的寫作什麼評語嗎？你同意那些評語和成績嗎？如果不同意，你會怎麼做？</p>
4	<p>In your opinion, what comprises a "good" piece of writing in the TESOL program?</p> <p>在你的研究所裡，你覺的什麼因素可以構成好的英文寫作？</p>

5	<p>Did you take any graduate course in teaching of English writing? What did you learn from that course?</p> <p>在你的求學過程中，你有修過英語寫作教學的課程嗎？你從中間學習到了什麼呢？</p>
6	<p>What are the writing experiences in the program that affect your thinking about teaching of English writing?</p> <p>你認為在國外求學的經驗中，什麼影響了你对英語寫作及英語寫作教學的看法？</p>
<p>RESEARCH QUESTION 2</p> <p>How do the participants construct their writing teacher identity after they return to Taiwan to teach English writing in light of the discourse of Native-Speakerism? In particular, how do their Western-educated experiences play a role in constructing their teacher identity?</p>	
1	<p>What courses in your TESOL program do you think the most helpful for your teaching English writing right now? What are the courses you think of less helpful?</p> <p>你覺得你在 TESOL 系上學到對現在的英語寫作教學最有幫助的課程是什麼？什麼是你覺得沒有幫助的？</p>
2	<p>Can you talk about your experiences, struggles and challenges when you come back to Taiwan and teach English writing?</p> <p>當你回來台灣教英語寫作的時候，你有遇到任何挫折嗎？是什麼呢？</p>
3	<p>Does your experiences of English writing in the TESOL program have any influence on your teaching right now? How? Please provide specific examples.</p> <p>你在英語國家的 TESOL 課程裡的寫作經驗，對你現在的教學有影響嗎？</p>
4	<p>In your opinion, what comprise a good English writing pedagogy?</p> <p>對你來說，什麼要素可以構成一個較好的英語寫作教學法/課程？</p>
5	<p>Can you comment on the connection between the ability of English writing and the ability of being a writing teacher?</p> <p>你可以說明一下你覺得寫作能力和當一個寫作老師的能力得關聯性嗎？</p>

Other relevant interview questions	
1	Can you comment on teaching English as a global language? 你有聽過 English as a global language 嗎？試定義？
2	Do you think that Anglophone English standard is still important to teach English writing in Taiwan? Why and why not? 你覺得美式/英式/白種人講的美語對台灣的英語教學還是很重要的嗎？對英語寫作也是很重要的嗎？
3	Do you think that English/writing is widely used among people in Taiwan as a local mean of communication? Examples? 你覺的英文已經成為在地的溝通語言呢嗎？試舉例？
4	I observe that you did XXX in your class today, can you talk about why you teach this way? 我今天觀察到你在課堂上有XXX上課，你可以說明你這樣做的目的是會何呢？
5	Do your students write Chinese English? How would you do if you see Chinese English in their writing? 如果你學生寫的是中式英語,你會如何處理？
6	Do you think that your experiences studying in the West affect your perspectives toward the local variety of English? How so? 你覺得你在國外受教育的經驗對你現在對英語在地化的看法有影響嗎？試解說？
7	In your opinions, what comprises a good English writing lesson? 你覺得什麼因素可以構成一個好的英語寫作課？
8	As English continues to spread around the world, what do you think your role is in teaching English/writing? 當英文一直在擴散的世界可的成為一個溝通管道，身為一個英文教師，你覺得你在其中的角色是什麼呢？

APPENDIX B: JEFFERSONIAN TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

(.)	A dot enclosed in a bracket indicates a pause in the talk of less than two tenths of a second.
(())	A description enclosed in a double bracket indicates a non-verbal activity, for example ((banging sound)).
-	A dash indicates the sharp cut-off of the prior word or sound.
:	Colons indicate that the speaker has stretched the preceding sound or letter. The more colons the greater the extent of the stretching.
()	Empty parentheses indicate the presence of an unclear fragment on the tape.
(text)	The words within a single bracket indicate the transcriber's best guess at an unclear fragment.
.	A full stop indicates a stopping fall in tone. It does not necessarily indicate the end of a sentence.
,	A comma indicates a continuing intonation.
?	A question mark indicates a rising inflection. It does not necessarily indicate a question.
<u>text</u>	Underlined fragments indicate speaker emphasis.
>text <	Indicates that the enclosed speech was delivered more rapidly than usual for the speaker.
<text>	indicates that the enclosed speech was delivered more slowly than usual for the speaker.

TEXT	Capitalized text indicates the speaker is speaking more loudly than in surrounding talk or utterances
=	The 'equals' sign indicates contiguous utterances.
[]	Square brackets between adjacent lines of concurrent speech indicate the onset and end of a spate of overlapping talk.
↓	Indicates falling pitch.
↑	Indicates rising pitch.

APPENDIX C: BETH'S SCORING RUBRICS

Category	4 – Excellent	3 – Proficient	2 - Needs Improvement	1 - Inadequate	Score
Introduction	Introductory paragraph begins with a statement that draws the reader's attention. It also outlines what is going to be discussed in the essay.	Introductory paragraph begins with a statement that attempts to grab the attention of the reader, but is incomplete in some sense, or may not be appropriate to the audience.	Introductory paragraph begins with a statement that might be construed as an attention getter, but is not clear.	Introductory paragraph does not contain a hook or attention grabber.	
Thesis statement	Introductory paragraph contains a clear thesis of main idea with clear suggestions as to how the body of the essay will support this thesis.	Introductory paragraph contains a clear thesis. However, the following support sentences are not necessarily, or only vaguely connected to the body paragraphs.	Introductory paragraph contains a statement that may be construed as a thesis or main idea. However, there is little structural support in the following sentences.	Introductory paragraph contains no clear thesis statement or main idea.	
Body	Body paragraphs provide clear evidence and ample examples to support thesis statement.	Body paragraphs provide clear connections to thesis statement, but may be need more examples or concrete evidence.	Body paragraphs are vaguely on topic, but lack clear connections, evidence and examples of thesis or main idea.	Body paragraphs are unrelated, or marginally connected to essay topic. Examples and evidence is weak or nonexistent.	
Conclusion	Closing paragraph contains a clear restatement of the main idea or thesis of the essay. It also provides a clear conclusion confirming author's position.	Closing paragraph concludes essay in satisfactory manner. However, author's position and / or an effective restatement of main idea or thesis may be lacking.	Conclusion is weak and at times confusing in terms of author's position with little reference to main idea or thesis.	Conclusion is nonexistent with little or no reference to proceeding paragraphs or author's position.	
Organization	Writing shows high degree of attention to logic and reasoning of points. Unity clearly leads the reader to the conclusion and stirs thought regarding the topic.	Writing is coherent and logically organized with transitions used between ideas and paragraphs to create coherence. Overall unity of ideas is present.	Writing is coherent and logically organized. Some points remain misplaced and stray from the topic. Transitions evident but not used throughout essay.	Writing lacks logical organization. It shows some coherence but ideas lack unity. Serious errors.	

APPENDIX C: BETH'S SCORING RUBRICS

Category	4 – Excellent	3 – Proficient	2 - Needs Improvement	1 - Inadequate	Score
Sentence Structure	All sentences are well constructed with very few minor mistakes. Complex sentence structures are used effectively.	Most sentences are well constructed with a number of mistakes. Some attempts at complex sentence structure are successful.	Some sentences are well constructed, while others contain serious errors. Use of complex sentence structure is limited.	Very few sentences are well constructed, or sentence structures are all very simple.	
Grammar & Spelling	Writing includes no or only very few minor errors in grammar and spelling.	Writing includes a relatively small number of errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation. However, reader's understanding is not impeded by these errors.	Writing includes a number of errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation which, at times, hinders reader's understanding.	Writing includes numerous errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation which makes reader's understanding difficult.	

APPENDIX D: AVA'S STUDENT 2'S FULL ESSAY

67

Try to 'approach' the topic in a more straightforward way. Your introduction seems circular; it fails to address the point directly.

Name: _____

Number: _____

Individual Under Age Fourteen Charged with Crimes Should Not be Tried as Adults

There is some "logical fallacy" concern here. Justice ≠ People ...
 (The justice can be defined as that people should act fairly and justly.) Of course

Although the victim's family wants a fair judgment, ^{... (There is a lack of idea consistency between the 2 sentences)} but if "kids" were tried as adults, it may also have violated the definition of justice. ^{? What do you mean here? Rephrase your sentence.} Therefore, the judgments for juvenile criminals

should take one's mind development into consideration. In many countries, 18 years old

^{is considered} ^{so the age} brings about freedom of many issues, like marriage, drinking, buying cigarette. ^{Whoever} ^{doing things legally}

People over 18 ^{are} ^{considered} were allowed to do these important things because they are "mature" enough.

However, juvenile under age 14 are still on elementary school age. ^{middle} They are too immature

to understand the significance of their behavior. I believe that teenager criminals should not be tried as adult.

Is this your main arguing point in this paragraph? ^{It is not a clear topic sentence.} (Children have not matured enough to recognize the gravity of their actions.)

From the scientist's studies shows that brain's prefrontal lobe, ^{Some} ^{that} ^a which plays the pivotal role in restraining ^{human's} ^{human} inappropriate behaviors, may have not developed fully until twenty ^{people turn} years old.

What is this source coming from? Cite the source.

Is this one paragraph?

It only talks about the research finding of

→ Is "maturity" your only arguing point? If so, that's not enough. Only one arguing point will make your argument less convincing.

you need to elaborate more in-depth discussion. you should also take your claim - ~~that~~ Because of immature mentality, juvenile delinquents under 14 should not be tried as adult - clearer.

It could be one of the reasons that sometimes children ^{can} not control impulse, ^{so that} they were not committed the crime deliberately. And it is also unconstitutional to tried them as unintentionally

adult in terms of law. Because the legislature considered that the emotional development this group of delinquents' emotion is not completely developed. hadn't completed yet. (In Constitution of Republic of China, the criminals under age

are fourteen would not be punished.) Therefore, Because of immature development of brain, it is inhuman and unfair to try teenagers under age fourteen as adults.

How is this constitutional regulation related to your claim of teenagers' immature mentality? You need to elaborate more discussion.

You need a clear topic sentence. Another argument point is that the adult court don't have a variety of flexible penalty system sentences like juvenile court do, The fact the teenager is subject to more severe sentence in adults may cause juvenile delinquents under 14

court. (There is an old saying that there is a reason for everything.) The traumatic childhood relative if they are tried as related to your argument? Make your sentences coherent. might be one of the factors to cause their crimes. According to the research, the family is that what research? Don't fake a research. Cite the source may

the top factor to cause the juvenile crimes. Most juvenile criminals came from an unusual come family, and the parents may have delivered false and distorted values. But the children ? what do you mean by "unusual family"?

are still young, they should be given chances to introspect. However, if the teenager criminal

was judge by juvenile court, they can obtain the guidance and treatment. They should be give can have ? unclear sentence. what do you mean here?

chances to correct their errors and make a fresh start. I firmly believe that the young for a perpetrator should be nurtured with restart of their lives positive energy.

Hence, they would have less ? what do you mean by "positive energy"? This allows them to

possibility of committing further crime ~~in the future~~. ~~The guidance and treatment must be~~
~~more effective than the severe punishments in adult court.~~ ^{what do you mean?}
^{your explanation is not clear.}

→ Make your description more concise.

Some may argue ~~by the point~~ that if juvenile only received light sentence of
treatment, they ^{may} would never understand how serious ^{mistakes} what they ^{make} have done. ~~However, the~~
~~record of adult court may cause that they may hard to fit in the society in the future.~~
~~This sentence looks awkward.~~

people might discriminate against them or avoid to getting along with them. So it will
^{may} probably cause more negative influences ^{on} to those young criminals. Moreover, it is unfair

to be judged by society, ~~because everyone should lives with self-esteem.~~ ^{they are} If people tried
them as adults, ^{their criminal} the record will ^{make} people discriminate against those children, ^{and they}
^{may} bring them hurdles in job hunting and interpersonal relationship.
will hard to fit in the society.

Other ^{may} could argue that juvenile ^{detrimental} ~~know they don't~~ need to take responsibility for

their crimes because they are under age fourteen, some ^{may} more willing to commit
crime. Nevertheless, children under age fourteen are elementary school students, they ^{not}

only haven't accepted the rule of law education ^{received} yet, ^{so that} but they also don't know how to act
flawlessly in society. According what I have mentioned ^{above}, some children were

delivered distorted values by their parents. They ^{As} are not the one ^{earlier} to blame. Not to mention
develop ^{Should not be blamed.}

Replace
this sentence.
It looks
awkward.

why?
awkward?

punished those small children severely by the standard of adult court) The treatment of

? What do you mean here? This sentence is awkward
in its structure and meaning.
juvenile is the more mild way to correct their vadies.

↑
This sentence is al
awkward in its
structure and mean

To sum up, the incomplete development of brain and immature mind could be

the reasonable reasons to get juvenile away from trying as adult. And I also firmly believe

that the flexible treatments (must much better than judging juvenile with serious
punishment) In terms of these reasons, the individual under age fourteen should not be

tried as adult.

What do you mean
by "wordy"?
example

- Your description is wordy. Try to make your description more
concise and clear. Avoid wordy sentences :- that makes readers
fail to understand your text

- Pay attention to "tense agreement". Some of your sentences are
present tense and some are past tense. Make your tense use
consistent.