Doctoral Research Article

LANGUAGE AND SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE
TESOL Teachers Negotiating their Relationship with Native-Speakerism

Robert Niewiadomski*
Hunter College, City University of New York

Native-speakerism is a language ideology rooted in hegemonic monoglot English and the colonial phantasm of Western racio-cultural supremacy. It asserts that speakers of privileged varieties of English as their L1 possess the superior right to establish language standards and instructional methods. Moreover, there are extra-linguistic modifiers that native speakerism incorporates, such as ethnicity, social class, or ancestry. This exploratory study, guided by Bourdieu's conception of symbolic violence and legitimate language, seeks to explore how monolingual and multilingual TESOL teachers negotiate their relationships with native-speakerism. The analysis of the data from semi-structured interviews reveals subtle patterns of allegiance and opposition to native-speakerism in the TESOL ecosystem. The study can inform teacher education and promote critical social justice-informed approaches to decolonizing TESOL instruction.

Keywords: native-speakerism, symbolic violence, plurilingual TESOL teachers, monolingualism

Native-speakerism is an ideology that holds that "native-speaking" teachers of English have the superior right to establish language standards and instructional methods (Holliday, 2006). This pervasive ideology accentuates language's role in reflecting and solidifying asymmetric social power dynamics manifested in racial injustice, economic inequity, social exclusion, and symbolic hegemony. As documented by sociolinguistic studies, TESOL teachers regarded as non-native English speakers are marginalized and silenced. Society does not recognize non-native speakers as legitimate owners of the language they teach (Blackledge, 2000). These teachers also have a sense of unpreparedness for teaching, which exacerbates the concern that students perceive them as imposters and their teaching method as illegitimate (Cioè-Pena, Moore & Rojo, 2016). There has been little research on how monolingual or multilingual TESOL teachers handle power dynamics induced by nativist ideologies. This study sought to fill that gap. The inquiry aimed to identify the negotiated power relations between TESOL teachers in the context of monoglot ideologies.

First and foremost, the purpose of the inquiry was to force teachers to critically consider their language ideologies in an increasingly globalized world where English functions as a lingua franca. All teachers, L1 English or otherwise, suffer under such an oppressive orientation, and resisting it begins at the discourse level among the teachers themselves. Furthermore, this inquiry's pedagogical objectives were to provide a deeper insight into the power ecosystem in which the teaching of English occurs and advance the cause of social justice by subverting the mechanisms of native-speakerism. Moreover, the study aimed to encourage de-colonizing TESOL pedagogy and, by extension, de-naturalizing white supremacy.

This exploratory inquiry focused on both monolingual and plurilingual TESOL educators. Plurilingual teachers are proficient in two or more languages (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013; Lüdi & Py, 2009). They often come from multilingual communities where English is one of the languages of communication. On the

*Corresponding author: robert.niewiadomski29@myhunter.cuny.edu

other hand, monolingual TESOL teachers possess competence in English only, sometimes with peripheral exposure to other languages. The popular perception of the latter category is that it consists of native speakers of English, almost invariably from Western countries where English is the dominant or official language. Conversely, the perception of the former category is that English is not their first language.

Two interrelated research questions guided this inquiry. First, how do monolingual and plurilingual TESOL teachers perceive their relationship with the ideology of native-speakerism? Second, how does native-speakerism impact the power dynamics between these groups?

The Ideology of Native-Speakerism

The social imagination of 19th century Europe was captured by the notion of a homogenous community with a shared common origin and destiny (Bonfiglio, 2010a, 2013). This essentialist mythology of the biologically and ethno-linguistically pure nation-state contributed to monoglot hegemony in 19th-century Europe (Bonfiglio, 2013; Pennycook, 1998). Critical theorists working on the relationship between language and power argued that English hegemony was an influential device of cultural control employed by the privileged classes that made colonialism possible (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 2006; Guo & Beckett, 2007; Pennycook, 1998). In turn, colonialism further exacerbated English hegemony worldwide.

The synergy between the specter of nationalistic purity with the earlier imperialist self-image of the Western elites as racially, ethically, intellectually, and linguistically superior to their colonial subjects (Pennycook, 2008) drove the rise of distinctions between linguistic centers and peripheries. This view eventually found its way into 20th-century linguistics. It manifested itself in various ways to organize, classify, and hierarchize English-using speech communities worldwide, according to principles evoking notions of centers and peripheries, with the center dictating the norms (Kachru, 1992). This preoccupation with idealized language variations also influenced Chomsky's (1965) canonical version of a native speaker, a paragon of language proficiency, grammatical acceptability, and linguistic competence. Other iterations of this concept held that native-speaking teachers of English also possessed superior pedagogical qualifications to their non-native counterparts (Holliday, 2006; Selvi, 2010).

Native-speakerism led to a tacit acceptance of monolingualism as an unmarked model (Ellis, 2007), while plurilingualism became an exception. Furthermore, native-speakerism involves extra-linguistic modifiers, including perceptions of accent, notions of racialized identity, and assumptions of citizenship, among others (Amin, 1997; Bonfiglio, 2010b; Braine, 1999; Mahboob, 2005; Rosa & Flores, 2017; Selvi, 2010). Consequently, achieving native or native-like fluency, isomorphic to that of a racially unmarked, monoglot speaker, has been often used as the gold standard of language education. By the 1980s, the language education industry adopted this standard as one of the requirements, placing a large group of non-native English teachers in a precarious position and often subject to discriminatory hiring practices (Braine, 1999). Plurilingual TESOL English teachers unwilling or unable to comply with the monoglot standard of native-speakerism have their linguistic rights imperiled (Eriksen, 1992) by being marginalized, silenced, and denied access to symbolic resources (Blackledge, 2000). Consequently, they become subject to linguistic violence (Gay, 1998), as society does not grant them legitimate ownership of the language they teach. Furthermore, society often views them as imitators of the monolingual speakers of selected varieties of English. These factors impact the formation of professional identities in the TESOL community, which often manifests itself in their teaching practices (Olivo, 2003).

Confirming Monolingual Hegemony

The study aims to join the efforts of researchers who have sought to resist symbolic violence by confronting the monolingual hegemony of the English language. In addition, it strives to amplify the efforts to de-legitimize native-speakerism, colonialism, and white supremacy. These efforts, rooted in critical theory, consist of three strategies: poststructuralist deconstruction, raciolinguistics, and a biographical approach.

The first strategy consists of a poststructuralist deconstruction. It utilizes anti-essentialist concepts of fluidity and performativity of social categories and identities, inspired by gender studies (Butler, 1990). It emphasizes the multiple, fluid, and dynamic nature of teacher identity (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001). Aneja (2016a, 2016b) provided representative examples of this strategy of applying poststructuralism to deconstruct colonial dichotomies of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992). Language imperialism involves teaching English worldwide, which fosters a system of racial and cultural inequality. Other cultures are framed and determined by an English-centric frame of reference. Moreover, it values monolingual English teaching and native English speakers as teachers. Furthermore, it stresses the importance of teaching English early and highlights the detrimental effect of using other languages on English proficiency (Phillipson, 1992).

As Aneja argued, "Individuals are not native or nonnative speakers *per se*, but rather are *(non)native speakered* concerning different characteristics, through different institutional mechanisms, individual performances, and social negotiations" (2016b, p. 576). The researcher coined the term *(non)native speakering* to stress the continuous construction of (non)native subjectivities. Aneja's approach provides an alternative to the native-speakerist dichotomy by replacing it with notions of fluidity and the heterogeneity of subjectivities of (non)native speaker teachers.

The second strategy employed raciolinguistics to uncover the mechanism of power dynamics in creating the native speaker / non-native speaker dichotomy. Raciolinguistics looks at how language constructs race and how race-related ideas shape the way we use language. Rosa & Flores (2017), for example, utilized this approach in their archeology of the role of raciolinguistic ideologies in the emergence of native-speakerism. The dichotomy between native and non-native speakers is essentially an asymmetrical power relation of intrinsically legitimate language practices of racially unmarked subjects and inherently deficient language practices of racialized ones (Bonfiglio, 2010b). Racialization is the process of creating racial categories to put racial meaning on the identities of various groups. In the post-colonial era, these beliefs still organize power relations. Specifically, they do so by perpetuating the impression that the language practices of racialized groups make them inadequate for participation in modern society (Rosa & Flores, 2017). For example, native-speakerism frames the bilingual language practices of racialized US Latinx in terms of a deficit of academic language required for complex thinking processes and successful engagement in the global economy (Rosa & Flores, 2017). Other scholars (Hill, 1998; Lippi-Green, 1997; Urciuoli, 1996) have demonstrated how accent played a role in stigmatizing racialized students.

The third approach explored the role of personal biography in subverting the native-speakerist dichotomy. In one case study, Subtirelu (2011) reconstructed the journey of a non-native instructor who confronted challenges posed to his legitimacy as an English teacher by circumventing the dichotomy entirely and re-negotiating his professional identity as a "well-read linguist." In another biographical study, Cioè-Peña, Moore, and Rojo (2016) examined the oral histories of four plurilingual teachers-in-training. The researchers found that the notion of native and non-native dichotomy emerged as salient in participant self-perceptions, and it manifested in feelings of deficiency and inadequacy. Furthermore, the sense of unpreparedness for teaching exacerbated the fear that students would perceive them as imposters and their version of English as illegitimate and thus not worth learning (Cioè-Peña, Moore, & Rojo, 2016).

Symbolic Violence and Linguistic Dominance

The ideology of native-speakerism highlights how certain notions of language can reinforce racial injustice, economic inequality, social exclusion, and symbolic hegemony in an asymmetric power dynamic. This inquiry utilized Bourdieu's (1991) notions of symbolic violence and legitimate language as a suitable theoretical framework.

Bourdieu (1991) saw language not merely as a method of communication but also as a power mechanism. There are four sociological concepts introduced by Bourdieu (1997) relevant to the current study: *capital*, *field*, *habitus*, and *symbolic violence*. The notion of capital refers to one's command over given economic resources, knowledge resources, and networks of influence. Assets based on prestige or recognition fall into the category of symbolic capital. Access to different forms of capital plays an essential role in one's position in a field - a network of formal and informal norms governing a particular social sphere of activity. Fields are relational and are subject to power struggles among stakeholders, who seek to control the capital in that field (Edgerton & Roberts, 2014). One's position in the field results, among other things, from one's *habitus*. The term refers to a "socialized subjectivity" (Bourdieu, 2002) or an internalized embodiment of social structures guiding one's conceptions, perceptions, and actions. Habitus arises from socialization within the family, and it depends on one's position within the social system (Edgerton & Roberts, 2014).

Dominant groups who command assets of cultural and symbolic capital are assigned a position of social authority, which they use to exert social dominance. This phenomenon, also known as symbolic violence, is usually indirect. Dominant classes exercise it through the control of cultural mechanisms, language, and images. Language ideologies reflect the power dynamics between dominant and non-dominant groups. They justify, normalize, and perpetuate social-cultural structures that benefit dominant groups or, at least, may distort reality in favor of those in power (Bourdieu, 1991, 1997; Kroskrity, 2004; Woolard, 1998). However, the oppressed are not entirely powerless. They utilize various strategies to question and resist the habitus of the dominant classes.

Study Design

The researcher selected six participants, from a larger pool, using a purposeful sampling technique to ensure a linguistically diverse sample (Creswell, 2011). The selected TESOL teachers worked in a large urban area of the northeastern United States. Three participants identified themselves as American-born monolingual English speakers with limited exposure to other languages. In contrast, the three remaining participants identified themselves as plurilingual. One came from a non-English speaking country in Central Europe, another came from a Spanish-speaking country in South America, and the third came from a multilingual country in Asia.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted, which included open-ended focal questions to elicit participants' unconstrained responses and follow-up questions (see Appendix A). The first part of the questionnaire focused on participants 'biographical and linguistic backgrounds. During the second part, the researcher asked the participants about their views on the native-nonnative dichotomy and various contexts in which the distinction appeared. The last question asked the participants to reflect on how their biographical, educational, or linguistic backgrounds shaped their view of that dichotomy (Appendix A).

Participants did not know the specific questions prior to the interview. Each interview lasted between 30 and 45 minutes. They were conducted via Skype, audiotaped, and transcribed. The researcher conducted frequent member checks during the interview and after recording and interpreting the data. Subsequently, the researcher coded the data through the constant comparative method and collapsed the re-occurring codes into main themes that formed the basis for the two main ideological orientations (Ravitch & Carl, 2016).

Findings

The thematic analysis of participants' discourses revealed two main ideological orientations regarding their relationship with native-speakerism. These orientations could be described, in working terms, as *Questioning Monolinguals* (QMs) and *Cautious Plurilinguals* (CPs). QMs are characterized by a general acceptance of the core tenets of native speakerism, albeit not complete and unconditional. Conversely, the main characteristic of CPs is general discomfort with the principles of native-speakerism, without,

however, a downright dismissal of the dichotomy that regulates the discourse. CPs had a tendency to counter the hegemony of native-speakerism. Still, they are uncertain of their status and hesitant to take the radical step of deconstructing the native-speakerist paradigm that regulates the discourse.

The themes constituting the two main ideological orientations are presented below in a compressed form to assist the reader before delving into a more detailed analysis of the participants' individual discourses (see Table 1 below).

Table 1

Ideological Orientations Regarding Relationship with Native-speakerism:

	Questioning Monolinguals (QMs):	**Cautious Plurilinguals (CPs):**
Ontology	Naturalizing - "native speaker" as a natural phenomenon. Chronology - "first language" makes a "native speaker" of that language. Geopolitics – being a "native speaker" of English is inseparable from the language of the geographical and political entity that is the custodian of certain privileged varieties of English (the "inner circle" - United Kingdom, North America, Ireland, Australia). Ethnos – being a "native speaker" of English is inseparable from the language of a certain ethnic community that is the custodian of the privileged varieties of English. Heredity - "nativeness" is transmitted intergenerationally in the context of family and "home" as opposed to learning at school or merely from a surrounding community.	Incidentalness –it appears that the criteria of "nativeness" are conveniently derived from the attributes of speakers of English from certain countries and communities. This seems somewhat incidental provided the historical contingency placed these political and geographical entities as colonial powers. Consequently, their varieties of English became dominant and paradigmatic. Ambiguity - the "native" vs. "non-native" dichotomy is difficult to make sense of. It is not clear what criteria should be used to make this distinction and who decides which of them should be selected and prioritized. Relative Naturalizing –it appears that the "native" vs. "non-native" dichotomy may represent some actual state of reality, even though it is unclear that its origins are natural or socially constructed.
Attitude	Relative Comfort –general approval comfortable with the dichotomy "native" vs. "non-native" with respect to English teachers. Neutralizing - "native" vs. "non-native" as neutral terms.	Relative Unease – the legitimacy of the "native" vs. "non-native" dichotomy is dubious and its continuous use may be potentially harmful to plurilingual TESOL teachers. Inferiority –the positive connotation typically attached to the term "native speaker" as of superior pedagogical skills and more "pure" in terms of competence is a misconception and it places plurilingual TESOL teachers in an inferior position.
Identity	Ownership – only a monolingual "native speaker" can truly be an "owner," a "custodian," or an "ambassador" of English. Personalizing – English language is essential to the "native speaker's" personhood, opposed to being a tool/utility for "non-native" plurilinguals.	Ambiguity – even though there is a doubt regarding the legitimacy of the "native" vs. "non-native" dichotomy, it appears that these terms may describe some "factuality" of certain privileged forms of monolingualism and thus plurilingual TESOL teachers may always be categorized as "non-native."

Competence	Mastery - "native speakers" generally display a higher level of mastery of English due to the "intimate" relationship with the language. Accentism – the accent of the "native speakers" is essential for "comprehension" and thus plays a crucial role in communication. "Native speakers" possess the "correct" accent as opposed to "non-native" plurilinguals.	Mastery – a person labeled as "non-native speaker" may excel in English and outperform the "native speaker." Multilingual Nativeness – it is conceivable that there are "native" bilinguals/plurilingual speakers and they have some advantages over monolingual "natives."
Problematizing	Competence –perhaps some "non-native" plurilinguals possess pedagogical advantages in connecting with students with whom they share their "native" language. Accent – perhaps accents are not so important after all and they are a product of social processes that establish hierarchies of accents related to privileged groups. Multilingual Nativeness – perhaps it is possible to be "native" in two or more languages.	Symbolic Violence – the notion of "nativeness" is used as an instrument of exerting power in educational settings; particularly to assert superior competence: linguistic, interpretative, and pedagogical. "Casteism" – the "native" vs. "non-native" dichotomy in conjunction with the notion of monolingual "purity" as opposed to plurilingual "contamination" creates a harmful appearance of substantive insurmountable differences between TESOL teachers with diverse backgrounds. Professional Marginalization – plurilingual TESOL teachers face prejudices related to the variety of English they speak, their accents, and extra-linguistic factors, in particular, their nationality or country of origin.

Discussion

These two main orientations could be synthesized into "narrative portraits" and illustrated with data-saturated excerpts from interviews. To facilitate readers 'understanding of the data, I have bolded parts of sentences that have particular significance.

Questioning Monolinguals (QMs)

QMs, while prompted to express their thoughts about the native vs. non-native labels, initially displayed a naturalizing approach. The QMs perceived the native-speakerism categories as natural, unmarked, and connected to the majority language of a given county. Furthermore, QMs noted that the native vs. non-native dichotomy applies primarily to teachers, which reflects and reinforces the already established division in TESOL:

> Native and non-native … I think **I use them very comfortably**. I **don't see them as terribly problematic** terms. They seem kind of **neutral** to me. Not having any particular deeper meaning, I think … I guess when I think about it now the issue could be about when they **first started learning English** or something like that … you could be called native or not native, whether your country speaks English as its **main language** … I use them for teachers usually. To describe teachers - native or non-native because I know that in some programs, some students like to only have native speakers teaching them English so… and some students don't have a preference. I would **only use them to describe teachers**.

When asked a probing question, "Who is a "native-speaking" teacher?" QMs self-examination subtly moved from the notion of the language of the country (or idealized *polity* / political identity) or "inner circles" of English (Phillipson, 1992) towards the notions of *ethnos* and heredity. To the initial condition of learning English at home at an "early age," QMs added an additional one – this has to occur in political entities that represent a certain paradigmatic variety of English:

> A teacher probably is native … I mean … If the teacher **received English at home from an early age** I suppose that **technically** could be a native speaker. But if English is the **minority language in their home country**, then it … **I guess that's a question**. I think maybe I would probably be referring to a native speaker as somebody who **is from an English-speaking country, learned English from childhood**. It's an interesting question … but I will probably be referring to **somebody from England, Ireland, Australia, America,** and so forth that **also grew up with English at home.**

Subsequently, QMs' reflections turned towards individuals, who grew up in an English-speaking household but in a country where English was not the majority language. At this stage of their auto-examination, the notion of heredity started to solidify. However, since it was initially conceived as a monolingual construct, entertaining the idea of "multilingual nativeness" problematized it. Nevertheless, a hypothetical person's exposure to a language through early education appeared not to play a significant role as compared to the paramount role of family and home, one was born into:

> Non-native I think I would distinguish them as **not having any English at home from their childhood.** I think that would be the best way … for me … Native … I'm trying to get back to the etymology or something in the word "native" –**natural** and these kinds of related words… I would have to **focus on the home**, and **not the school**, not the language of government … **Native and natural** … like a **home life** … in the home … I would associate with the **home and the family** … Yeah. I think so. I don't think I would… when I think of a native speaker, **I don't think of the country, I don't think of the law, I don't think of the school**. It's more about the **family, the parents, or their caregivers**. And also about childhood, also about **early childhood, pre-verbal childhood**, perhaps I should say. Pre-verbal childhood… I associate with a native speaker… learning to speak through this language; **as opposed to learning a language after you learn how to make language** … So, five years old who begins to learn, even though that's an early age … if the parents hire a French teacher for 5 years old –is not a native speaker of French but an early learner, as opposed to somebody who learned to speak by using that language. Does that make sense? So, I associate it with an early age, the **family**, the **home**, and a **pre-verbal development**.

One can also observe that, as exemplified in the above passage, what transpired was the notion of the importance of linguistic capital as a form, in Bourdieu's terms, of the embodied cultural capital. Nevertheless, in another place, QMs described the assets of cultural capital to "non-native" multilingual teachers:

> If I came from China and I'm teaching English and I have a Chinese student, I may involve some cross translations. It may involve our shared native language in my instruction. So, that's **definitely an advantage that bilingual or multilingual teachers have over me**. It's that I can't come from a place of knowledge like that for a student and there is a case that a bilingual student has a bit more **language awareness** in general than a monolingual student and so that may affect maybe some of the technical aspects of what they teach.

A sense of "ownership/ambassadorship" of the "native" language by the monolingual speaker was another theme that also transpired in QMs discourse. Also, QMs introduced another dichotomy concerning the role played by the English language in the lives of their users, that was superimposed onto the native vs. non-native: personality and tool (identity vs. utility):

> I just feel it's my **responsibility** because I have to have a really clear explanation [of the rules of English]. **I need to represent English**. I feel like I need to represent the language and **defend the language** maybe sometimes, you know, a little bit, even though it seems so crazy so I need to kind of like this is **my language** and I feel kind of **ownership** to it, so I want to be defensive of it … I feel the need to get on a deeper level and be kind of **ambassador** whereas maybe a **bilingual or multilingual teacher recognizes English as a tool rather than, you know, a personality**.

The last major theme that emerged in the QMs discourse pertained to the role of accent in drawing the critical line between "native" and "non-native" speakers. The strong association of the accents of the "inner circle" varieties of English with nativism was, however, problematized by UM's reflection on the socially constructed nature of hierarchies of accents:

> I listen carefully to my colleagues. I mean, I have to listen to accents all day to **correct accents** or to **correct pronunciations**, so I think maybe there is some, as some English teachers would say, that their **radar about accents is a little bit finer**. I think it would be just based on that, not really much anything else because, again, in New York City you can have an accent, you might not sound American but you were born in Coney Island … So … I reserve any judgment where a person is actually from even if they might have a strong, what you would call, accent. But **it would be probably based on that, how they speak, pronunciation.** So, just the accent … in my opinion accents… I think a lot of this actually … the word accent to me is a word that is almost a political word. I have an Ohio accent and somebody else has a North Ohio accent. You know you can get finer and finer distinctions, and what all it is –**is about popularity and power**, and **what accent is acceptable**.

Cautious Plurilinguals (CPs)

Contrary to QMs' acceptance of the core tenets of native-speakerism, CPs expressed discomfort with the labels, without outright rejection of the dichotomy, by pointing to their misalignment with the notion of linguistic competence:

> I personally am **not too fond of these labels** because they carry this connotation that if you are **a non-native speaker somehow you are less than a native speaker**, that is. And I'm not sure how broadly true that is... of course if you put two people who are, you know... who are of similar backgrounds, maybe interests, and aptitude, whatever, whatever, intelligence then perhaps you can compare. Okay, non-native speakers would be like this vs. native speakers. But things really don't work... life doesn't work that way and, you know, a **native speaker can excel** in… I don't know... more in math but not so much in the language. And so a native speaker, sure, can get by and maybe more than getting by but then a **non-native speaker who may be passionate about language and even then they are labeled non-native, they may excel**, they can be even **more eloquent, creative and fluent and whatnot**, you know, in the so-called target language.

In addition to the criticism of native-speakerism based on assumed superior competence, CPs' discourse revealed other ideological dichotomized elements that CPs problematized, namely, the idea of monolingual "purity" as opposed to bi/multilingual "contamination":

> I think with using these terms, I guess, the quick advantage with using these terms is that people may have the conception that if you are a single language speaker, let's just say x-language is your native language, then **your mind is clear of other languages**, of all the complications that come with languages in general. And so your mind is clear, you have, you know what I mean? Like **you're somehow purer and more competent in the native language.** I think that could be the concept.

CPs'resistance to native-speakerism was framed in terms of "connotation" vs. "denotation" of the terms "native" and "non-native" speaker. CPs' discourse did not seem to question the very notion that the terms denote an actual phenomenon. CPs were discontent, however, with the positive connotation of the label "native" that implied superiority:

> People usually **don't use native speakers in a negative connotation**. And **pure is rather a positive connotation** so it just kind of **linked the two together**. **More competent has a positive connotation** and so in the context in which I have experienced these labels and the context in which I've read about these labels those are the adjectives I would use to describe the **misconceptions** anyway.

Although CPs struggled with the dichotomy, they ultimately reified the notion of native-speakerism in a broad sense:

> I'm a true bilingual because also at home when I was little, even though I was in HK, my parents spoke Fujianese around me, and so I heard these languages. So as a bilingual speaker, **I have room in my head to see it from the native speakers's side as well**. And I was just kind of –I need time to reflect: "Why did I interpret this passage in such a way, whereas a native speaker – wouldn't?" I was trying to digest where she was coming from as a native speaker vis-à-vis my interpretation.

Still operating within the "native" vs. "non-native" dichotomy, CPs, similarly to QMs, entertain the notion of "native bilingualism" that was signaled in CPs' discourse as a cultural asset:

> **I am not dismissing the fact that native speakers do have more experience**. And perhaps they have more experience, **perhaps they have more diverse experience with the language** … but again … maybe we should also take in other factors too. Bilingual speakers are speakers growing up bilingual, right? In a bilingual environment, speakers **who have bilingual minds**, for example, are training in bilingual **can also contribute in different ways as well if not in more ways than a single language speaker**.

Nevertheless, CPs' narratives revealed instances of native-speakerism being used to assert interpretative authority and exert symbolic power to gain power over an interlocutor in an educational setting:

> I don't [use these labels] and when people do, just to end an argument, a debate, and a discussion, I get what they mean. For example, **if we are both reading the same passage and**

> **let's just say you are a native speaker and I'm not and I tell you what my interpretation of the sentence is you might say, well that may be but a native speaker would not interpret it that way.** So that somehow ends the conversation. And somehow... and **I have conceded when people did use that** as a quick … like a quick stop on a conversation.

The discourse analysis revealed that both orientations, in the most general sense, do not question the dichotomy imposed by the ideology of native-speakerism. There were, however, quite significant differences in their conceptualizations. The QMs' orientation includes as its constituent elements: Nativism, heredity, accentism, and "ownership" of the "native" language. In many places, however, the QMs' discourse revealed its conceptual heterogeneity that prompted QMs to display subtle signs of discomfort with some of the mentioned concepts, for example regarding the issue of competence, accent, and multilingual "nativeness." Nevertheless, QMs' monolingual habitus was generally isomorphic to the main tenet of native-speakerism in the sense that the "native" vs. "non-native" dichotomy may represent some actual state of reality.

On the other hand, CPs plurilingual habitus manifested interrogation and criticism of the monolingual ideology of native-speakerism but the very idea of nativeness, as a substantive category, was not rejected on principle. CPs generally confronted the symbolic violence of monolingual native-speakerism manifested in its claims to superior competencies: linguistic, interpretative, and pedagogical. Moreover, CPs' discourse problematized the symbolic capital conferred by native-speakerism by exposing the vacantness of the positive connotations associated with it. Instead, CPs claimed that the "native" and "non-native" terms should be used in a denotative sense only.

Conclusion

Native-speakerism led to an implicit acceptance of monolingualism of certain privileged varieties of English as a norm and the perception of plurilingualism as an exception (Ellis, 2007). As a result, even though they represent the majority of English teachers globally in the TESOL field, plurilingual English teachers have been subjected to various forms of linguistic violence. They are frequently denied professional legitimacy, the ownership of the language they teach, and are regarded as deficient versions of monolingual speakers of the privileged varieties of English. They have been affected by systemic marginalization and exclusion (Blackledge, 2000) due to extra-linguistic factors such as geographical origins, race, nationality, and social class (Amin, 1997; Bonfiglio, 2010a, 2010b; Mahboob, 2005; Rosa & Flores, 2017).

This exploratory study was guided by Bourdieu's (1991) conception of symbol violence and legitimate language and sought to explore the ways in which monolingual and multilingual TESOL teachers negotiated their power relationships with native-speakerism. The discourse analysis revealed two orientations, namely Questioning Monolinguals (QMs) and Cautious Plurilinguals (CPs).

Concerning the first research question ("How do monolingual and plurilingual TESOL teachers perceive their relationship with the ideology of native-speakerism?"), the analysis demonstrated that the participating teachers experienced, to varying degrees, a tension between their internalized ideologies of those who are in a position of symbolic dominance and the liberating ideologies of non-dominant groups, to which the participants had some exposure. However, the very notion of native-speakerism, although tested and questioned by participants during interviews, was never completely de-naturalized.

Both ideological orientations represent stakeholders in the same field (Bourdieu, 1997) as TESOL teachers. The field tends to be dominated by monolingual native-speakerist ideology. Nevertheless, QMs and CPs claimed command of different cultural assets. QMs' discourse showed commitment to the embodied cultural and symbolic capital of a monolingual teacher of English. CPs discourse was prone to delegitimize the value of QMs' capital and emphasize the assets of plurilingual teachers. Nonetheless, since fields are relational, they inevitably become subject to power struggles among stakeholders who

seek to control the capital (Edgerton & Roberts, 2014). This was manifested in the cases of both identified orientations.

Thus, with respect to the second research question ("How does native-speakerism impact the power dynamics between these groups?"), QMs seem better positioned in this struggle since their habitus is closely aligned with the field. QMs do not need to resist or subvert the rules of the field but merely uphold and defend them. Nevertheless, the alignment of QMs' s' habitus and the field is not completely isomorphic. Hence QMs displayed some distance from the rules of the field. CPs, on the other hand, represented a habitus that is less aligned with the field. As agents and stakeholders in the field, CPs attempted to resist the symbolic violence of the present ideology by re-shaping the internal rules of the field to validate CPs assets. However, one rule that neither of them questioned is the notion of linguistic nativeness as a substantive "fact."

There is often a persistent conviction among educational researchers that both quantitative and qualitative inquiries ought to strive for scientific objectivity as established by the positivist tradition. Even though such a notion of objectivity has been revealed as an illusion (i.e., Haraway, 1988), generalizability, reliability, and verifiability issues are often raised concerning qualitative research. Therefore, it is necessary to clarify the limitations of this study. Like any type of qualitative research, this study was chiefly concerned with the meaning of phenomena that were investigated. It aimed to "offer interpretations for how and why" (Luttrell, 2009, p.1), concerned with individuals using their voice to make sense of their lives rooted in the rich context of social reality. This study did not attempt to make extensive generalizations but, instead, was more concerned with authenticity, intersubjectivity, and trustworthiness.

Furthermore, it is essential to explicitly acknowledge my positionality as a plurilingual investigator, who is an "instrument" of gathering data and analysis as well as "part of the setting, context, and the social phenomenon he or she seeks to understand" (Schwandt, 2001, p. 224). The researcher did not merely record and analyze the data but also interpreted and co-constructed the narrative in the process of negotiating the meaning with the participants (Talmy, 2010). The research position does not need to be necessarily perceived as a hindrance, as long as the researcher is engaged in an ongoing process of reflexivity that examines the role of biases, theoretical predispositions, and preferences in the process of knowledge construction (Creswell, 2011).

Finally, this exploratory study did not engage in a deeper investigation of the racial and ethnic aspects of the participants that certainly could have played a role in the formation of their and linguistic identities (Rosa & Flores, 2017) and their subsequent relationship with monoglot hegemonies. Thus, no overreaching conclusion regarding the role of race and ethnicity should be drawn based on the data collected in this preliminary study. This aspect of the studied phenomenon unquestionably warrants further exploration in future follow-up studies.

The investigation of the ways TESOL teachers negotiate their relationships with monoglot ideologies, such as native-speakerism, could lead to a deeper understanding of the production of teacher identities. It could inform modifications in teacher education by engaging teachers in a critical examination of their linguistic ideologies without assuming pre-existing identity categories. The pedagogical implications of this inquiry call for an ongoing conversation between monolingual and plurilingual TESOL teachers and students about the role of asymmetrical power dynamics in language instruction and the role of extra-linguistic factors in their formation. This, in turn, could contribute to empowerment in the efforts to decolonize classrooms and de-naturalize nativist hegemonies. In the tradition of critical pedagogy (Freire, 1972), such efforts could be used to re-imagine communities where plurilingual teachers and students aren't seen as misbegotten defective versions of the mythical nativeness (Cioè-Peña, Moore, & Rojo, 2016).

Robert Niewiadomski is a doctoral candidate at Hunter College, CUNY. After graduating from Columbia University, Robert earned a master's degree in TESOL at Fordham University. His research interests are grounded in critical theory. They focus on the intersection between multilingualism, sociolinguistics, raciolinguistics, and queer studies.

References

Amin, N. (1997). Race and the identity of the nonnative ESL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 580-583. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587841

Aneja, G. A. (2016a). Rethinking nativeness: Toward a dynamic paradigm of (non)native speakering, *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 13*, 351-379. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2016.1185373

Aneja, G. A. (2016b). (Non)native speakered: Rethinking (non)nativeness and teacher identity in TESOL teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(3), 572-596. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.315

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2006). *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Blackledge, A. (2000). Monolingual ideologies in multilingual states: Language, hegemony and social justice in Western liberal democracies. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, *1*(2), 25–45.

Bonfiglio, T. P. (2010a). *Mother tongues and nations: The invention of the native speaker.* De Gruyter Mouton.

Bonfiglio, T. P. (2010b). *Race and the rise of standard American*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Bonfiglio, T. P. (2013). The inventing the native-speaker. *Critical Multilingualism Studies, 1*(2), 29-58.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). The forms of capital. In A. H. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, & A. S. Wells (Eds.), *Education: Culture, economy, and society* (pp. 46-58). Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2002). Habitus. In J. Hillier & E. Rooksby (Eds.), *Habitus: A sense of place* (pp. 27-34). Ashgate.

Braine, G. (Ed.). (1999). *Nonnative educators in English language teaching*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brutt-Griffler, J., & Samimy, K. K. (2001). Transcending the nativeness paradigm. *World Englishes*, *20*(1), 99-106. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971x.00199

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2013). Towards a plurilingual approach in English language teaching: Softening the boundaries between languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, *47*(3), 591–599. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.121

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.

Cioè-Peña, M., Moore, E., & Rojo, L. M. (2016). The burden of 'nativeness': Four plurilingual student-teachers' stories. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature, 9*, 32-52. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.677

Creswell, J. W. (2011). *Education research: Planning, conduction, and evaluation quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Edgerton, J. D., & Roberts, L. W. (2014). Cultural capital or habitus? Bourdieu and beyond in the explanation of enduring educational inequality. *School Field*, *12*, 193-220. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878514530231

Ellis, E. M. (2007). Monolingualism: The unmarked case. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, *7*(2), 173–196.

Eriksen, T. H. (1992). Linguistic Hegemony and Minority Resistance. *Journal of Peace Research*, *29*(3), 313–332. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343392029003007

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. (M. B. Ramos, Trans.) (Reprint ed.). Herder and Herder.

Gay, W. C. (1998). Exposing and overcoming linguistic alienation and linguistic violence. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, *24*(2-3), 137-156. https://doi.org/10.1177/019145379802400210

Guo, Y., & Beckett, G. H. (2007). The hegemony of English as a global language: Reclaiming local knowledge and culture in China. *Convergence, 40*(1-2), 117–132.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, *14*(3), 575-599. https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066

Hill, J. H. (1998). Language, race, and white public space. *American Anthropologist*, *100*(3), 680-689. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1998.100.3.680

Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, *60*(4), 385-387. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl030

Kachru, B. (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. University of Illinois Press.
Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 496-517). Blackwell Pub.
Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States* (1st ed.). Routledge.
Luttrell, W. (2009). *Qualitative educational research: Readings in reflexive methodology and transformative practice* (1st ed.). Routledge.
Lüdi, G., & Py, B. (2009). To be or not to be . . . a plurilingual speaker. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *6*(2), 154–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710902846715
Mahboob, A. (2005). Beyond the native speaker in TESOL. In S. Zafar (Ed.), *Culture, context, and communication* (pp. 60-93). Center of Excellence for Applied Research and Training and the Military Language Institute. https://www.academia.edu/816218/Beyond_the_native_speaker_in_TESOL
Olivo, W. (2003). "Quit talking and learn English!": Conflicting language ideologies in an ESL classroom. *Anthropology Education Quarterly*, *34*(1), 50-71. https://doi.org/10.1525/aeq.2003.34.1.50
Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the Discourses of Colonialism (The Politics of Language)* (1st ed.). Routledge.
Pennycook, A. (2008). English as a language always in translation. *European Journal of English Studies, 12*, 33-47. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825570801900521
Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
Ravitch, S. M., & Carl, N. M. (2016). *Qualitative research: Bridging the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*, *46*(5), 621-647. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404517000562
Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Qualitative inquiry: A dictionary of terms* (2nd ed.). SAGE.
Selvi, A. F. (2010). All teachers are equal, but some teachers are more equal than others: Trend analysis of job advertisements in English language teaching. *WATESOL NNEST Caucus Annual Review, 1*, 156-181.
Subtirelu, N. (2011). Juggling identity and authority: A case study of one non-native instructor of English. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language, 15*(3), 1-30. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ957135.pdf
Talmy, S. (2010). The interview as collaborative achievement: Interaction, identity, and ideology in a speech event. *Applied Linguistics*, *32*(1), 25-42. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amq027
Urciuoli, B. (1996). *Exposing prejudice: Puerto Rican experiences of language, race, and class*. Westview.
Woolard, K. A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 3-47). Oxford University Press.

Appendix A

Semi-structured Interview Protocol

Focal Questions:

1. Could you describe/tell me about your linguistic background?
2. Could you describe/tell me about your educational trajectory?
3. Speakers of English are often categorized as "native" and "non-native" –what are your thoughts about this distinction?

4. Have you encountered the terms “native” and “non-native” prior to your training as a teacher? If so, in what context? What were your thoughts about that use?
5. Did the terms “native” and “non-native” occur during your training as a teacher? In what context? What were your thoughts about that?
6. Are these terms used in your current educational setting? In what context? What are your thoughts about that?
7. Have you discussed the use of these terms with others (i.e. colleagues)? Could you please provide context/examples of these conversations?
8. Do you use these terms? If not, why not? If yes, with reference to whom? In what context/situations? Can you provide some examples?
9. Do you think that your own biographical, educational, or linguistic background informed in any way your views on the use of the terms “native” and “non-native”? If so, how?

General Probing Questions (examples):

1. Could you please tell me more about that?
2. You said ___. Could you please elaborate on that?
3. You use the term ____. What motivated you to choose this term?
4. You mentioned ____. Could you please expand on that?