6   "What Authority I Have?": Analyzing Legitimation Codes of English Composition ITAs

Aleksandra Kasztalska
BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Michael Maune
MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

The native English speaker (NES) has traditionally been regarded as the judge of what is correct in language and as a language model for nonnative English speakers (NNESs) to emulate. Because of their presumably innate and superior linguistic competence, native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) may benefit from native-speakerism, or the belief that NESs make better language teachers than their NNES colleagues (Holliday, 2006; Kachru, 1990; Swan et al., 2015). Some research has suggested that native-speakerism in English language teaching (ELT) may limit nonnative English-speaking teachers' (NNESTs') access to employment (Fithriani, 2018; Mahboob & Golden, 2013; Rivers, 2016; Ruecker & Ives, 2015; Selvi, 2014) and that NNESTs may be challenged by students who prefer NESTs (Amin, 1999; Crandall, 2003; Thomas, 1999).

Recent scholarship has further suggested that, beyond language teaching, native-speakerism can also impact NNESTs of writing (e.g., Liu, 2005; Ruecker et al., 2018; Shehi, 2017). Writing classes invariably bring forth issues of language use and interrogate both teachers' and students' assumptions about language in general and, specifically, the language in which one is writing. Because writing and language assumptions are deeply interconnected, NNESTs of writing can be affected by native-speakerism as they negotiate their identities as teachers and experts on writing, as well as nonnative users of English.

One of the most robust contexts where the aforementioned issues arise are FYW courses. These writing seminars are the cornerstone of higher education in the US, as universities typically require that incoming freshmen take at least one, and sometimes more, of these writing-intensive classes. Due to the common practice of hiring international graduate students to teach lower-level courses, many of these introductory courses are taught by interna-

tional teaching assistants (ITAs). While exact data on ITAs of composition is unavailable, April Ginther (2003) noted that ITAs and international research assistants make up about half of all "advanced-level research and teaching assistant activity being carried out by students" (as cited in Cassell, 2007, p. 1) at higher education institutions in the US. Consequently, a large number of writing courses are taught by ITAs, whose responsibility it is to introduce students to the expectations of academic writing and language conventions. It is therefore important to understand the experiences and challenges that these instructors may face in their work as teachers of writing.

Research on ITAs across disciplines has seemed to confirm that these instructors—like other NNESTs—may encounter issues with their students, who at times challenge their authority as legitimate teachers and criticize their use of English. For example, in their small-scale study of graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) who taught undergraduate ESL education courses, Barcu Ates and Zohreh R. Eslami (2012) found that the three NNES GTAs were directly challenged by their students, who claimed that they could not understand their instructors. The participants also believed that their language was "being monitored by [their] students" (Ates & Eslami, 2012, p. 108), as did the 25 ITAs surveyed by Aparna Hebbani and Katherine C. Hendrix (2014). On the other hand, while the six ITAs interviewed by Ekaterina Arshavskaya (2015) did not report being challenged in the classroom due to their NNES status, they admitted to sometimes struggling to keep up with their students' informal and fast speech, and cited anecdotal evidence of students dropping a course as soon as they learned that the teacher was an ITA. This anecdotal evidence is somewhat supported by Julie Damron's (2000) dissertation study. Having conducted focus groups with 26 NES freshmen, Damron concluded that these students were often dissatisfied with their ITAs' use of English and that some preferred to enroll in an American teacher's class rather than take a course led by an ITA. Some of the participants also seemed uninterested and unwilling to develop a better relationship with their ITAs, suggesting that it was the ITA's responsibility to adapt and adjust linguistically, culturally, and pedagogically to the local students.

The limited research on ITAs of composition has suggested that these instructors may also face challenges in their professional work. For example, George Braine (1999) recalled his "traumatic first semester" (p. 21) of teaching FYW in the US and having to adjust to new cultural, pedagogical, and linguistic standards while having to project authority. Moreover, Davi S. Reis (2011, 2012) reported on the experiences of two ITAs of ESL writing, whose professional self-identities seemed to be shaped by their status as a NNES and who consequently experienced self-doubt and feelings of inadequacy as writing

teachers. In this chapter, we shed more light on the experiences of these diverse and multilingual teachers, who play such a key role in U.S. higher education.

The data we analyzed in this chapter were collected as part of a larger study (Kasztalska, 2015) that used interviews, focus groups, and questionnaires to examine the professional practices and identities of ITAs of composition at a large public university in the Midwest. In this chapter, we used legitimation code theory (LCT), a model of how knowledge and people become legitimate in a social field, to re-examine the published data in Aleksandra Kasztalska (2015) and shed more light on how native-speakerism works. LCT allowed us to synthesize a variety of analyses of this problem by revealing that the claims about an inherent difference between NESs and NNESs and the claims that NESs are better teachers of English or writing are rooted in a common basis of legitimation. In particular, our analysis suggests that these claims are made because of certain underlying assumptions about knowers and knowledge in ELT and composition. These assumptions, which operate as rules to (de)legitimate NNESTs, place emphasis on social group attributes rather than knowledge and abilities, which creates tensions between different stakeholders in the field. Informed by the LCT analysis, we argue that as a general rule writing programs should emphasize knowledge about writing rather than social attributes, namely native-speaker status, when making administrative, curricular, and personnel decisions.

Legitimation Code Theory

In analyzing the structure, types, and range of knowledge construed in the data, we drew on LCT. LCT is a sociological theory of knowledge that aims to be empirical in its methods and practical in its effects (Maton, 2014). Knowledge is modeled in LCT as a structure with different dimensions, and the most salient for this study is specialization. Specialization describes the "basis of knowledge claims to legitimacy" (Maton, 2014, p. 31) and reveals to what degree knowledge or types of knowers are being emphasized as necessary to make legitimate claims in a given field. When a claim is deemed legitimate because of the speaker's choice of object to study or their method of studying that object, then the relationship between the claim and the object of study—or the epistemic relations (ER)—is stronger. For example, when a scientist makes a claim in a research article, the claim can be deemed legitimate based on their choice to use the scientific method to arrive at and to justify the claim, which indicates that ER are relatively strong.

In contrast, when a claim is considered legitimate because of some attribute or disposition of the speaker, then the relationship between the claim and the speaker—or the social relations (SR)—is stronger. For example, a teacher may

make a claim about teaching, and their claim may be deemed legitimate primarily because of some attribute or disposition of the teacher, such as extensive experience or native speaker status. This legitimation process shows stronger SR compared to ER. In short, specialization can show what serves as the basis for making legitimate claims in a field—knowledge (ER) and/or knowers (SR).

LCT posits that in any particular knowledge practice, such as teaching or writing, emphasis may be placed more or less on ER or SR along a cline. In other words, when trying to make a legitimate claim in a field, sometimes it matters more that one knows something and sometimes it matters more that one has a particular attribute as a practitioner in that field. Some knowledge practices emphasize ER over SR. These represent *knowledge codes* because legitimate knowledge is based more on "possession of specialized knowledge of specific objects of study" (Maton, 2014, p. 30) than on "attributes of actors" (p. 30). Conversely, some practices represent *knower codes* because they are legitimized by placing more emphasis on the knower and their attributes, such as their "dispositions" (Maton, 2014, p. 32), "natural talent," or "taste" (p. 31). Finally, practices that rely on both ER and SR equally are *élite codes*, while *relativist codes* rely on neither.

LCT has been useful in examining legitimation codes and knowledge structures of various educational fields. For example, Hanelie Adendorff and Margaret A. L. Blackie's (2020) LCT analysis of decolonizing science curriculum in South African universities has shown a productive way forward to addressing issues of equality and discourse. However, LCT has not yet been applied to examine native-speakerism and the experiences of ITAs in composition.

In our study, we used the dimension of specialization to reveal the basis of legitimation in the fields of composition pedagogy and ELT. In particular, we examined the degree to which these fields emphasize ER (knowledge) and SR (knowers). Because authority and legitimacy were key themes in the foundational study (Kasztalska, 2015), specialization provided a different analytical lens to classify and refine the interpretation and potential implications of knowledge practices in teaching composition.

Methods

In this chapter, we reanalyze the published results of questionnaires, interviews, and focus groups from a previous study conducted by one of the authors (Kasztalska, 2015), which examined the developing professional identities and practices of ITAs of composition and the role of world Englishes in this process. In this chapter, the term world Englishes refers to the framework, first proposed by Braj Kachru, for describing the global spread of English as well as the growing field of research on the emerging English varieties and their uses.

The participants in Kasztalska (2015) were 15 international graduate students pursuing Ph.D. degrees in English-related fields and working as ITAs at a large Midwestern university in the US. The majority of the participants were teaching composition, and a few taught or tutored oral English communication. The ITAs represented diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds and had generally lived in the US for several years prior to the start of the study.

Due to scheduling conflicts, only 12 of the 15 ITAs in the study were able to participate in semi-structured focus groups, and four of these ITAs also took part in a follow-up interview that used Steinar Kvale and Svend Brinkmann's (2009) life world interview model to further explore the issues raised during focus groups. In addition, the three ITAs who were unable to take part in focus groups agreed to one-on-one semi-structured interviews. The focus groups and interviews centered on how the ITAs negotiated their identities as writing teachers and NNESs. In particular, the participants were invited to share their reasons for becoming teachers, their positive and negative experiences in the classroom, and the challenges they faced as writing instructors more generally and as NNESTs in particular. Additionally, the participants were asked to share how, if at all, they applied their knowledge of world Englishes to their teaching practice and how, if at all, the world Englishes framework influenced their own identities or helped them navigate native-speakerism in their professional lives. The researcher focused on world Englishes because this university offered courses specifically on world Englishes, and the majority of the participants had been exposed to this field in their graduate coursework.

All focus groups and interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed, and all participants were given female pseudonyms, even though some participants identified as male. The researcher decided to use female pseudonyms because at the time of the study there were so few male ITAs teaching composition that revealing this information about them might have made it easier for someone familiar with the university to infer the identity of the participants. All participants were asked to fill out an anonymous written questionnaire, which collected demographic, educational, and professional aggregate data.

In Kasztalska (2015), the first author followed John W. Creswell's (2013) guidelines to identify a number of themes emerging from the data. These were then subdivided into more specific codes, using John Lofland's (1971) classification. The major themes identified through this method included pedagogical, cultural, and linguistic challenges faced by the participants in their teaching. Another key theme was the influence and interaction of two

discourses—that of world Englishes and native speakerism—on the ITAs' professional practice and identity. The researcher wanted to understand how, if at all, the ITAs' exposure to the world Englishes framework and research, which problematizes the concept of the native speaker and of the ideal English user, might challenge the participants' native-speakerist assumptions in ELT and in composition.

In the analysis presented in this chapter, both researchers used Karl Maton's (2014) legitimation code theory (LCT) to examine the participants' framing of the native speaker construct and the NES/NNES dichotomy. The LCT analysis drew on procedures from Maton and Rainbow Tsai-Hung Chen (2015) for LCT qualitative research design. Our goal was to provide a typological classification of the knowledge practices described by the participants, especially those related to native-speakerism. To this end, we built on the themes developed in Kasztalska (2015).

We initially coded each theme according to its ER and SR emphasis. We then grouped themes by their specialization code and conducted further analysis via research memos outlining the potential indicators of the code and representative participant quotes for those themes. We consolidated like themes in the same code to achieve parsimony. This process resulted in a translation device[1] (Maton, 2014; Figure 6.1, Tables 6.1 and 6.2) that serves as a set of systematic empirical indicators for classifying and describing the data according to their ER and SR and which serves to justify the conclusions from the data.

Knowledge claims are legitimated through **relative emphasis** on…

Epistemic Relations	Social Relations
English composition curriculum & instruction	Teacher identity
U.S. cultural knowledge	U.S. cultural experience
Standard English language knowledge and use	Native speaker status
Training & educational support	Community & emotional support
Non-English language knowledge and use	Non-native speaker status

Figure 6.1. Overview of translation device for ITA dataset.

In Figure 6.1, we provide an overview of the main ways the knowledge claims were legitimated in the data. Knowledge claims can be legitimated by emphasizing ER more or SR more, and the ER and SR are manifested through different concepts, as described in Figure 6.1. In Table 6.1, we expand on the ER concepts and provide empirical indicators and examples of each of the concepts. In Table 6.2, we expand on the SR concepts and provide empirical indicators and examples of each of the concepts.

Table 6.1. Epistemic Relations Translation Device for Coding ITA Dataset

Epistemic Relations Concept	Empirical Indicator	Example
English composition curriculum & instruction	Knowledge of teaching methods (ESL, rhet/comp), course structure, and/or content knowledge (texts, genres, academic conventions) is emphasized.	"It's completely different here in the context of U.S. . . . That we need to emphasize those three things [logos, pathos, and ethos] when you make an argument? . . . That was something that I don't know."
U.S. cultural knowledge	Knowledge of specific cultural artifacts and/or practices from US is emphasized.	"[The] approach that I was getting training was a . . . digital rhetorics approach? And we had to do . . . movie reviews, writing . . . narratives with . . . the pictures or something? . . . That was all kind of new to me? So I kind of struggled how to exactly teach them. . . . I'd never written that kind of thing . . . in my life. Before."
Standard English language knowledge and use	Knowledge of English academic/specialized vocabulary, grammar, and standard pronunciation is emphasized.	"Even in the textbook sometimes I would . . . read the text and I would see the words that I don't know. I was like, wow. What is this? . . . What does this word even mean? You know, I had to . . . look it up in the dictionary."
Training & educational support	Having previous teaching experiences, training in local pedagogies, and sharing of materials, strategies, and knowledge are emphasized.	"Because it's . . . a really tough transition for me because that was the first time I actually taught in the classroom setting ever. Before that I was only a tutor."
Non-English language knowledge and use	Knowledge of non-English vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation is emphasized.	"At the end of the day, I feel more competent as an English teacher to teach writing and grammar and all kinds of other skills. Because I'm a nonnative speaker, I have been taught all these things in the past, so I know where students make mistakes and how I can help them basically with all those areas, a lot better."

Table 6.2. Social Relations Translation Device for Coding ITA Dataset

Social Relations Concept	Empirical Indicators	Examples
Teacher identity	Identifying as a good writer and/or an authoritative and knowledgeable teacher is emphasized.	"Sometimes I feel like . . . To be the teacher? . . . Especially in Asian culture? . . . Teachers tend to appear to be knowledgeable? And know everything . . . So I feel like, should I be your teacher?"
U.S. cultural experience	Past experience in U.S. culture and relating to that culture is emphasized.	"I don't know what kinds of classes that they take in high school? And what kinds of things that they learn? . . . So whenever they talk about, like, high hool experience in their essays . . . I couldn't really, you know, share the same feelings."
Native speaker status	Being a native speaker is emphasized as the basis for being a legitimate teacher and/or writer.	"Because they are native speakers, their writing will be good."
Community & emotional support	Emotional support, sense of community, and validation from peers, students, and faculty are emphasized.	"I feel like if you do kind of have this rapport with the students and they do trust you and you trust them, so they're actually willing to help you. Like, if you don't know something . . . Can you tell me more? And . . . they feel like they can actually help you."
Nonnative speaker status	Being an international student and/or nonnative speaker is emphasized as the basis for being a legitimate teacher.	"I think we have similar education. We share this common language. And so I think it's actually [an] advantage for me to teach these group of students. Cause I can relate [to] their difficulties?"

Results and Analysis

The Native Speaker is a Knower Code

The native speaker construct was often framed by the ITAs as a knower code, meaning that whether one can claim to be a NES or not depends more on their attributes than on their knowledge of the language. One of the more significant attributes that defined the NES is identifying as or being identified as a NES. For example, one participant drew an analogy between NES status and a person's skin color—both of which she framed as innate, immutable characteristics. She likened a NNES's desire to sound like a native to something as unrealistic as

wanting to change one's skin color: "And then I think you are, for example, you are an Asian? And then you wanna be like a Caucasian . . . How can you change your skin color? It's just like that." In using racial terms to discuss the NES/NNES dichotomy, the participant likened NES status to belonging to a social group that one is generally born into, thus suggesting that NES status is based primarily on who a person is, instead of what they know. This finding supports Alan Davies' (2004) observation that the NES/NNES distinction reveals more about one's "autobiography" (p. 438) and their social membership than their language abilities. The participant's response also points to a possible racial dimension of the NES/NNES dichotomy (Butcher, 2005; Hackert, 2009; Mahboob, 2009). Further evidence is offered by another ITA who received "weird reactions" from her students, which she attributed to the fact that she is not White and speaks with a nonstandard accent: "I had surprises on their faces when they saw me. I'm this girl with black hair, dark eyes, I don't look American at all, I have this accent, where did I come from?" In sum, the basis of legitimation for being a NES rested largely on identifying with or being identified as part of that particular social group—which gives credence to Davies' (2004) argument concerning the circular reasoning of native-speakerism.

Another significant form of evidence supporting knower code classification of NES status was the ITAs' emphasis on a certain kind of *knowing*—a feel for the language or an innate intuition that differs from explicit principles and procedures of knowledge. As one participant suggested, NES competence extends beyond knowledge of grammar or the ability to produce grammatically "correct" sentences, and includes something less tangible yet "native-sounding":

> I could write correct sentences but the correct sentence does not mean the best sentence or the perfect sentence or the native-sounding, or it would sound native to the native speaker. So they would tell . . . this is written by the international student. Because the way they write, even though it is correct, even though it is grammatically correct . . . There is something different there.

As this excerpt suggests, only a NES can write a "perfect" sentence, and it is the NES who judges whether a sentence sounds perfect, based on how native-sounding it is. In other words, the language produced by a NES differs from that of a NNES precisely *because* it possesses some ineffable quality or characteristic that marks it as native-like. This further supports our claim that the NES construct is a knower code, which legitimizes those with an intuitive, tacit *knowing* over a more clearly defined, principled *knowledge*, such as grammatical knowledge.

Writing and Writing Pedagogy Emphasize Native Speaker Status

In discussing writing and writing pedagogy, the ITAs suggested that these fields place some emphasis on a particular type of knower as a basis for legitimation. For example, several participants admitted that they used to subscribe to the "good writer fallacy" (Kasztalska, 2018), or the belief that NESs are innately good writers. This belief places the basis of legitimation for being a good writer on the kind of knower that a person is—that is, a NES. As one ITA put it, as a novice teacher she assumed that even her first-year U.S. students would produce strong papers: "Because they are native speakers, their writing will be good." Moreover, she experienced a "writing crisis that came from thinking of [herself] as a bad writer because [she's] not a . . . native writer." In essence then, the good writer fallacy conflates NES status and writing skills, thus framing writing as an inherent attribute rather than a learned ability, which prevents some ITAs from seeing themselves as strong writers in English or as legitimate teachers of English writing. Thus, the good writer fallacy as an extension of native-speakerism may contribute to the feelings expressed by ITAs and other NNESTs who see themselves as subpar teachers and English users (Braine, 2004; Reis, 2012; Tang, 1997; Wolff, 2015).

In emphasizing NES status, the good writer fallacy also relies on the writer relating to U.S. cultural artifacts and practices as a basis for being a legitimate writer. This may lead to a perceived imbalance between the NNEST and NES student, in which the student is framed as being more competent in writing because of their experience with U.S. culture. One ITA reported that she recognized this imbalance as based on the lack of a shared past experience: "I don't know what kinds of classes that they take in high school? And what kinds of things that they learn? . . . So whenever they talk about, like, high school experience in their essays . . . I couldn't really, you know, share the same feelings." This past experience of acculturation into U.S. culture also played a role in teaching writing, as another ITA explained:

> I also had difficulty with understanding . . . cultural issues? Like, when we discuss something . . . related to politics I really didn't have anything to say because I didn't have any background in that area. So I couldn't really bring that into discussion in my class . . . And it was not just about politics. It was about many different topics that I didn't feel comfortable having students discuss about . . . because I don't know any-

thing about it. And writing always includes something about culture, I think.

Thus, along with the emphasis on the NES identity, the ITAs seemed to also recognize an emphasis on becoming legitimate through experience with NESs' dominant culture. Both of these place the basis of being a legitimate teacher of writing on social identities and/or experiences (SR) rather than discrete knowledge (ER).

This lack of shared cultural experience compounds the already challenging situation many ITAs face in their "traumatic first semester" (Braine, 1999, p. 21) as novice writing instructors. According to another ITA:

> [NES student background] is something that is very difficult for me to relate to when I taught [mainstream composition] in the beginning. Because it's . . . a really tough transition for me because that was the first time I actually taught in the classroom setting ever. Before that I was only a tutor . . . I was teaching American students. I have zero international students in my class, unfortunately.

These statements echo those made by ITAs in other studies, whose authors called for more intercultural training for ITAs to help them relate to and teach domestic students (Ates & Eslami, 2012; LeGros & Faez, 2012), as well others who argue that students should receive similar training (e.g., Corbett, 2003). At the same time, while the emphasis on shared experience in composition can be a challenge for ITAs working with NES writers, our research also suggests that it can help ITAs work with NNES writers. This sentiment was echoed by several participants, who stated that because they can "relate to the experiences [international students] are going through," ITAs understand their students' needs and offer meaningful feedback. In sum, the evidence suggests that writing instructors are legitimated by NES identity and the acculturation that comes with that status; on the other hand, when teaching NNES students, the ITAs' NNES status can grant them some legitimation.

Because NES status appears to be a knower code and because writing and writing instruction seem to emphasize a particular kind of knower—the NES—the ITAs' experiences suggest a code clash. In other words, the code that the participants use to legitimize themselves clashes in some ways with the one expected in the field they are working in. Specifically, the ITAs see their potential legitimacy as based on their knowledge of English and writing pedagogy, but the code they experience also includes the expectation that

one must be a particular kind of knower or person—NES—with particular experiences—shared cultural knowledge.

One of the consequences of this code clash is that the ITAs, like other NNESTs in prior research (e.g., Crandall, 2003; Thomas, 1999), are not regarded as legitimate writers or teachers of writing by their students. This was suggested by a participant who felt that she had to "prove" to her students that she is "qualified even though [she's] not [a] native speaker." This code clash led her to feel anxious in teaching writing to NESs, who she feared may question her authority. While this ITA did not report any overt resistance from her students or outward prejudice, a few others felt they were challenged by students, at least in part due to their status as NNESs. For example, one ITA thought that some of her students were "testing [her] vocabulary" in an attempt to discredit her as a teacher, while another admitted that in their final course evaluations some students wrote that they wanted an "ENGLISH teacher," in all capital letters. This suggests that at least some NES students also subscribe to the good writer fallacy and rely on NES status in evaluating their writing teacher's legitimacy. As a result, the prevalent discourses on writing present a seemingly insurmountable obstacle for ITAs of composition, who are denied professional legitimacy on the basis of being NNESTs. This finding brings to our minds Suresh A. Canagarajah's (1999) observation about the "absurdity" of a field that "prepares one for a profession it disqualifies the person at the same time" (p. 77).

While the NES seems to be the "ideal knower" (Maton, 2014, p. 32) for being a writer and writing instructor, there is also a great deal of data in the study that challenges this form of legitimation. As also suggested by the ITAs, NNESTs were generally quick to discover that NES students were not always as skilled in their writing as one might assume. Several participants were surprised when they found some "terrible writing styles" or "grammatical mistakes" in papers produced by their NES students. The realization that NESs were not in fact innately talented at writing in their mother tongue seemed to have helped some ITAs see themselves as more legitimate teachers and recognize the importance of their knowledge and training in composition, which many of their students lacked. In other words, emphasizing knowledge in the practice and teaching of writing allowed NNESTs to recognize that they really "can help some students" and to claim authority as writing teachers.

Implications

Our LCT analysis of the data reveals two key findings. Firstly, the NES tends to be discursively constructed as a knower code rather than a knowledge code. In other words, what distinguishes NESs from NNESs is not primarily their

use of language, but rather their identification or perceived status as a NES. This finding supports Davies' (2004) assertion that the NES/NNES distinction is not a matter of linguistics or language abilities, but instead marks an individual's perceived social membership in the NES group, which is often contingent upon nonlinguistic factors, such as place of birth or race (Mahboob, 2009; Moussu & Llurda, 2008). Secondly, teachers perceived as NNESs, including ITAs, may experience a code clash when attempting to claim legitimacy as teachers of English writing. This is because the "good writer fallacy" (Kasztalska, 2018) frames writing competence as an innate attribute of NESs, rather than a learnable skill, and thus delegitimizes NNESs as English writers. The code clash also stems from the framing of successful teaching of writing as contingent upon the teacher and student sharing some cultural background and knowledge, which many NNESTs do not share with NES students. As a result of the code clash, many ITAs in this study and in other studies (e.g., Ates & Eslami, 2012; Liu, 2005; Ruecker et al., 2018) may struggle to see themselves as legitimate writing teachers or as an authority in the classroom.

This study largely supports earlier assertions that the "native speaker fallacy" (Phillipson, 1992, p. 182) can impede NNESTs' attempts to claim legitimacy as English teachers (Varghese et al., 2005). In addition, our LCT analysis also reveals the underlying assumptions about knowledge and knowers in ELT and composition. There are several key implications of our research for writing program administration (WPA) and for ITA training, but our overarching recommendation is that WPAs recognize native-speakerism as a knower code and strengthen their ER, emphasizing knowledge more in teaching writing. Emphasis on knowledge as the basis of legitimation should not only inform how writing and the teaching of writing are discursively framed, but should also inform course instructor assignments, teacher training, and writing curriculum.

WPAs Should Emphasize Knowledge in Course Instructor Assignment.

Firstly, course instructor assignment decisions should not be based on the teacher's NES status, but instead on their knowledge and overall readiness. To this end, we recommend that WPAs work more closely with ITAs and other TAs to assess their readiness for teaching specific courses. Moreover, writing programs should not assume that an ITA is inherently better suited to working with international students or that local TAs should work with NESs. Instead, WPAs should follow the example set by the institution in this study, which regularly assigns ITAs to both ESL and mainstream writing

courses. Above all, writing programs should understand the educational and professional backgrounds, as well as teaching abilities of all incoming TAs, thus placing a stronger emphasis on knowledge—as opposed to internal attributes—for course instructor assignment.

WPAs Should Emphasize Knowledge in Training ITAs.

We suggest that writing programs re-evaluate their ITA training to emphasize knowledge. Since many ITAs in this and other studies (Liu, 2005; Reis, 2012) report anxiety over teaching composition, especially to NESs, they may benefit from more explicit training. First, ITAs can benefit from learning about the local cultural and educational context and about the local student population, as this information should inform every teacher's instruction. Second, ITAs may need more extensive training in composition theory and pedagogy, which can help them make sound pedagogical choices and follow best teaching practices. Additionally, a stronger foundation in composition may allow ITAs to more readily see themselves as experts on writing and as authorities in their classrooms.

Moreover, we argue that to prepare ITAs for working with NESs and to challenge the "good writer fallacy," ITA training programs should expose these teachers to texts produced by both experienced and inexperienced NES and NNES writers. In concurrence with the emerging studies on ITAs of composition (Liu, 2005; Ruecker et al., 2018), our research suggests that exposure to different types of writing can remind NNESTs of composition that one's status as a NES or NNES does not reflect or limit their writing abilities. ITAs are often surprised to find that many of their NES students cannot produce strong academic texts, which leads ITAs to embrace more of a knowledge orientation to writing and realize that writing is ultimately learned. When reminded of their own training and experience with academic writing, ITAs can more easily claim legitimacy as English writers and as teachers of writing.

While we argue that there needs to be more emphasis on knowledge in the training of prospective writing teachers, we are *not* arguing against an emphasis on social relations in general. We critique certain knower codes in this chapter, but we also recognize the need for preparing and supporting ITAs through certain practices that emphasize knowers. Specifically, we agree that writing programs need to familiarize ITAs with local cultures and student populations, build stronger peer support systems for ITAs, as well as foster a feeling of community and emphasize diversity (Liu, 2005; Nemtchinova et al., 2010; Ruecker et al., 2018). ITAs may also benefit from working with or shadowing a more experienced instructor before they teach their own class (see Reichelt, this volume). In sum, while a certain knower emphasis is important

in ITA training, we argue that WPAs should place more emphasis than they currently do on knowledge in their training of prospective teachers.

WPAs and Writing Teachers Should Make Writing Expectations More Explicit.

Finally, our LCT analysis suggests that for students to benefit from ITAs' and NESs' instruction, the bases of legitimation for successful writing and being a successful writer should be made as explicit as possible. In order to reveal the "hidden curriculum" (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996, p. 169), students need to know the "rules of the game" (Maton, 2014, p. 11) for writing in terms of specialized knowledge, principles, and procedures, as well as knower attributes and dispositions. Neither of these should be hidden or implicit. When knowledge and knowers are not discussed, students are left to make inferences that often lead to misconceptions like the "good writer fallacy" (Kasztalska, 2018). As we have shown, this misconception can lead to a code clash between ITAs and some NES students' image of a legitimate writing teacher. In effect, ITAs may not be regarded as legitimate teachers of English writing because they are not NESs and they do not share cultural experiences with their students.

To challenge or avert the development of these misconceptions, writing must be explicitly framed as a knowledge code that can be learned, rather than an internal attribute like NES status or having a specific cultural background. To this end, following Mary Macken-Horarik (2011), we advocate for writing programs to *foreground* explicit teaching of writing knowledge and to *background* the reliance on internal attributes and shared cultural experience. However, we also recognize that sometimes knowledge is not enough; students need to be *taught* to develop some internal attributes to head off misconceptions about NNESTs. In particular, we advocate—alongside Todd Ruecker and colleagues (2018)— for explicit teaching of the value of linguistic and cultural diversity in order for students to develop a more just disposition towards teachers and writers from diverse backgrounds. Only through emphasizing knowledge and developing knowers can we help shape effective educational contexts for students to learn writing from NNESTs and to see these teachers of writing as legitimate.

References

Adendorff, H., & Blackie, M. A. (2020). Decolonizing the science curriculum: When good intentions are not enough. In C. Winberg (Ed.), *Building knowledge in higher education* (pp. 237-254). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003028215-14

Amin, N. (1999). Minority women teachers of ESL: Negotiating White English. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching* (pp. 93-104). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315045368

Arshavskaya, E. (2015). International teaching assistants' experiences in the U.S. classrooms: Implications for practice. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *15*(2), 56-69. https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v15i2.12947

Ates, B., & Eslami, Z. R. (2012). Teaching experiences of native and nonnative English-speaking graduate teaching assistants and their perceptions of preservice teachers. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 23*(3), 99-112.

Braine, G. (1999). From the periphery to the center: One teacher's journey. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-Native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 15-27). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315045368

Braine, G. (2004). The nonnative English-speaking professionals' movement and its research foundations. In L. D. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals* (pp. 9-24). University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.9648

Butcher, C. A. (2005). The case against the "native speaker." *English Today*, *21*(2), 13-24.

Canagarajah, S. A. (1999). Interrogating the "native speaker fallacy": Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77-92). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315045368

Cassell, E. C. (2007). *Understanding community linguistic diversity: An ecological approach to examining language use patterns of international graduate students* [Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University]. Purdue e-Pubs. https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/dissertations/AAI3287301/

Corbett, J. (2003). *An intercultural approach to English language teaching*. Multilingual Matters.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 169-206). Cambridge University Press.

Crandall, J. (2003). They DO speak English: World Englishes in U.S. schools. *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin*, *26*(3), 1-3.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage.

Damron, J. A. (2000). *Chinese 101, a prerequisite to math 100? A look at undergraduate students' beliefs about their role in communication with international teaching assistants* [Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University]. Purdue e-Pubs. https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/dissertations/AAI3018186/

Davies, A. (2004). The native speaker in applied linguistics. N A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 431-450). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470757000.ch17

Fithriani, R. (2018). Discrimination behind NEST and NNEST dichotomy in ELT professionalism. *KnE Social Sciences, 3*(4), 741-755. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i4.1982

Hackert, S. (2009). Linguistic nationalism and the emergence of the English native speaker. *European Journal of English Studies*, *13*(3), 305-317. https://doi.org/10.1080/13825570903223541

Hebbani, A., & Hendrix, K. G. (2014). Capturing the experiences of international teaching assistants in the US American classroom. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 138*, 61-72. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20097

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

Kachru, B. B. (1990). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes*. University of Illinois Press.

Kasztalska, A. (2015). *The role of world Englishes in supporting international teaching assistants' professional identity and development* [Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University]. Purdue e-Pubs. https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/dissertations/AAI3736165/

Kasztalska, A. (2018). International teaching assistants in the composition classroom: From world Englishes to translingualism and beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *18*(3), 161-175. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2018.1545584

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Sage.

LeGros, N., & Faez, F. (2012). The intersection between intercultural competence and teaching behaviors: A case of international teaching assistants. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, *23*(3), 7-31.

Liu, J. (2005). Chinese graduate teaching assistants teaching freshman composition to native English speaking students. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Nonnative Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession* (pp. 155-177). Springer. https:/.doi.org/10.1007/0-387-24565-0_9

Lofland, J. (1971). *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis*. Wadsworth.

Macken-Horarik, M. (2011). Building a knowledge structure for English: Reflections on the challenges of coherence, cumulative learning, portability and face validity. *Australian Journal of Education*, *55*(3), 197-213. https://doi.org/10.1177/000494411105500303

Mahboob, A. (2009). Racism in the English language teaching industry. In A. Mahboob & C. Lipovsky (Eds.), *Studies in Applied Linguistics and Language Learning* (pp. 29-40). Cambridge Scholars Press.

Mahboob, A., & Golden, R. (2013). Looking for native speakers of English: Discrimination in English language teaching job advertisements. *Voices in Asia Journal*, *1*(1), 72-81.

Maton, K. (2014). *Knowledge and knowers: Towards a realist sociology of education*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203885734

Maton, K., & Chen, R. T.-H. (2015). LCT in qualitative research: Creating a translation device for studying constructivist pedagogy. In K. Maton, S. Hood, & S. Shay (Eds.), *Knowledge-building: Educational studies in legitimation code theory* (pp. 27-48). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315672342

Moussu, L., & Llurda, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching*, *41*(3), 315-348. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005028

Nemtchinova, E., Mahboob, A., Eslami, Z., & Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (2010). Training non-native English speaking TESOL professionals. In A. Mahboob (Ed.), *The NNEST lens: Non-native English speakers in TESOL* (pp. 222-238). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

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, 2011*(208), 139-160. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2011.016

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.

Rivers, D. J. (2016). Employment advertisements and native-speakerism in Japanese higher education. In F. Copland, S. Garton, & S. Mann (Eds.), *LETs and NESTs: Voices, views and vignettes* (pp. 79-100). British Council.

Ruecker, T., Frazier, S., & Tseptsura, M. (2018). "Language difference can be an asset": Exploring the experiences of nonnative English-speaking teachers of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, *69*(4), 612-641. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44870978

Ruecker, T., & Ives, L. (2015). White native English speakers needed: The rhetorical construction of privilege in online teacher recruitment spaces. *TESOL Quarterly*, *49*(4), 733-756. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.195

Selvi, A. F. (2014). Myths and misconceptions about nonnative English speakers in the TESOL (NNEST) movement. *TESOL Journal*, *5*(3), 573-611. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.158

Shehi, M. (2017). Why is my English teacher a foreigner? Re-authoring the story of international composition teachers. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, *44*(3), 260.

Swan, A., Aboshiha, P., & Holliday, A (2015). Introduction. In A. Swan, P. Aboshiha, & A. Holliday (Eds.), *(En)countering native-speakerism: Global perspectives* (pp. 1-8). Palgrave MacMillan. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1344103

Tang, C. (1997). The identity of the nonnative ESL teacher: On the power and status of nonnative ESL teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*(3), 577-580. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587840

Thomas, J. (1999). Voices from the periphery: Non-native teachers and issues of credibility. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 5-14). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315045368

Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. A. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *4*(1), 21-44. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327701jlie0401_2

Wolff, D. (2015). *All in the same boat? Native and non-native English speaking teachers' emerging selves in a US MATESOL program*. Michigan State University.