

Reinforcement of White Native-Speakerism: An Analysis of English Language Teacher Training Materials

GATESOL in Action Journal
2020, Vol. 30(1), pp. 16–31
ISSN: 2331-6845

Elise Brittain

Culture, Literacy, and Language, University of Texas at San Antonio

Abstract

This article draws awareness to Whiteness as a centered phenomenon in ELT which contributes to discriminatory practices through reliance on and privileging of White norms on a global scale. This study sought to address this issue through a critical discourse analysis of 14 English as a foreign language (EFL) open-source teacher training modules with the following guiding question: How are ideologies that reinforce White native-speakerism demonstrated in open-source English teaching methodology training materials designed for global ELT audiences? Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS; Nayak, 2007), the concept of native-speakerism (Holliday, 2006), and the ‘native speaker’ frame (Lowe, 2020) informed the theoretical assumptions of the study. Critical Discourse Studies (CDS; Wodak & Meyer, 2015) provided an analytical lens to examine discourses of power and framing of ideology in the texts. The main thread that emerged from the analysis was an *avoidance of stance*, demonstrated through contradictory, simultaneous representations of resistance to and reinforcement of ideologies of White native-speakerism. This avoidance of stance is exemplified through *representation of language varieties*, the emergence of a *monolingual view of teaching*, *representations of culture*, and *the framing of authenticity*.

Keywords

White native-speakerism, Whiteness, English teacher training, training materials, English as a foreign language (EFL), English language teaching (ELT), reinforcement, resistance

Background

The 2020 murders of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and Ahmaud Arbery by police officers in the United States incited the most recent wave of nationwide anger about the brutal treatment of African Americans in the U.S. and reignited an awareness across organizations and racialized communities of the need to address systemic racial divides. Our international field of English language teaching (ELT) is no exception to the presence of systemic racism which privileges Whiteness. A statement from English Language Programs, which oversees some U.S. Department of State-funded international English teaching programs, expressed a call for an antiracist stance:

Now, more than ever, the world needs compassion, exchange, and mutual understanding. The death of George Floyd was a horrendous tragedy that has mobilized the world to stand up for justice and human rights in solidarity with communities of color everywhere. (English Language Programs, 2020)

This call recognizes a need to reexamine ELT in teacher preparation as well as U.S. public and cultural diplomacy efforts around the world as part of the work to address systemic racism as a collective challenge to discrimination.

This article draws awareness to Whiteness as a centered and reinforced phenomenon in global ELT which contributes to discriminatory practices against English educators and learners who do not conform to White norms¹ (Charles, 2019; Gerald, 2020a, 2020b; Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Lowe & Lawrence, 2018; Matias & Mackey, 2016; Ruecker, 2011; Schreiber, 2019; Zacharias, 2019). Language is not a neutral tool (Pennycook, 2017) and carries political implications in the ideologies that accompany its use, learning, and teaching. This study examines the reinforcement of Whiteness in ELT through a critical analysis of an open-source teacher training program developed for English as a foreign language (EFL) teacher audiences which is available as part of U.S. Department of State English teaching initiatives. The following question guided the study: How are ideologies that reinforce White native-speakerism demonstrated in open-source English teaching methodology training materials designed for global ELT audiences?

Whiteness and the *Native Speaker*

Whiteness is a socially-constructed, fluctuating, racialized ideology based on exclusion of socially-constructed racialized groups (Gerald, 2020b; Nayak, 2007; Ruecker, 2011). It is not only appearance but also *doing*—actions, behaviors, and thinking standardized and centered as norms (Jenks & Lee, 2020). Primarily, the naturalization of Whiteness in relation to an *Other* is propagated by White people but can also be internalized by People of Color (Matias & Mackey, 2016). White individuals may be unaware of or deny their racial identities and privilege (Picower, 2009). Robin DiAngelo described the implication of this in her conversation with Layla Saad on the *Good Ancestor* podcast, saying, “If I can’t hold what it means to be white, I cannot hold what it means not to be white” (Saad, 2019). Resistance to acknowledgement of White racial identity and privilege may manifest as strategic tools of Whiteness that act as a *protection* of hegemonic views (Picower, 2009). This self-protection aligns with Robin DiAngelo’s (2018) concept of white fragility which originates in “superiority and entitlement” and reinforces “white racial control and the protection of white advantage” (p. 2), resulting in avoidance of the inequality that emanates from the ELT field because of the discomfort that accompanies this recognition (Gerald, 2020a, 2020b). This may take the form of an “altruistic shield” applied to White educators in ELT (Gerald, 2020a, p. 22), or “native speaker saviorism” (Jenks & Lee, 2020, p. 2) or the ‘white savior’ role, which places Whiteness as the destination for non-White students and the White educator as the guide to salvation (Matias & Mackey, 2016).

The term *native speaker* encompasses a racial component along with a linguistic component (Ruecker, 2011; Sung, 2011). Native speakers of English are often described as people born in countries with a majority White population and closely associated with Whiteness historically (Phillipson, 1992; Ramjattan, 2019; Ruecker, 2011; Ruecker & Ives, 2015); however,

¹ The work of decentering Whiteness in my life, both as a person who identifies as White and as a White teacher and scholar in ELT, is new for me, and this article and the analysis described marks a beginning to an ongoing process of growth, learning, and action toward supporting Black lives and the lives of marginalized peoples. For those interested in forming accountability and action groups and continuing the conversation of decentering Whiteness in ELT, in academia, or beyond these institutions, we can form groups toward this work together, and I invite correspondence toward this endeavor. I strongly encourage readers to follow the work and training developed by Dr. Della V. Mosley and Pearis Bellamy (2020) and their colleagues at academics4blacklives.com and #Academics4BlackLives to first and foremost support your Black colleagues, and through such work also support your non-Black People of Color colleagues and *non-native* English speaking colleagues.

these associations may be greater with countries such as the U.S., the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada (Charles, 2019; Iams, 2016; Kramadibrata, 2016; Ruecker, 2011) with others forgotten or excluded (e.g., South Africa, Ireland) (Ruecker, 2011). The label native speaker may be assigned primarily to a homogenous, stereotyped, and essentialist view of White native speakers, and the nuanced experiences of teachers representing non-White racialized groups, notably Black teachers of English, are not considered (Charles, 2019; Kubota, 2018). The exclusion of race from the conversation about native-speakerism ignores the internalized image of a racialized White native speaker as the ELT ideal (Sung, 2011). This study applies these understandings to examine reinforcement of the White native speaker image and influence in teacher training materials designed for EFL audiences and distributed with a public and cultural diplomacy agenda.

Theoretical Framework

Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS), the concept of native-speakerism (Holliday, 2006), and the native speaker frame (Lowe, 2020) formed the theoretical basis for the study. CWS is described by Nayak (2007) as consisting of the following foundational beliefs:

1. Whiteness is a modern invention; it has changed over time and place.
2. Whiteness is a social norm and has become chained to an index of unspoken privileges.
3. The bonds of whiteness can yet be broken/deconstructed for the betterment of humanity. (p. 738)

This lens brings forward the social construction of Whiteness in ELT; the privileges and disparities associated with conforming or not conforming to White-centered norms; and the need for resistance to these naturalized and internalized norms.

Native-speakerism is an ideology that privileges those considered to represent the notion of the Western native speaker of English (Lowe & Lawrence, 2018). The use of the term is “characterized by the belief that ‘native-speaker’ teachers represent a ‘Western culture’ from which spring the ideas both of the English language and of English teaching methodology” (Holliday, 2006, p. 385). Holliday’s conceptualization of native-speakerism has been critiqued for exclusion of intersecting identities of native speakers who may experience privilege of native speaker status but also marginalization based on race, such as Black teachers of English (Charles, 2019) and other biases (e.g., ableism, heteronormativity, ageism). “Native speakerness and Whiteness work in tandem to signify competence and intelligence and thus superiority, negatively affecting the experiences of non-native or native English-speaking teachers of color” (Kubota, 2018, p. 3654). This study employs the term *White native-speakerism* to denote the privileged White Western norms which exclude non-native speakers of English and People of Color, including Black, Asian, Indigenous, Indian, and the myriad ethnic and racialized identities of native speakers of English.

Lowe’s (2020) definition of ideologies is “widespread systems of knowledge and belief” (p. 51). These systems are “socially-constructed and cognitively-stored” (Jumiah, 2016, p. 17), making them unobservable (Lowe, 2020). Lowe (2020) indicates that ideology can be interpreted by identifying frames, which are more readily observable. The native speaker frame refers to a lens which “has a monolingual and monocultural approach to language teaching” and, though not necessarily explicitly, “devalue[es] and den[ies] the contributions and traditions of other cultures and educational systems” but may also be influenced by additional localized ideologies and discourses (Lowe, 2020, p. 57). Although distinguishing the two, Lowe aligns the native speaker

frame to the White racial frame which centers White norms, resulting in the perpetuation of systemic racism. Lowe (2020) indicates the following examples of dominant discourses reinforcing the native speaker frame: the idealization of the 'native speaker,' Western methodological superiority over non-Western approaches, methodological standardization of best practices, English-only in the classroom, and cultural deficiency of students. These conceptualizations formed the basis of the assumptions of this study.

White Native-Speakerism Research in ELT

Research regarding teacher identity has explored the complex experiences of Black teachers of English abroad, revealing a navigation of native speaker status privilege and simultaneous marginalization (Charles, 2019). White preservice teachers preparing for culturally diverse classrooms in the U.S. have expressed a realization of their own White discourse stance through Critical Whiteness Studies (Matias & Mackey, 2016), while also demonstrating the employment of *tools of Whiteness* to justify their biases (Picower, 2009). White native speaker teachers with experience abroad have reflected on their White native speaker privilege through autoethnography (Iams, 2016) and duoethnography (Lowe & Lawrence, 2018). Other studies have explored White teachers' navigations of morality in South Korea (West, 2019) and native speakers' reactions to changes in local policy which threatened their privileged positioning in English teaching in South Korea (Jenks & Lee, 2020). *Non-native* teachers have shared their experiences navigating their self-value as educators and as non-native speakers (Sung, 2011; Zacharias, 2019). Non-native speaking MA TESL students in Sri Lanka and native U.S. undergraduates also reported challenging their own misconceptions about each other through a cultural exchange project (Schreiber, 2019).

Exclusion based on White native-speakerism was demonstrated through Lowe and Lawrence's (2018) description of Yamanaka's (2006) research which showed the exclusion of certain varieties of English from contexts which use English as a native language. Mohamed (2015) also exemplifies exclusion in a Libyan EFL text's reading passage which reduced an image of poor Black South Africans to exoticism and Othering. Textbooks typically include standard dialects of English (e.g., American Standard English) while other native English language dialects, such as African American Vernacular English, are excluded (Jumiah, 2016). The view of textbooks as authentic representations of all English language use perpetuates a hidden curriculum that renders deviations as illegitimate English use (Jumiah, 2016). Jumiah also notes that the producers of textbooks are generally from where English is spoken as a native language, i.e. *Inner Circle* countries as named by Kachru (2006) or *center* countries according to Phillipson (1992). Teaching methods are recommended from the dominant center, providing White, Western countries with the authority to dominate the development and distribution of texts even though local developers are able to produce them (Kumaravadivelu, 2016). Kumaravadivelu (2016) critiques the notion that the critical examination of textbooks from White native speaker dominant countries should fall on local teachers and students: "It would be naive to think that the passive tactics of the weak can deter the aggressive strategies of the strong" (p. 75). Leaving the local context to critically break down White native-speakerism is a task of challenging a dominant internalized discourse.

Textbooks and materials may be presented and received as neutral, generalizable tools (Jumiah, 2016; Mohamed, 2015). However, the perspective of language as an ideology (e.g., Bourdieu, 1991 & Foucault, 1972, as cited in Jumiah, 2016) positions texts as "ideology-driven and serv[ing] certain interests" (Jumiah, 2016, p. 58). Jumiah (2016) found Western social and economic ideologies which serve the interests of White Western publishers and society in high

school EFL texts developed for Saudi Arabia. Topics in generalized texts include *neutral* topics (e.g., clothing, food) and exclude *controversial* topics (e.g., religion, racism), indicating a belief that removal of these topics renders a text neutral (Jumiah, 2016). Mohamed (2015) understands textbooks as ideology in their reflection of the writers' cultural perspective which is then reinforced among textbook users. The attempt to generalize the content of textbooks removes the development of the negotiation of cultural identity in English, demonstrated by Jumiah (2016) who criticized the minimal inclusion of Islamic texts in Saudi EFL textbooks as an omission that removes students' opportunity to use English to express an integral part of their identity, thereby deepening the divide between English language and the local culture.

White native speaker status may be either ascribed or not ascribed based on students' and parents' perspectives. Charles (2019) described how one Black teacher of English in South Korea did not openly state she was teaching Black history to avoid potential conflict with parents. Iams (2016) described referring a friend to a job who was not considered because students expected native speakers. Kramadibrata (2016) showed that students indicated a preference for a White teacher when seeing videos with the image and voice of a White or Indian teacher. Sung's (2011) observations in Hong Kong included parents' preference for White native speaker teachers, exemplified through a parent's doubt regarding an Asian American teacher, only appeased by the monolingual status of the teacher, indicating a bias equating bilinguals with inferiority as English teachers. Ramjattan (2019) named the use of such preference to justify discriminatory hiring practices as "inequality as customer desire" (p. 134).

White Native-Speakerism in Teaching Methodology

Kumaravadivelu (2016) describes English teaching methodology as "the most crucial and consequential area where hegemonic forces find it necessary and beneficial to exercise the greatest control, because method functions as an operating principle shaping all other aspects of language education: curriculum, materials, testing, and training" (p. 73). Methods, such as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), emanate from White-dominant developers, presented as universal solutions to EFL teaching needs (Kumaravadivelu, 2016). Although methodologies such as CLT are simply approaches, they may be accompanied by "some sense of cultural superiority or cultural chauvinism" (Lowe & Lawrence, 2018, p. 180). Delivery of methodologies as best practices to different cultural contexts without attention to local cultural and methodological practices imposes White native speaker developed methodologies as the ideal (Lowe & Lawrence, 2018). Even historical methods highly criticized now, such as grammar and translation, still widely employed in EFL contexts, are "Western ideological imposition[s] on non-Western countries" which reinforce the ideology "that only English teaching techniques from the West are appropriate, and [native English speakers] are most suitable to teach the English language because it is their native language" despite variance in culture and educational techniques (Charles, 2019, pp. 6–7).

White native-speakerism is reinforced through this hidden curriculum which influences teachers' socialization into English teaching (Lowe & Lawrence, 2018). English programs may reinforce and normalize such ideologies through the hiring of only teachers trained in Western institutions or conducted by Western staff, orientation processes, classroom observations, and professional development sessions (Lowe, 2020). Kiczkowiak et al. (2016) discuss how demand for native speakers for teacher training activities prioritizes the methodologies of White-dominant English-speaking countries without challenging lack of contextual knowledge or potential monolingual biases. Even native speakers with no teaching qualification or experience are considered to have valuable teaching methodology contributions for EFL contexts, demonstrated

in a recount of a White teacher's induction into the Peace Corps as an inexperienced teacher trainer (Iams, 2016).

The White 'native speaker' may be considered inherently linguistically equipped to teach English, while those categorized as *Other* are not. Iams (2016) noticed trends in publication titles which demonstrated the ideology generalizing native speaker teachers as linguistic ideals with non-native teachers indicated as linguistically challenged in teaching but more pedagogically qualified. These generalizations primarily include Standard English, which is associated with White middle and upper class status (Jumiah, 2016). Black teachers of English in Korea sought to dismantle the myth of White-centered monolithic English use in ELT (Charles, 2019). Native speakers may hold ideas that they are the best pronunciation teachers, which reinforces the ideology that to be perceived as a "good" English speaker, one must sound like a native, excluding the multiple accents, varieties, and uses of English around the world (Charles, 2019). This echoes beliefs expressed by native teachers, who also mocked non-standard-conforming accents in Korean uses of English, that only native speakers could lead English-only zones, which they believed necessary for proper development of English (Jenks & Lee, 2020).

Standards of English are based on an unspoken accommodation of the White listener (Flores, 2020; Gerald, 2020b; Rosa, 2016). Rosa (2016) argues that the standards set for academic language development for students are based in raciolinguistic ideologies which favor White native speaker judgment. Studies of ELT textbooks show how White supremacist ideologies manifest in the materials through "the racialization of the English language and associating the idealized native speaker's identity of English to whiteness" (Jumiah, 2016, p. 150). Flores (2020) criticizes the assumptions that Mexican-origin students in the U.S. lack *academic* language in both Spanish and English, an assumption marking their uses of language as inferior. This ascribed "languagelessness" is in reality a nonconformity with dominant standards and a perception that users are "incapable of producing *any* legitimate language" (Rosa, 2016, p. 163). There is a need to combat such ideologies through raising language awareness among educators (Kiczkowiak et al., 2016).

Reinforcement of White Native-Speakerism

The ELT policies of specific countries can reinforce White native-speakerist ideologies. For example, South Korea has enforced visa laws requiring English teachers to hold passports from countries strongly associated with White native speaker status (Charles, 2019; Jenks & Lee, 2020; West, 2019). The visa requirements of South Korea have expanded to include English teachers from other countries such as Singapore, Malaysia, the Philippines, and India; however, these teachers are required to possess teaching credentials that are not required for teachers from countries strongly associated with Whiteness (Charles, 2019). Jumiah (2016) describes a societal internalization of light skin status and alignment of identity with Whites' power and wealth access in Saudi Arabia that is reinforced through EFL textbooks and circulating ideologies that position American and British standard varieties of English as more prestigious and connected with economic and social opportunity. Schreiber (2019) describes the policies and practices of English use in Sri Lanka where English is used regularly in an official capacity as a result of British colonization history despite the official languages being Sinhala and Tamil, with unequal English access across the country resulting in a social hierarchy associating English use with higher status (Schreiber, 2019). Job advertisements and hiring practices of English teachers in China have been shown to favor native speakers (Sung, 2011). The reinforcement of White native-speakerism through the societal ideologies and official policies of specific countries and communities may

impact resistance to hegemonic policies and practices in ELT, especially when seen as “the way things are” and legitimizing inequality (Ramjattan, 2019).

Notions of authenticity are entwined with White native speaker norms (Lowe & Pinner, 2016). A label of authenticity places materials, language use, etc., in a state of authority which upholds the power attributed to White native speakers (Lowe & Pinner, 2016). Culturism, or Othering, can occur in how references to authentic materials refer to native speakers and Other users of English, essentializing Western norms in contrast to the local culture, just as native-speakerism others the non-White Western English speaker (Lowe & Pinner, 2016). Authenticity may be seen as cultural capital, or the view that learning certain varieties of English results in gain of status, connecting knowledge with Western standards (Lowe & Pinner, 2016).

Positionality

My embodied Whiteness and use of Standard American English as an ESL instructor both inside and outside the U.S. have reinforced ideologies of White native-speakerism. Students asked to learn how to speak “like me” and described me as a “real American” to compare me to U.S. citizens of non-White racialized identities. I was invited to conferences outside my expertise, introduced as an “American native speaker” and not as a credentialed and experienced teacher. My native speaker status granted me privileges, moving myself and my companions through border checks and granting me publishing and speaking opportunities. As I address my lack of active resistance to my own privilege, my neglect in empowering non-White colleagues, and my taking for granted my understandings of teaching methodology, I acknowledge that my process of change is ongoing and in flux. In undertaking this analysis, I did not remove my own Whiteness and internalization of White norms in ELT. I recognize that my perceptions of language, speakers of English, and English teaching are strongly entwined with internalized White native-speakerism that requires a lifelong unlearning. As such, undertaking this process of change has shaped and will continue to evolve my interpretations as I confront my internalized truths.

Methodology

The critical lens turned toward Whiteness in ELT is called for by scholars that have identified Whiteness as “the central driving force behind ELT” which either explicitly or implicitly excludes those seen as non-White or non-White conforming (Gerald, 2020b, p. 45). Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) (Wodak & Meyer, 2015) provided the analytical lens to examine discourses of power and framing of ideology in the texts. From this lens, discourses are understood as more than uses of languages but placed within the context which frame language use, as “relatively stable uses of language serving the organization and structuring of social life” (Wodak & Meyer, 2015, p. 5), and include written, oral, and visual texts. Dominant ideologies are understood in how they “appear as ‘neutral,’ linked to assumptions that remain largely unchallenged” (Wodak & Meyer, 2015, p. 8). Power is “in the way discourse (re)produces social domination...mainly understood as power abuse of one group over others, and how dominated groups may discursively resist such abuse” (Wodak & Meyer, 2015, p. 9). Theoretical and empirical analyses are essential to each step of CDS, “imply[ing] a circular and recursive–abductive relationship between theory and discourse” (Wodak & Meyer, 2015, p. 14). In this study, this relationship between theory and discourse was addressed through an ongoing review of literature prior to and during analysis to connect interpretations from empirical studies to the researcher’s interpretations of discourses in the training modules. CDS informed the analytical approach to examining discourses in the modules which reinforce or resist the social division of different racialized identities in ELT,

understood both through what is said and what is left unsaid and therefore presented as inferable (Gee, 2014). CDS in this study guided the analytical focus to textual and visual discourses that frame or resist ideologies of White native-speakerism, both present and not present and that have been demonstrated in previous studies to unequally position the roles of different groups, their racialized identities, and uses of languages and language varieties within the context of global EFL teacher training.

Data Sources

The materials are 14 open-source teacher training modules available on AmericanEnglish.state.gov, developed through the University of Oregon for the U.S. Department of State Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs Office of English Language Programs (Opp-Beckman & Klinghammer, 2006). Each module consists of a video segment available on YouTube that is between ten and fifteen minutes and a text facilitation guide with handouts to accompany the videos. The videos begin with a narrated introduction of the module focus, followed by video clips of classroom teaching or interviews with teachers. The footage represents primary, secondary, and adult level classes, with English classrooms in the U.S., Egypt, Costa Rica, and Thailand. The facilitation guides, approximately 10 pages of text each, begin with notes for the trainer, “Before Viewing” discussion prompts and vocabulary related to the content focus or video segments, reflection questions, and steps for teachers to create an action plan for teaching. The guides also include suggested answers to the reflection questions on the video segments. Each module focuses on one of the following topics: contextualizing language, building language awareness, integrating skills, pair and group work, learner feedback, managing large classes, learning strategies, authentic materials, critical and creative thinking, alternative assessment, individual learner differences, younger learners, peer observations, and reflective teaching. The modules were designed for a general EFL teacher audience whose goals are, according to the introduction, “to build an academic or ‘pedagogical’ foundation in language teaching” and “to improve language teaching classroom practices” (Introduction, p. 7). These materials are likely to be used by EFL teachers in countries in which the U.S. sponsors English language programs. The modules are designed for flexible use and could be facilitated by an experienced teacher trainer or by teachers in individual or group professional development. The modules are designed to be used either in the order presented or selected individually based on interest. Users are encouraged to consider how they might immediately apply what they learned to their own contexts. The modules were designed to address a lack of teacher training materials with examples from EFL teaching contexts.

Data Analysis

The application of CDS guided the focus of coding on discourses which framed ideologies of White native-speakerism, including both what was said and not said, and potential inference in the context (Gee, 2014). The analysis included identifying positioning of power: between participants and facilitators, between teachers of different racialized identities, between varied teaching methodology choices, and the wording and framing of questions and definitions (e.g., culture, authentic materials). Both what the module developers chose to include and not include were considered. The common ideologies regarding White native-speakerism gleaned from the literature review guided interpretation of discourses in the text, which included a consideration of the potential premises that led to the choices in phrasing by the developers (e.g., “other speakers

of English” vs. “non-native speakers”) and possible interpretations of these choices by target audiences (Fairclough, 2016; Gee, 2014).

An initial review of literature provided guidance in uncovering discourses which framed normative White teaching practices against a deficient Other and the framing of success as the achievement of a native-like (i.e., White) norm. All data source materials were reviewed prior to coding to gain a general sense of the modules. A textual analysis of the facilitation guides was conducted first: The instructions for facilitation, questions for participants, and suggested responses to the video discussion prompts framed the textual materials as guiding documents. The prior and ongoing literature review informed the initial stage of deductive thematic coding of the written texts which resulted in the development of topic coding and in vivo codes (Richards, 2015). Emergent themes were then categorized for the second round of coding, targeting the framing of the discourses evidenced in initial themes and the development of analytical codes (Richards, 2015). This resulted in topical categories, including culturally-related, language-related, program-related, and teacher-related codes, authenticity, and adaptation to the local context. Refinement of these categories included text searches of the textual data sources for words and phrases including “authentic,” “culture,” “effective,” “it is important,” “real world,” and “speakers” to identify instances of repeated discourse patterns related to themes which developed in the first rounds of coding. The researcher wrote ongoing analytic memos for each coded theme to reflect on and develop interpretations.

At this stage, the developed categories revealed contradictions which interconnected themes across categories and prompted the next round of categorization. This analysis centered on the premises on which discourses were based, how these discourses might be received, what was left as inferable, and alignment with the visual and audio representations in the videos. A video analysis was used to confirm themes which arose from the textual data, especially regarding visual and audio representations of teachers and cultures which were not present in the textual materials. These representations included accents, language varieties, demonstrations of culture in classrooms, racialized identities of teachers, how teachers were positioned relative to each other, and the relationship of this positioning with language varieties and racialized identities. A memo for each module video was created to record the number of featured teachers (those interviewed or showcased in their classrooms), their racialized identities and possible nationalities (inferred from the 4 represented countries in the modules: Egypt, the U.S., Thailand, and Costa Rica), their accents or English varieties used, gendered identities, and presence or positioning relative to other teachers in the videos. In some cases, content from the interviews were noted as relevant to the facilitation guides and coding material (e.g., the use of the word pidgin to describe students’ English use). Classroom visual and linguistic landscapes were also noted, including wall charts which represented languages or culture themes, oral language use in the classroom, student products of activities, and items used in the classroom. Native language use was also noted.

The computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software NVivo 12 (QSR International Pty Ltd, 2020) was used to organize all analyzed data sources, manage codes and the coding process, and search the full range of analyzed texts using the text query feature.

Findings and Discussion

The overarching theme that emerged from the analysis is an *avoidance of stance*, demonstrated through contradictory, simultaneous representations of resistance to and reinforcement of ideologies of White native-speakerism. This avoidance of stance is marked by a deference to participants and their contexts. The repetition of the following sentence on the first page of each

of the module facilitation guides except Modules 5 and 12 indicates this emphasis on participant contexts: “It is important that teachers apply the concepts in the module to their own classrooms and situations.” The importance placed on context provides agency to participants to adapt training material to their own contexts; however, this deference to the context may falsely place the impetus onto participants to resist marginalizing ideologies that hierarchize language and teaching methodologies. The idea that teachers and learners can resist native-speakerism in dominant teaching materials and marketing diminishes the real control that the dominant discourse maintains (Kumaravadivelu, 2016). These contradictions position ELT training as neutral ground and reinforce a naturalized preference for Whiteness and White-centered ELT methodology. This avoidance of stance is further exemplified through *representation of language varieties*, the emergence of a *monolingual view* of teaching, *representations of culture*, and *the framing of authenticity*.

Representation of Language Varieties

Resistance to White native-speakerism is demonstrated through references to English use. Questions for participants ask them to reflect on how students might use English and apply English use as a basis to inform lesson design. The modules reference not only native speaker varieties of English as benchmarks but also explicitly include “other users of the target language” (Module 2, p. 21) and “any of the various forms of native speaker English and/or examples of native and non-native English that are likely to be used in the learners’ environment” (Module 8, p. 85). This highlighting of the existence of multiple legitimate varieties of English for communication resists the ideology that only native varieties are suitable. A majority of the 14 module videos (86%) featured the voices of teachers of varied racialized identities using standard and non-standard accents in contrast to the percentage of videos which featured White teachers (57%). There is clear inclusion of teachers of color, both native and from EFL contexts, which visually and aurally resists the White native speaker ideal.

Alongside this resistance is reinforcement of the ideology that English ownership is not extended to these users. The term *native speaker* is placed first and in opposition to *other users*. This phrasing may have been chosen to specifically resist a native-speakerism ideology denoting only sources from native speakers as authentic; however, the term native speaker is loaded in ways that may delegitimize multiple native speaker identities. This may serve to reinforce White native-speakerism held by a community or individual due to the lack of directly recognizing the complex meanings of native speaker and other users of English.

Monolingual View

The monolingual perspective views language learners as multiple monolinguals in one, separating languages into distinct functions of use; however, bilinguals and multilinguals (the majority of the world population) utilize their full linguistic repertoire (Baker & Wright, 2017). English only methodology advantages English-speaking monolingual speakers and advocates for a monolingual approach to language learning unaligned with the multilingual realities of many language learners around the world (Baker & Wright, 2017).

Few instances in the training modules demonstrated an acknowledgement that languages other than English will be used in the classroom. One acknowledgement was through observation reflection questions that asked the participant to note the percentage of time English is used during an observed lesson, which can be understood as in comparison with the percentage of other language use. This type of questioning could allow for an analysis of language use in the classroom

from a holistic view of language; however, without explicit purpose, it is open to interpretation from a monolingual view of bilingual development. Four out of the fourteen video modules include the use of a word from a native language or writing in the native language on classroom visual supports. The video narrator's suggestion that class rules be posted in both English and the native language as a management technique positions the L1 as a disciplinary tool rather than a tool for learning. Other references point to an "English-only" paradigm; for example, regarding a teaching demonstration on the use of realia, the guide states: "Note that [the teacher] uses only English, and the children are able to follow along very well" (Module 8, p. 90). This comment, and the limited representation of the L1, point to an application of English only in the classroom, indicating White native speakerist ideology (Lowe, 2020).

Representations of Culture

A definition of culture embedded in one of the facilitation guide activities portrays culture in an inclusive, non-essentialist manner:

If we think of "culture" in the broadest possible sense—something like "a shared set of behavior patterns" among any group of people—then we can see that it applies as a concept not only to ethnic cultures, but to workplace cultures and even classroom cultures as well. (Module 4, p. 38)

This definition provides a view of culture in the facilitation guides beyond ethnicity and brings the concept of culture into everyday lived experience. However, in a later guide (Module 8), references to "not culture-specific" materials imply that there are objects from people's everyday life that are universal. The idea that the objects or practices of people can be "not culture-specific" aligns with deculturation of White practices as the neutral standard to compare with the Other (Kumaravadivelu, 2016).

Most of the coded references to topics and activities in the facilitation texts (approximately 50) were topics presented generally to apply across contexts, aligning with the general one-size-fits-all approach for all English learning contexts (Jumiah, 2016). However, specific references to White U.S.-based topics include the Pilgrims, American Thanksgiving, Uncle Sam, a news story about a U.S. event, planning a trip to D.C., and famous people in the target culture. The Pilgrims and Thanksgiving examples specifically reference a White-centered historical group of people and holiday. Examples demonstrating inclusion of students' cultures were more predominant in the video segments, including a teacher describing her use of folk stories from students' cultures to build upon their prior knowledge, students explaining a project which leveraged both locally relevant sources along with English-language sources to create a book about the students' city and culture, and a class-created poster in English on the wall highlighting local Thai desserts. The non-U.S. contexts in the modules do not match the U.S. cultural examples in number or specificity, reinforcing the ideology that cultural content in English teaching should be related to White history and culture. Despite the importance placed on the module content to be adjusted for participants' contexts, teacher participants do not see non-White, locally relevant culture legitimated in the English classroom and thus do not see themselves represented. As the audience is a predominantly EFL context, the lack of specific examples incorporating local culture into the classroom homogenates EFL contexts and essentializes U.S. culture.

Framing of Authenticity

Among the many applications of the term *authentic* in the modules are "authentic classroom scenes," "authentic items," "authentic language," "authentic context," "authentic opportunities,"

“authentic text,” “authentic purposes,” and “authentic sources.” “Authentic materials” occurs most often (30 times). *Authentic materials*, the topic of Module 8, are explicitly defined as “Materials used in the target culture for actual communicative needs. They should enable the learner to hear, read, and produce language as it is used in the target culture” (Module 8, p. 84). The criteria for choosing authentic materials include that they be “in a style of English learners will hear and use” (p. 85), inviting different varieties of English to be represented in the classroom but also potentially reinforcing particular varieties as cultural capital: more authentic, more authoritative, and contributing to gain of status and connection (Lowe & Pinner, 2016). The linking of authenticity with *the* target culture negates the authenticity of English use in the local context and the myriad ways English is used around the world. In contrast, *authentic use* (11 occurrences) refers to “us[ing] language to communicate purposefully.” The definition of *authentic tasks* (3 occurrences) also denotes language use: “Tasks or activities that are used in the ‘real’ world for actual communication needs” (Module 8, p. 84). *Real world* (10 occurrences) is “The world in which we live—outside the classroom” (Module 1, p. 12). Here, *the target culture* is not mentioned, the focus instead on students’ language use. The contrast between authentic materials (objects) and use (action) weakens the construction of authenticity, which avoids a clear stance through deferring the task of interpreting authenticity to participants. In pointing to *the* target culture in describing objects, activities, and sources as authentic, authority is reinforced for whichever image has been determined as the target, i.e., White-dominant culture. These references to the target culture as authentic may also establish culturism through the separation and essentialization of Western norms from the local culture in ELT (Lowe & Pinner, 2016).

Implications

Taking White-centeredness as a given in teacher training materials and ELT as a field needs to be explicitly resisted, with these ideologies confronted head-on in teacher training. To establish awareness of the presence of such ideologies, their impacts, and resistance, Gerald (2020a) strongly advocates for educators to step out from behind the ELT altruistic shield to challenge White supremacy in the field rather than ignoring it beneath a justification of the “goodness” of our work. Teacher training must incorporate explicit questioning of White native-speakerism (Kiczkowiak et al., 2016), including understanding that training materials are not neutral—they are influenced by the ideologies internalized in the field. Training materials need to advocate for teachers to develop skills as producers of knowledge rather than passive recipients of knowledge and materials from the target culture (Kumaravadivelu, 2016). Rather than the colorblind approach to ELT and teacher training, explicit acknowledgement of race and culture, impacts experienced by ELT teachers of color, and the highlighting of the voices and experiences of ELT teachers of color need to be opened up in teacher training (Charles, 2019), along with fostering critical assessment skills for both ELT teachers and students to reveal hidden curricula (Jumiah, 2016; Lowe & Lawrence, 2018). Greater incorporation of a multicultural and multilingual approach in ELT is also suggested to combat the widespread monolingual approach to teaching (Kiczkowiak et al., 2016). Along with suggestions for greater inclusion of a wide variety of World Englishes to resist these ideologies (Jumiah, 2016; Kubota, 2018; Ramjattan, 2019), explicit and ongoing discussions that raise awareness of and break down White native-speakerist ideology are necessary to combat essentialism (Kubota, 2018) and need to be explicitly included in training materials rather than left to individual users.

Impacts

Continuing to reinforce silently-centered Whiteness in ELT causes harm to those who are racialized as non-White (Gerald, 2020b). Non-White teachers and non-native speaking teachers are positioned as deficient, inferior, illegitimate, and unequal (Ramjattan, 2019). This harm, while perhaps not intentional, is under the responsibility of various stakeholders, one of which is teacher training developers and programs, who contribute to this harm through neglecting to address disparity-causing issues such as White native-speakerism (Jenks & Lee, 2020). The profit motive for perpetuating White native-speakerism, as ELT is a money-making enterprise benefiting White native speaker dominant countries and communities, also reinforces the perpetuation of this ideology (Gerald, 2020b). This leads to further economic disparity among race divides through privileging White native speakers in employment access and White publishers and materials developers (Gerald, 2020b) along with professional recognition and advancement in the field (Kubota, 2018; Kumaravadivelu, 2016). There are also impacts on students when the standard for their legitimacy as English users and speakers is reliant on a standard that is largely dependent on birth (Gerald, 2020b) and the impetus for marginalized racialized communities to remove themselves from oppression is placed on their ability to modify their language practices (Flores, 2020). Teachers may internalize a negative self-image if they do not meet the White native speaker standard and do not see themselves represented as legitimate in the profession (Lowe & Pinner, 2016; Zacharias, 2019). Such ideology may include a form of Othering of Western native speakers and “reduc[e] them to tokens and commodities” (Lowe & Lawrence, 2018, p. 164). These impacts indicate the complexity of implications and consequences of native-speakerism ideology and the importance of addressing its reinforcement.

Limitations and Future Research

This analysis cannot be generalized to all materials and is based on the researcher’s interpretation which excludes comprehensive contextual knowledge about the texts’ development (Wodak & Meyer, 2015) and how trainers have employed the materials beyond the researcher’s experience. The centering of Whiteness in this study is meant to bring awareness to and challenge White native-speakerism in EFL teacher training; however, this endeavor does not do justice to the need for the voices of teachers and students of color from a wide variety of contexts, identities, and experiences to break down this construct. This study does not look at intersections of oppression (Crenshaw, 1989) in ELT, such as the relationship of race with classism, sexism, homophobia, ableism, transphobia, fatphobia, immigration status, religion, or other ways teacher training may oppress along the intersections of commonly separated identities. Future studies that incorporate a larger sampling of texts may provide insight into the generalization of these findings. Further research should include the perspectives of developers, trainers, and teachers from varied contexts who have utilized these materials; how individuals and communities may internalize or resist these ideologies; and how other factors, such as national or institutional policies and practices, influence individuals’ reception of such materials.

Conclusion

These materials are clearly designed to honor teacher agency and context and promote teacher development grounded in theory and practice. This can be acknowledged while also understanding how these materials may reinforce White native-speakerism in ELT. White native-speakerism is firmly rooted, “hidden and normalised” within the field of ELT (Lowe, 2020, p. 152). Resistance is in direct action, and when it comes to racism, there is no middle ground; there is a racist stance

and an anti-racist stance, and those in power will act based off of what benefits the dominant group (Kendi, 2017). An anti-racist stance will actively call out White native-speakerism in ELT; empower teachers of color and their varied language varieties, accents, and dialects; de-exoticize culture; and reexamine the assumptions of English teaching methodology.

References

- Baker, C., & Wright, W. E. (2017). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (6th ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Charles, Q. D. (2019). Black teachers of English in South Korea: Constructing identities as a native English speaker and English language teaching professional. *TESOL Journal*, 10(4), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.478>
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), 139–167.
- DiAngelo, R. J. (2018). *White fragility: Why it's so hard for white people to talk about racism*. Beacon Press.
- English Language Programs. (2020, June 11). [Image]. Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/elprograms/photos/a.10153768841096184/10156970781271184>
- Fairclough, N. (2016). A dialectical-relational approach to critical discourse analysis in social research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed., pp. 86–108). SAGE Publications.
- Flores, N. (2020). From academic language to language architecture: Challenging raciolinguistic ideologies in research and practice. *Theory Into Practice*, 59(1), 22–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1665411>
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. Routledge.
- Gerald, J. P. B. (2020a). Combatting the altruistic shield in English language teaching. *NYS TESOL Journal*, 7(1), 22–25. http://journal.nystesol.org/jan2020/3_AP.pdf
- Gerald, J. P. B. (2020b). Worth the risk: Towards decentring whiteness in English language teaching. *BC TEAL Journal*, 5(1), 44–54.
- Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, 60(4), 385–387. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl030>
- Iams, S. (2016). Unpacking the native speaker knapsack: An autoethnographic account of privilege in TESOL. *Korea TESOL Journal*, 12(2), 3–21.
- Jenks, C. J., & Lee, J. W. (2020). Native speaker saviorism: A racialized teaching ideology. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 17(3), 186–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2019.1664904>
- Jumiah, A. A. (2016). *Language, power, and ideology in high school EFL textbooks in Saudi Arabia*. University of New Mexico.
- Kachru, B. (2006). English: World Englishes. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language & linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 195–202). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00645-3>
- Kendi, I. X. (2017). *Stamped from the beginning: The definitive history of racist ideas in America*. Bold Type Books.

- Kiczkowiak, M., Baines, D., & Krummenacher, K. (2016). Using awareness raising activities on initial teacher training courses to tackle 'native speakerism.' *English Language Teacher Education and Development Journal*, 19, 1–9.
- Kramadibrata, A. (2016). The halo surrounding native English speaker teachers in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 282–295. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v5i2.1352>
- Kubota, R. (2018). Racial, ethnic, and cultural stereotypes in teaching English. In J. I Lintas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–7). John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0298>
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2016). The decolonial option in English teaching: Can the subaltern act? *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(1), 66–85. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.202>
- Lowe, R. J. (2020). *Uncovering ideology in English language teaching: Identifying the 'native speaker' frame*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-46231-4>
- Lowe, R. J., & Lawrence, L. (2018). Native-speakerism and “hidden curricula” in ELT training: A duoethnography. *Journal of Language and Discrimination*, 2(2), 162–187. <https://doi.org/10.1558/jld.36409>
- Lowe, R. J., & Pinner, R. (2016). Finding the connections between native-speakerism and authenticity. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 7(1), 27–52. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2016-0002>
- Matias, C. E., & Mackey, J. (2016). Breakin' down whiteness in antiracist teaching: Introducing critical whiteness pedagogy. *The Urban Review*, 48(1), 32–50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-015-0344-7>
- Mohamed, M. A. S. (2015). The role of English language textbooks in the reproduction of racism. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 3(1), 95–108.
- Mosley, D. V., & Bellamy, P. L. (2020). *Academics for Black survival and wellness*. <https://www.academics4blacklives.com>
- Nayak, A. (2007). Critical whiteness studies. *Sociology Compass*, 1(2), 737–755. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2007.00045.x>
- Opp-Beckman, L., & Klinghammer, S. (2006). *Shaping the way we teach English: Successful practices around the world*. Office of English Language Programs. <https://americanenglish.state.gov/resources/shaping-way-we-teach-english-successful-practices-around-world>
- Pennycook, A. (2017). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315225593>
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined Whiteness of teaching: How White teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 12(2), 197–215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320902995475>
- QSR International Pty Ltd. (2020). *NVivo* (Version 12) [Computer software]. QSR International Pty Ltd. <https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/home>
- Ramjattan, V. A. (2019). The white native speaker and inequality regimes in the private English language school. *Intercultural Education*, 30(2), 126–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2018.1538043>
- Richards, L. (2015). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

- Rosa, J. D. (2016). Standardization, racialization, languagelessness: Raciolinguistic ideologies across communicative contexts. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 26(2), 162–183. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jola.12116>
- Ruecker, T. (2011). Challenging the native and nonnative English speaker hierarchy in ELT: New directions from race theory. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 8(4), 400–422. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2011.615709>
- 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>
- Saad, L. F. (Host). (2019, December 12). Robin DiAngelo on White fragility (No. 011) [Audio podcast]. In *Good Ancestor*. <http://laylafsaad.com/good-ancestor-podcast/ep011-robin-diangelo>
- Schreiber, B. R. (2019). “More like you”: Disrupting native speakerism through a multimodal online intercultural exchange. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(4), 1115–1138. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.534>
- Sung, C. C. M. (2011). Race and native speakers in ELT: Parents’ perspectives in Hong Kong: Chinese parents in Hong Kong err in their perceptions of racial background and the native speaker of English. *English Today*, 27(3), 25–29. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078411000344>
- West, G. B. (2019). Navigating morality in neoliberal spaces of English language education. *Linguistics and Education*, 49, 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2018.12.004>
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Zacharias, N. T. (2019). The ghost of nativespeakerism: The case of teacher classroom introductions in transnational contexts. *TESOL Journal*, 10(4), e499. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.499>