



Title of Project:

Linguistic Diversity and the Politics of International Inclusion
in Higher Education: A Critical Sociolinguistic Study of
International Teaching Assistants

Researcher:

Nicholas Subtirelu
Georgetown University (Current Affiliation)
Georgia State University (Doctoral University)
nic.subtirelu@gmail.com



Nicholas Subtirelu

Research Supervisor:

Stephanie Lindemann
Georgia State University
lindemann@gsu.edu

Project Summary

It is commonplace to hear institutions of higher education describe themselves as “international” or “global.” Colleges and universities are eager to point to the national origins of their faculty and student body as evidence of the opportunities for cross-cultural contact and cooperation that abound on their campuses. These institutions often present themselves as places where students can come to be exposed to new people and new cultures as a way of preparing themselves for a world marked by an accelerated pace of globalization.

However, it is unclear that universities in the United States (US) are prepared to accept and support the linguistic diversity that arises out of efforts to create “global communities.” Intentional planning and policy related to language and communication are likely to be necessary. Institutional efforts to deal with language and communication, however, have tended to be confined to assessing and remediating the language of those coming from abroad.

A case in point is the reception of international teaching assistants (ITAs) at US universities. For decades, researchers have pointed to problems in communication between ITAs and students (e.g., Bailey, 1984; Plakans, 1997; Fitch & Morgan, 2003). Although researchers have occasionally acknowledged that students contribute to these difficulties, most attention has been paid to ITAs’ language and their other teaching-related competencies. As a result, we know relatively little about how students cope with the task of communicating with someone whose language background differs from their own. However, the abilities that facilitate communication across linguistic difference are arguably a central component of the “global competency” that many universities aspire to develop in their students.

In my dissertation, I sought to address a different type of issue than has usually been explored with respect to ITAs at US universities. Instead of asking how ITAs could be better prepared to



teach US students, I asked how institutions of higher education might be better prepared to facilitate productive communication between ITAs and students. I was particularly interested in exploring two areas: (1) how institutional policies might facilitate (or not) classroom communication at a linguistically diverse institution and (2) what strategies or orientations might empower students to help ensure that communication with their ITAs is successful (or not). I explored these questions through a case study of one internationalizing US university that I call Shrinking World University (SWU). I collected documents and conducted interviews with SWU administrators, ITAs, and students. I also observed and recorded two ITA-taught Biology laboratories several times over the course of a semester. I sought student and ITA feedback on episodes from the classroom to better understand what students and ITAs thought and felt about apparent problems in communication.

Through my research at SWU, I identified a number of ways in which institutional policy and procedure might promote successful communication between ITAs and students or not. First, many students I spoke with pointed out that large lecture courses were not particularly conducive to interaction. As such, they felt unable to clear up the communication difficulties they predictably encountered while listening to someone who speaks in a manner with which they are unfamiliar. Relatedly, even in smaller laboratory classes, I observed that when an ITA was in “lecture mode,”—presenting a relatively long monologue often with a PowerPoint—students were likewise unwilling to ask questions or to give feedback about their understanding, preferring instead to remain silent even though they often had troubles understanding. Often, the students’ concerns were tied up with fears about embarrassing their instructors by drawing attention to what was perceived to be the ITAs’ linguistic deficiencies.

However, students had further reasons why they often avoided ITAs. In some cases, staffing decisions aided students in their avoidance. For example, when ITAs co-taught with other instructors, students often reported avoiding communication with the ITA and instead going to another instructor often another TA who used a form of English that was more familiar to the students.

Finally, some students I spoke with echoed SWU’s commitment to respecting and seeking to learn more about diverse people, and they saw communication with their ITAs as a natural opportunity to learn more and increase their ability to communicate across linguistic difference. However, other students saw communication with ITAs as irrelevant to the real purpose of their time at SWU. These students tended to see the difficulties inherent in communicating across linguistic difference as obstacles to learning course-related information, passing exams, getting good grades, and graduating.

I believe this study has several implications for institutions of higher education engaged in internationalization. First, as Dippold (2015) argues, colleges and universities need to consider how linguistic diversity affects classroom interaction. One of the simplest ways of aiding students and ITAs in communicating is to reduce class sizes wherever possible so that students feel more comfortable asking questions and clearing up communication difficulties when they arise. Although smaller class sizes, regardless of instructor language background, would create more opportunities for students to have meaningful interaction with their instructors, it is particularly important for students to interact meaningfully with their international instructors if universities wish to foster “global competence”.



It is also important for universities to consider how they are preparing ITAs. At SWU, I found that ITAs usually received preparation from their academic departments, and some ITAs also took a course, offered by the English as a second language program, specifically aimed at helping international teaching assistants succeed in the classroom. The preparation that ITAs receive, however, is often focused on improving ITAs' delivery of monologic classroom instruction in a manner that resembles dominant forms of instruction in US university classrooms (i.e., lecturing with some interaction coming from student questions). Based on my observation that students and ITAs communicate most successfully in smaller groups, I argue that it would be more beneficial to focus on preparing ITAs to facilitate dialogic forms of instruction that invite students to engage in small group work with their peers and their ITAs.

Finally, I argue that universities need to take a more direct approach in preparing students to be part of a linguistically diverse community. This is relevant not only to their success on a diverse campus but also in the global community for which universities purport to be preparing students. Universities need to find places in their curricula where students can learn about and become more accepting of other ways of using English. Students may also need explicit guidance in how to engage in the negotiation of meaning that takes place in linguistically diverse settings. Furthermore, universities need to take steps toward getting students on board with the broader humanistic goals of internationalization, such as cross-cultural cooperation. Such material might be fruitfully incorporated into courses or other learning opportunities that are expected of most or all new students, such as new student orientation, first year composition courses, or courses designed to introduce students to university study.



References

- Alberts, H. C., Hazen, H. D., & Theobald, R. (2013). Teaching and learning with accented English. In H. C. Alberts & H. D. Hazen (Eds.), *International students and scholars in the United States: Coming from abroad* (pp. 199-217). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Amin, N. (1997). Race and the identity of the nonnative ESL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 580-583.
- Amin, N. (2001). Nativism, the native speaker construct, and minority immigrant women teachers of English as a second language. *CATESOL Journal*, 13(1), 89-107.
- Ates, B., & Eslami, Z. R. (2012). An analysis of non-native English-speaking graduate teaching assistants' online journal entries. *Language and Education*, 26(6), 537-552.
- Axelson, E. R., & Madden, C. G. (1994). Discourse strategies for ITAs across instructional contexts. In C. G. Madden & C. L. Myers (Eds.), *Discourse and performance of international teaching assistants* (pp. 153-185). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Bailey, K. M. (1983). Foreign teaching assistants at U.S. universities: Problems in interaction and communication. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 308-310.
- Bailey, K. M. (1984). The "foreign TA problem." In K. M. Bailey, F. Pialorsi, & J. Zukoswki/Faust (Eds.), *Foreign teaching assistants in U.S. universities* (pp. 3-15). Washington, DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA).
- Bailey, K. M. (1984). A typology of teaching assistants. In K. M. Bailey, F. Pialorsi, & J. Zukoswki/Faust (Eds.), *Foreign teaching assistants in U.S. universities* (pp. 110-125). Washington, DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA).
- Baker, W., Jenkins, J., & Baird, R. (2015). ELF researchers take issue with 'English as a lingua franca: An immanent critique'. *Applied Linguistics*, 36(1), 121-123.
- Berdie, D. R., Anderson, J. F., Wenberg, M. S., & Price, C. S. (1976). Improving the effectiveness of teaching assistants: Undergraduates speak out. *Improving College and University Teaching*, 24(3), 169-171.
- Billig, M. (1999). Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 10(4), 543-558.
- Björkman, B. (2013). *English as an academic lingua franca: An investigation of form and communicative effectiveness*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.



- 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). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Briggs, C. L. (2007). The Gallup poll, democracy, and the vox populi: Ideologies of interviewing and the communicability of modern life. *Text & Talk*, 27(5/6), 681-704.
- Briggs, S. L. (1994). Using performance assessment methods to screen ITAs. In C. G. Madden & C. L. Myers (Eds.), *Discourse and performance of international teaching assistants* (pp. 63-80). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Brown, K., Fishman, P., & Jones, N. (1990). *Legal and policy issues in the language proficiency assessment of international teaching assistants* (IHELG Monograph 90-1). Houston, TX: Institute for Higher Education Law and Governance.
- Brutt-Griffler, J., & Samimy, K. K. (2001). Transcending the nativeness paradigm. *World Englishes*, 20(1), 99-106.
- Buchstaller, I., & Kattab, G. (2014). Population samples. In R. J. Podesva & D. Sharma (Eds.), *Research methods in linguistics* (pp. 74-95). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Buzzelli, C., & Johnston, B. (2001). Authority, power, and morality in classroom discourse. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(8), 873-884.
- Byrd, P., & Constantinides, J. C. (1992). The language of teaching mathematics: Implications for training ITAs. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(1), 163-167.
- Canagarajah, S. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 923-939.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Chadderton, C. (2012). Problematizing the role of the white researcher in social justice research. *Ethnography and Education*, 7(3), 363-380.
- Chiang, S.-Y. (2009a). Dealing with communication problems in the instructional interactions between international teaching assistants and American college students. *Language and Education*, 23(5), 461-478.
- Chiang, S.-Y. (2009b). Mutual understanding as a procedural achievement in intercultural interaction. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(3), 367-394.
- Chiang, S.-Y. (2011). Pursuing a response in office hour interactions between US college students and international teaching assistants. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(14), 3316-3330.



- Chiang, S.-Y. (2016). "Is this what you're talking about?": Identity negotiation in international teaching assistants' instructional interactions with U.S. college students. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 15(2), 114-128.
- Chiang, S.-Y., & Mi, H.-F. (2008). Reformulation as a strategy for managing 'understanding uncertainty' in office hour interactions between international teaching assistants and American college students. *Intercultural Education*, 19(3), 269-281.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209.
- Damron, J. (2003). What's the problem? A new perspective on ITA communication. *Journal of Graduate Teaching Assistant Development*, 9(2), 81-88.
- Davies, A. (1991). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Davies, C. E., & Tyler, A. (2005). Discourse strategies in the context of crosscultural institutional talk: Uncovering interlanguage pragmatics in the university classroom. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & B. S. Hartford (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics: Exploring institutional talk* (pp. 133-156). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dippold, D. (2015). *Classroom interaction: The internationalised anglophone university*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), 19-47.
- Ellis, R., & Roberts, C. (1987). Two approaches for investigating second language acquisition. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in context* (pp. 179-195). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Ernst, C. (2008). *International teaching assistants - From admissions to placement*. (Doctor of Philosophy dissertation), Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Farnsworth, T. L. (2013). An investigation into the validity of the TOEFL iBT speaking test for international teaching assistant certification. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 10(3), 274-291.
- Firth, A. (1990). 'Lingua franca' negotiations: Towards an interactional approach. *World Englishes*, 9(3), 269-280.



- Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26(3), 237-259.
- Firth, A. (2009). The lingua franca factor. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(2), 147-170.
- Fitch, F., & Morgan, S. E. (2003). "Not a lick of English": Constructing the ITA identity through student narratives. *Communication Education*, 52(3/4), 297-310.
- Fox, W. S., & Gay, G. (1994). Functions and effects of international teaching assistants. *The Review of Higher Education*, 18(1), 1-24.
- Gaffikin, F., & Perry, D. C. (2009). Discourses and strategic visions: The U.S. research university as an institutional manifestation of neoliberalism in a global era. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(1), 115-144.
- Gallego, J. (1990). The intelligibility of three nonnative English-speaking teaching assistants: An analysis of student-reported communication breakdowns. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 219-237.
- Ginther, A. (2003). International teaching assistant testing: Policies and methods. In D. Douglas (Ed.), *English language testing in U.S. colleges and universities* (2nd ed., pp. 57-84). Washington, DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.
- Gomez, M. L., Khurshid, A., Freitag, M. B., & Lachuk, A. J. (2011). Microaggressions in graduate students' lives: How they are encountered and their consequences. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(8), 1189-1199.
- Hahn, L. D. (2004). Primary stress and intelligibility: Research to motivate the teaching of suprasegmentals. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(2), 201-223.
- Halleck, G. B., & Moder, C. L. (1995). Testing language and teaching skills of international teaching assistants: The limits of compensatory strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(4), 733-758.
- Harklau, L. (2000). From the "good kids" to the "worst": Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(1), 35-67.
- Hoekje, B., & Linnell, K. (1994). "Authenticity" in language testing: Evaluating spoken language tests for international teaching assistants. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 103-126.
- Hoekje, B., & Williams, J. (1992). Communicative competence and the dilemma of international teaching assistant education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(2), 243-269.
- Holliday, A. (2010). Analysing qualitative data. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 98-110). London, UK: Continuum.



- Holtgraves, T. (2004). Social desirability and self-reports: Testing models of socially desirable responding. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(2), 161-172.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(3), 509-532.
- Hsu, C.-F. (2011). The influence of vocal qualities and confirmation of nonnative English-speaking teachers on student receiver apprehension, affective learning, and cognitive learning. *Communication Education*, 61(1), 4-16.
- Institute of International Education. (2015). Open Doors Report 2015. *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved April 24, 2016, from <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data>
- Isaacs, T. (2008). Towards defining a valid assessment criterion of pronunciation proficiency in non-native English-speaking graduate students. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 64(4), 555-580.
- Jaschik, S. (2015, March 2). Accent on bias. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/03/02/study-finds-instructors-asian-last-names-receive-lower-scores-rate-my-professors>
- Jenkins, J. (2011). Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(4), 926-936.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Johnson, D. C. (2013). *Language policy*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-36). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kang, O. (2010). Relative salience of suprasegmental features on judgments of L2 comprehensibility and accentedness. *System*, 38(2), 301-315.
- Kang, O. (2012). Impact of rater characteristics and prosodic features of speaker accentedness on ratings of international teaching assistants' oral performance. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 9(3), 249-269.
- Kang, O., Rubin, D., & Lindemann, S. (2015). Mitigating U.S. undergraduates' attitudes toward international teaching assistants. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(4), 681-706.



- Kang, O., & Rubin, D. L. (2009). Reverse linguistic stereotyping: Measuring the effect of listener expectations on speech evaluation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 28(4), 441-456.
- Kanno, Y., & Varghese, M. M. (2010). Immigrant and refugee ESL students' challenges to accessing four-year college education: From language policy to educational policy. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 9(5), 310-328.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1989). The life and times of ITA programs. *English for Specific Purposes*, 8(2), 109-124.
- Kaur, J. (2010). Achieving mutual understanding in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 29(2), 192-208.
- Kim, D., Twombly, S., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2012). International faculty in American universities: Experiences of academic life, productivity, and career mobility. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2012(155), 27-46.
- King, K. (1998). Mandating English proficiency for college instructors: States' responses to the TA problem. *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, 31(1), 203-256.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model*. Hong Kong, China: Hong Kong University Press.
- Laihonen, P. (2008). Language ideologies in interviews: A conversation analysis approach. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(5), 668-693.
- Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(2), 205-221.
- Lev-Ari, S., & Keysar, B. (2010). Why don't we believe non-native speakers? The influence of accent on credibility. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(6), 1093-1096.
- Lichtman, M. (2012). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Lindemann, S. (2002). Listening with an attitude: A model of native-speaker comprehension of non-native speakers in the United States. *Language in Society*, 31(3), 419-441.
- Lindemann, S., Litzenberg, J., & Subtirelu, N. (2014). Problematizing the dependence on L1 norms in pronunciation teaching: Attitudes toward second-language accents. In J. Levis & A. Moyer (Eds.), *Social influences in L2 Pronunciation* (pp. 179-194). Berlin, Germany: DeGruyter Mouton.
- Lindemann, S., & Subtirelu, N. (2013). Reliably biased: The role of listener expectation in the perception of second language speech. *Language Learning*, 63(3), 567-594.



- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Liu, J. (2005). Chinese graduate teaching assistants teaching freshman composition to native English speaking students. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the professions* (pp. 155-177). New York, NY: Springer.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2010). Language policy and planning. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 143-174). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- LoCastro, V., & Tapper, G. (2006). International teaching assistants and teacher identity. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 185-218.
- Manohar, U., & Appiah, O. (2015). Perspective taking to improve attitudes towards international teaching assistants: The role of national identification and prior attitudes. *Communication Education*, 1-15.
- Matsuda, P. K., & Silva, T. (1999). Cross-cultural composition: Mediated integration of US and international students. *Composition Studies*, 27(1), 15-30.
- Mauranen, A. (2006). Signaling and preventing misunderstanding in English as lingua franca communication. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 177(1), 123-150.
- May, S. (2011). The disciplinary constraints of SLA and TESOL: Additive bilingualism and second language acquisition, teaching and learning. *Linguistics and Education*, 22(3), 233-247.
- McChesney, B. J. (1994). The functional language of the U.S. TA during office hours. In C. G. Madden & C. L. Myers (Eds.), *Discourse and performance of international teaching assistants* (pp. 134-152). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Menard-Warwick, J. (2014). "Tiffany does not have a solid language background, as she speaks only English": Emerging language ideologies among California students. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 11(2), 75-99.
- Miller, E. R. (2011). Indeterminacy and interview research: Co-constructing ambiguity and clarity in interviews with an adult immigrant learner of English. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 43-59.
- Myers, C. L. (1994). Question-based discourse in science labs: Issues for ITAs. In C. Madden & C. L. Myers (Eds.), *Discourse and performance of international teaching assistants* (pp. 83-103). Alexandria, VA: TESOL Inc.



- Myers, G. (1998). Displaying opinions: Topics and disagreement in focus groups. *Language in Society*, 27(01), 85-111.
- National Science Foundation. (2014). Survey of Earned Doctorates. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation.
- O'Regan, J. P. (2014). English as a lingua franca: An immanent critique. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(5), 533-552.
- Pae, T.-I. (2001). International teaching assistant programs and World Englishes perspective. *Journal of Graduate Teaching Assistant Development*, 8(2), 71-75.
- Papajohn, D. (1999). The effect of topic variation in performance testing: the case of the chemistry TEACH test for international teaching assistants. *Language Testing*, 16(1), 52-81.
- Park, J. S.-Y., & Wee, L. (2009). The three circles redux: A market-theoretic perspective on World Englishes. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(3), 389-406.
- Park, J. S.-Y., & Wee, L. (2011). A practice-based critique of English as a Lingua Franca. *World Englishes*, 30(3), 360-374.
- Park, J. S.-Y., & Wee, L. (2012). *Markets of English: Linguistic capital and language policy in a globalizing world*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Patel, V. (2016, April 24). How colleges help foreign grad students with their teaching. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <http://chronicle.com/article/How-Colleges-Help-Foreign-Grad/236218>
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Petrovic, J. E. (2015). *A post-liberal approach to language policy in education*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Pickering, L. (2001). The role of tone choice in improving ITA communication in the classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(2), 233-255.
- Pickering, L. (2004). The structure and function of intonational paragraphs in native and nonnative speaker instructional discourse. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23(1), 19-43.
- Plakans, B. S. (1997). Undergraduates' experiences with and attitudes toward international teaching assistants. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 95-119.
- Rajadurai, J. (2007). Intelligibility studies: A consideration of empirical and ideological issues. *World Englishes*, 26(1), 87-98.



- Rajagopalan, K. (2010). The soft ideological underbelly of the notion of intelligibility in discussions about 'World Englishes'. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 465-470.
- 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.
- Rosaldo, R. (1989). *Culture and truth: The remaking of social analysis*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Ross, P. G., & Krider, D. S. (1992). Off the plane and into the classroom: A phenomenological explication of international teaching assistants' experiences in the American classroom. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 16(3), 277-293.
- Rounds, P. L. (1987). Characterizing successful classroom discourse for NNS teaching assistant training. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(4), 643-671.
- Rubin, D. L. (1992). Nonlanguage factors affecting undergraduates' judgments of nonnative English-speaking teaching assistants. *Research in Higher Education*, 33(4), 511-531.
- Saif, S. (2002). A needs-based approach to the evaluation of the spoken language ability of international teaching assistants. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquee*, 5(1), 145-167.
- Saif, S. (2006). Aiming for positive washback: a case study of international teaching assistants. *Language Testing*, 23(1), 1-34.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society*, 8(2), 165-187.
- Shaw, P. A. (1994). Discourse competence in a framework for ITA training. In C. G. Madden & C. L. Myers (Eds.), *Discourse and performance of international teaching assistants* (pp. 27-51). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Shuck, G. (2001). *Imagining the native speaker: The poetics of complaint in university student discourse*. (Doctor of Philosophy Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ.
- Shuck, G. (2004). Conversational performance and the poetic construction of an ideology. *Language in Society*, 33(2), 195-222.
- Shuck, G. (2006). Racializing the nonnative English speaker. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 5(4), 259-276.
- Singh, R. (Ed.). (1996). *Towards a critical sociolinguistics*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.



- Singh, R., Lele, J., & Martohardjono, G. (1988). Communication in a multilingual society: Some missed opportunities. *Language in Society*, 17(1), 43-59.
- Smart, G. (2008). Ethnographic-based discourse analysis: Uses, issues and prospects. In V. K. Bhatia, J. Flowerdew, & R. H. Jones (Eds.), *Advances in discourse studies* (pp. 56-66). London, UK: Routledge.
- Staples, S., Kang, O., & Wittner, E. (2014). Considering interlocutors in university discourse communities: Impacting U.S. undergraduates' perceptions of ITAs through a structured contact program. *English for Specific Purposes*, 35, 54-65.
- Stephan, P., Scellato, G., & Franzoni, C. (2015). International competition for PhDs and postdoctoral scholars: What does (and does not) matter. *Innovation Policy and the Economy*, 15(1), 73-113.
- Sterzuk, A. (2015). 'The standard remains the same': Language standardisation, race and othering in higher education. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 36(1), 53-66.
- Subtirelu, N. (2011). Juggling identity and authority: A case study of one non-native instructor of English. *TESL-EJ*, 15(3). Retrieved from: <http://www.tesl-ej.org/pdf/ej59/a2.pdf>
- Subtirelu, N. (2014). A language ideological perspective on willingness to communicate. *System*, 42(1), 120-132.
- Subtirelu, N. (2015). "She does have an accent but...": Race and language ideology in students' evaluations of mathematics instructors on RateMyProfessors.com. *Language in Society*, 44(01), 35-62.
- Subtirelu, N., & Gopavaram, S. R. (2016). Crowdsourcing critical discourse analysis: Using Amazon's Mechanical Turk to explore readers' uptake of comments about language on RateMyProfessors.com. *Critical approaches to discourse analysis across disciplines*, 8(1), 38-57.
- Subtirelu, N., & Lindemann, S. (2014). Teaching first language speakers to communicate across linguistic difference: Addressing attitudes, comprehension, and strategies. *Applied Linguistics*, 1-20. doi:10.1093/applin/amu068
- Talmy, S. (2011). The interview as collaborative achievement: Interaction, identity, and ideology in a speech event. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 25-42.
- Tannen, D. (1981). New York Jewish conversational style. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 30, 133-149.



- Theobald, R. (2013). International faculty: A source of diversity. In H. C. Alberts & H. D. Hazen (Eds.), *International students and scholars in the United States: Coming from abroad* (pp. 111-130). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Thomas, C. F., & Monoson, P. K. (1993). Oral English language proficiency of ITAs: Policy, implementation, and contributing factors. *Innovative Higher Education, 17*(3), 195-209.
- 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). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Thompson, C., & Kleine, M. (2015). An interdisciplinary dialog about teaching and learning dialogically. *Innovative Higher Education, 40*(2), 173-185.
- Toler, A. C. (1998). *The role of academic departments in the English screening and pedagogical training of international teaching assistants*. (unpublished doctoral dissertation). North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2013). Language policy in a time of crisis and transformation. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (2nd ed., pp. 11-34). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tyler, A. (1992). Discourse structure and the perception of incoherence in international teaching assistants' spoken discourse. *TESOL Quarterly, 26*(4), 713-729.
- Tyler, A. (1995). The coconstruction of cross-cultural miscommunication. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17*(02), 129-152.
- Tyler, A., & Davies, C. (1990). Cross-linguistic communication missteps. *Text, 10*(4), 385-412.
- Villarreal, D. (2013). Closing the communication gap between undergraduates and international faculty. *CATESOL Journal, 24*(1), 8-28.
- Wee, L. (2011). *Language without rights*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, G. (2007). Investigating the influences on the teaching identity of international teaching assistants. In M. Mantero (Ed.), *Identity and second language learning: Culture, inquiry, and dialogic activity in educational contexts* (pp. 305-328). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Williams, J. (1992). Planning, discourse marking, and the comprehensibility of international teaching assistants. *TESOL Quarterly, 26*(4), 693-711.
- Winter, J., Turner, R., Gedye, S., Nash, P., & Grant, V. (2014). Graduate teaching assistants: Responding to the challenges of internationalisation. *International Journal for Academic Development, 1*-13.



- Xi, X. (2007). Validating TOEFL[R] iBT speaking and setting score requirements for ITA screening. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 4(4), 318-351.
- Yates, L. (2005). Negotiating an institutional identity: Individual differences in NS and NNS teacher directives. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & B. S. Hartford (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics: Exploring institutional talk* (pp. 67-97). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zhou, J. (2009). What is missing in the international teaching assistants training curriculum? *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 23(2), 19-24.
- Zhu Hua. (2015). Negotiation as the way of engagement in intercultural and lingua franca communication: Frames of reference and Interculturality. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(1), 63-90.
- Zielinski, B. W. (2008). The listener: No longer the silent partner in reduced intelligibility. *System*, 36(1), 69-84.