神戸市外国語大学 学術情報リポジトリ

The preservation of native-speakerist ideology

メタデータ	言語: English
	出版者:
	公開日: 2022-03-01
	キーワード (Ja):
	キーワード (En):
	作成者: He, Xinqi, He, Xinqi
	メールアドレス:
	所属:
URL	https://kobe-cufs.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/2620

The preservation of native-speakerist ideology

Xinqi He

University of Tokyo

Within the field of English language teaching (ELT), native-speakerism is shown to be a dominant ideology that exerts influence on individuals involved within ELT (Holliday, 2006), especially in countries where English plays a significant role in the school curriculum as well as entrance exams, such as Japan (Houghton and Rivers, 2013). This chapter takes a constructive perspective towards Native-speakerism and regards it as being produced and reproduced through discourses at the institutional level, such as in school curriculums, teaching policies or teaching methods, as well as at the individual level, such as daily interactions among individuals involved in ELT. Taking a constructive position, this chapter views individuals as possessing the agency to frame discourses and thus to exert impacts on native-speakerist ideology. While native-speakerism was based on an assumption on the existence of a stable community (Seargeant, 2013), scholarship has pointed out fluid phenomena exists in social categories such as language, culture, race and ethnicity due to the increase of mobile populations under the process of globalization. This chapter thus aims at understanding how mobile populations interact with native-speakerist ideology through four cases of migrant students learning English in Japan, who experience both English native-speakerism in ELT and are also exposed to Japanese native-speakerism in Japanese society.

Native-speakerist ideology and its assumptions

Native-speakerism is a prevalent ideology which has been proposed in ELT (English teaching field) by Holliday (2006) as 'characterized by the belief that "native-speaker" teachers represent a "Western culture" from which spring the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology'(pp. 385). This definition of native-speakerism demonstrates its colonial feature as there is a superiority attached to those who are labeled as 'Western' to those which are labeled as 'non-Western'. Holliday's definition not only demonstrates the unbalanced value attachment and power relations between NS (native speakers) and NNS (non-native

speakers), it also implies the labels of NS/NNS are not purely linguistic but also related to other social markers. This definition was further elaborated by Houghton and Rivers (2013) who added a humanist perspective to this unbalanced power structure and emphasized that native-speakerist ideology was 'prejudice, stereotype and/or discrimination, typically by or against foreign language teachers, on the basis of either being or not being perceived and categorized as a native speaker of a particular language, which can form part of a larger complex of interconnected prejudices including ethnocentrism, racism and sexism' (pp.14). Houghton and Rivers' (2013) definition reflects the real consequences that individuals experience under this ideology. It has also been pointed out how power relations under native-speakerist ideology intertwine with the power structure of other social identity markers.

Based on these two definitions, research on native-speakerism unveils how NNS teachers have been marginalized (Kumaravadivelu, 2012) as their experience and knowledge are devalued (McBeath, 2017) and their language has been labelled as 'deficient' (Huang, 2018), and thus excluded from teaching materials (Manara, 2018). This marginalization also influences how NS/NNS experience the employment processes of the educational market (Mahbood et al., 2004), teaching role arrangements (Glasgow, 2014) as well as the students' attitude (Calafato, 2019), have been found to be influenced by native-speakerist ideology. Research also shows how NS/NNS labels have racialized that non-whiteness is excluded from the NS label (Kubota & Fujimoto, 2013) and whiteness is objectified as a commodity (Todd & Pojanapunya, 2009). While native-speakerism was first proposed in ELT and the majority of the research is still based in this field, there is research similar to native-speakerist phenomena in other language teaching fields such as Japanese language (Kusunoki, 2018), and in a broader social context outside of educational institutions (Jensen, 2011).

Native-speakerist ideology is argued to be based on a combination of a psycholinguistic and nationalist assumptions (Seargeant, 2013). Psycholinguistic assumptions are based on critical period theory (Penfield & Roberts, 1959) which has dominated second language acquisition field. This theory argues a remarkable difference in language between individuals who acquire it before teenager-hood and those who acquire it after this period. This assumption explains the 'authenticity' attached to NS language which is regarded as superior to its NNS counterparts. The psycholinguistic assumption also combines with a nationalist assumption where an

imagined stable community exists, and those who are inside the community are able to acquire the language and culture knowledge which are qualitatively different from those who are outside of the community. This assumption demonstrates a belief in the single-layered relationship among language and culture which serves as a guarantee for membership within the community. This assumption thus explains the belief of cultural representation towards NS. Both assumptions are imagined as a stable community with fixed boundaries that distinguish social identity markers between individuals inside and outside of the community.

The construction of native-speakerist ideology and the agency of fluid populations

This chapter regards native-speakerist ideology under the definition of ideology being as 'widespread systems of knowledge and belief' (Lowe, 2020) which help people construct their relationships with their living world (Hall, 1985). Taking a constructive position, this chapter views ideology as not existing inside of individuals per se, but in the construction of meaning in a discursive interplay within every individual, which thus occurs on a social level (Mumby, 1989). As a field of meaning construction, it is said that ideology serves as a site of struggle among people who try to demonstrate or contest different terms and attach value to them positively or negatively (Mumby, 1989). Consequently, the process of this meaning construction inevitably depends on the power of individuals or groups who take part in the process. Following this logic, ideology is often regarded as a tool for dominant groups to legitimatize themselves through construction of their beliefs as natural and universal (Eagleton, 1991). As such, ideology not only produces the 'subjects of a given social order' (Mumby, 1989, p. 302) but the 'subjection' to that order, namely the unbalanced power relations among groups in society. The dominant power of ideology has been the focus of ideology studies and utilizes ideology as a tool to unveil unequal power structures among different social groups. David (2013) proposes a concept of internalized oppression to psychologically illustrate the experiences of marginalized groups as subjects of oppression. It is argued that the pervasiveness of oppression leads to this salient internalization of oppression (David, 2013) which consequently facilitates the dominant group to maintain an ideology that serves to benefit the group and continues the marginalization of the group who internalizes it. In this sense, a marginalized group can be regarded to unconsciously strengthen the oppressive ideology which marginalizes them.

Yet, a double-edged function of ideology is also argued to exist due to the reason that on the one hand, ideology tends to enhance dominate power through production and reproduction of itself, and on the other hand, the multi-accentual nature of ideology (Volosinov, 1973) embeds possibilities for resistance and challenge (Mumby, 1989). Given the constructive perspective this chapter takes on ideology, ideology is better regarded as a dynamic process rather than a fixed result. Ideological becoming is defined as "the dialogical processes by which people come to align with some voices, discourses and ways of being, and to distance themselves from others" (Rampton, 2014, p. 276). This definition of ideology reflects the agency of individuals in constructing ideology during their interaction with others via constructive discourses. Discourse is defined as 'a group of statements which provide a language for talking about – i.e. a way of representing – a particular kind of knowledge about a topic' (Hall, 1996, p. 201, citing Foucault). Although discourse is often regarded as the representation of ideology, it is constructed by individuals who exert their agency in the construction of discourses. Lowe (2020) proposes a frame analysis in understanding ideology where framing is defined as "a process whereby people draw on discourses to mobilise their ideological resources in meaning making" (p. 58). This leaves a room for the agency of a group to resist and challenge as well as to exert their power through everyday semiotic interactions. As such, the role of construction of meaning and ideology can be understood as not only limited to institutions that possess power but also open to interactions among individuals in society. Ideology does not guarantee a smooth reproduction of itself (Hall, 1985) and multiaccentuality serves as a space that can embody discursive events of resistance that exert agentive power (Mumby, 1989).

Against this background, this chapter thus regards native-speakerist ideology as in a constant constructive process at macro, meso and micro levels where discourses are produced and framed by individuals who exert their agency in either maintaining or challenging native-speakerist ideology. While ideology is argued to facilitate the dominated group to maintain an unbalanced power structure which benefits themselves (Mumby, 1989), this chapter focuses on the marginalized group under native-speakerist ideology in order to unveil how the marginalized group exerts their agency in framing discourses under native-speakerist ideology, and thus how native-speakerist ideology maintains or deconstructs itself through this discursive process.

As stated above, native-speakerist ideology assumes a stable community where people inside the community are expected to reach a linguistic proficiency and a

level of cultural knowledge that is remarkably different from that acquired by individuals outside of the community. Consequently, native-speakerism positions those who are labelled as NS as well as NS language as 'authentic' with superior authoritative value. These assumptions of native-speakerism are questioned by concepts such as 'World Englishes' and 'English as an International Language', which values NNS forms of English, and concepts such as translanguaging (Canagarajah, 2011) and metrolinguistics (Otsuji & Pennycook, 2011), which fundamentally question the existence of stable communities. These concepts emphasize a fluid reality where the boundaries within and among communities, languages and cultures are blurred. Under these blurred boundaries, there no longer exists a clear difference between NS and NNS language, and thus the native-speakerist assumptions on an existing hierarchy between two also become indefensible. This fluid reality and the blurring of boundaries are best represented by groups of mobile populations. Mobile populations carry their language, culture, nationality and ethnicity across borders where they contribute to increasing diversity among (and within) these categories. Yet, under a native-speakerist lens, existing in nation-states or in educational institutions, mobile populations are placed in an inferior position for their unevenly developed linguistic resources and mixed positionality in identity categories. In other words, mobile populations, while possessing the potentiality to challenge native-speakerist ideology, have been marginalized under this ideology. This chapter thus focuses on a mobile population group in Japan to explore how native-speakerist ideology maintains or deconstructs itself through their framing towards oppressive discourses.

Migrants learning English language in Japan

This chapter applies multiple interviews with four migrants in Japan. Vladimir[3] was originally from Russia and speaks Russian at a native level. Chau was born and raised in Vietnam and speaks Vietnamese at a native level. Satoshi was originally from Nigeria and speaks Arabic and French at a native level. Yuen was born and raised in Taiwan and speaks Mandarin Chinese at a native level. All of them have spent one and a half years in a Japanese language school to learn Japanese after they came to Japan. While Chau was enrolled in an international university, the other three were enrolled in KOMO, a language institution, as English majoring students. Satoshi was also enrolled in an international university after he graduated from KOMO, while Vladimir was recruited into an international company in Japan. Yuen,

---

[3] All the names of participants and schools are pseudonyms.

different from the group, was recruited into a Japanese company. None of them speak Japanese nor English as their native languages, which is the same as the researcher. Although the researcher was also working as an English teacher in KOMO, all of the participants were not students of the researcher but were introduced through a snow-balling method by either school staff or other students.

Native-speakerist ideology intertwining with neoliberal meritocratic ideology

All the participants in this study reported experiencing native-speakerist ideology towards Japanese language within educational institutions when they underwent the school curriculum including English language. These experiences also occurred outside of educational institutions during their daily lives. Experiences under Japanese native-speakerism includes their Japanese NNS language being devalued, Japanese speaker-hood being denied and othering from the Japanese community. Among them, Japanese native-speakerism was mostly demonstrated at both meso and micro levels where migrant students were constantly exposed to a NS language level requirement and where their Japanese NNS language was denied during their English acquisition process in KOMO.

> (Excerpt 1, Yuen, 1st interview)
>
> Y: Yes. In the beginning, I heard that there would not be any classes on translation during the first year. So I was surprised that translation was included in teacher's teaching plan.
>
> R: What was the situation like when the teacher asked you to improve your Japanese? Did he write you an email or talk to you?
>
> Y: He said that in front of the whole class (laughs).
>
> R: Oh, dear! Could you describe the situation a bit for me, if you remember?
>
> Y: Well, there was once I didn't get good score. And the teacher was giving the exam paper to everyone in the class. When he gave me mine, he said, Yuen, your Japanese was, was the most miserable one in our class. Because KOMO provides Japanese support classes for those whose proficiency is lower than N2, the teacher at that time suggested me to take the classes.
>
> (Omitted)
>
> R: I see. You were then, I'm wondering how did you feel when the teacher said that to you?
>
> Y: Pretty humiliating (laughs). Yeah, I can understand my Japanese ability is not enough. But I never thought I would be told like this. Even though it was break time, maybe nobody was listening, but still he was telling me when everyone else was there.

In the above excerpt, Yuen described a 'humiliating' experience where his Japanese NS teacher who was teaching English pointed out in front of his classmates that Yuen's Japanese language was the most 'miserable' one in the class. The teacher's comment towards Yuen's Japanese language demonstrates the power relations between NS and NNS where NNS language is regarded by NS as inferior. It is notable that KOMO streams English major students into different classes based on their TOEIC scores and Yuen was streamed in the top class for English majors that was comprised of 30 Japanese NS students and 4 migrant students. It can be seen that the adjective 'miserable' which the teacher used to describe Yuen's Japanese was based on a comparison between Yuen's language and that of his Japanese NS classmates. In other words, Yuen's language was denied under a NS language criteria. In addition, Yuen mentioned the course he took was not a translation class but a class for English skills. In other words, the Japanese NS teacher applied a translation method to teach English language in a class which requires a high Japanese proficiency. As most of the students in the class are Japanese NS, the translation teaching methods creates a distinction between Japanese NS students whose Japanese language was acknowledged by the Japanese NS teacher and Japanese NNS students whose Japanese language was denied and excluded. As such, it can be said that Yuen's Japanese language was denied and thus marginalized under a native-speakerist learning environment.

> (Excerpt 2, Yuen, 1st interview)
> R: I see. Did you take the Japanese support class as the teacher suggested?
> Y: I asked the staff in KOMO and they said I've already passed N1, so they said the content there would be too easy for me. So I didn't take it. I also asked other students in my class who took those Japanese support class. They also said it was easy and didn't recommend me to take the classes.
> R: So you are saying that the Japanese support classes provided by KOMO could not satisfy the Japanese proficiency requirement of your teacher, or the Japanese proficiency requirement of translation teaching method?
> Y: Yes, they told me that the Japanese support classes aim at making sure you're fine with your daily life Japanese use.
> R: I'm also wondering, is there any Japanese requirement when you were enrolled in KOMO? I mean is there any Japanese proficiency test you need to pass to be enrolled?
> Y: When I was enrolled, I remember that everyone with N2 or N3 level of Japanese proficiency can be enrolled. But if you looked at other foreign students

in KOMO, this requirement seems to be not strict. It could be just a preferrable qualification rather than a required one.

As Yuen's Japanese language was denied by his Japanese NS teacher and the NS-orientated teaching method, he was suggested to attend the Japanese language class provided by KOMO for Japanese NNS students. In the above excerpt, Yuen mentioned the staff in the Japanese class suggested that he not to take the class for the reason that Yuen has already attained the highest Japanese proficiency test certification and that the Japanese class aims at helping students cope with daily life in Japanese. It can be seen that there was a huge gap between the Japanese support provided by KOMO and the Japanese requirement imposed on Yuen. While the Japanese language class failed to help Yuen to meet the requirement from the Japanese NS teacher, Japanese support in KOMO shifts the responsibility of filling the gap between the NS requirement and Yuen's language proficiency to Yuen as an individual rather than questioning the institutionalized NS-oriented requirement itself. In other words, it only functioned as a justification of institutionalized NS-oriented requirements.

This justification by Japanese support system is also demonstrated in Japanese language schools for migrants in Japan in general. In a similar fashion, Japanese language schools aim at helping students reach the highest level in Japanese proficiency test, and to cope with everyday life in Japan. In other parts of the interview, Yuen mentioned one reason he felt humiliated was the fact that he had already attained the highest level in terms of the Japanese language proficiency test, which he accomplished soon after he entered a Japanese language school before KOMO. Yet, as what has been reported in all participant's cases, their Japanese language was denied and excluded once they entered another educational institution or working in Japanese companies. Thus, it can be argued that there is a gap that exists between the highest level of Japanese proficiency test that NNS can reach and the Japanese requirement that migrants are faced with.

As language proficiency test aims at evaluating test-takers' proficiency based on the 'correctness' under NS language criteria, they function to divide NS and NNS language. The fact that language proficiency tests were made for NNS and exclude NS demonstrates a distinction between NS and NNS language where NNS are positioned in the NNS category of language and NS language is positioned as the goal to attain. While the 'correct answer' of language proficiency tests is based on a

NS usage of language, and the test-takers, namely NNS, were required to perform the way test requires, the test thus attaches an absolute authority to NS language and a denial towards NNS language. Shohamy (2013) argues that discourses of power relations are produced in language tests as certain language is constructed as preferable and legitimate while other forms of language are marginalized. Consequently, the language proficiency test functions in a way to push NNS test-takers to adapt their language to NS and thus internalizing more to native-speakerist ideology.

In addition, language tests also produce a discourse where NNS are making efforts to reach NS language level since there exists a highest 'goal' of 'correct language' which a test-taker could reach. Yet, as what has been described above, achieving this goal did not guarantee their languages being accepted. This explains Yuen's feeling of shock while he thought his Japanese language met the requirement as while he attained the highest level in language tests, he failed to meet the language demand imposed on him while living in Japan. It thus serves a function to shift responsibility to NNS to fill the gap between their languages and a NS demand. In a similar fashion to Japanese language support in educational institution, a Japanese language school combining language proficiency test, which were unique to NNS and legitimize the distinction between NS and NNS, failed to provide sufficient language support for NNS students to meet the NS requirement in educational and working contexts. Thus, these institutions only function as a driving factor to push Japanese NNS towards the internalization of native-speakerist ideology.

Undergoing these institutionalized driving factors, NNS students could barely resist as these factors are embedded in neoliberal meritocratic educational system that requires individual's self-adaption to the market. Although neoliberalism is a concept used in economic and political field to describe a system emphasizing a free market without any interference from any forces (Holborow, 2015) and characterized with an individualist and competitive feature (Block et al, 2013), it is argued that neoliberal ideology became a "common-sense way many of us interpret, live in, and understand the world" (Harvey, 2005, p. 3). This prevalent neoliberal ideology is also shown in educational market where students are expected to adapt themselves to the market rule through a form of competition without interference. This competition intertwines with a meritocracy belief that effort should be the crucial factor to decide individual's success (Suzuki & Hur, 2021). The failure of Satoshi who attempted to challenge the school rule illustrates these intertwining ideas.

Satoshi, who was also enrolled in English major in KOMO was faced with a similar difficulty of the NS language requirement as Yuen where this NS-oriented learning environment impeded him from English acquisition. Yet, when Satoshi attempted to negotiate with the school staff on the difficulty that Japanese language caused him, he was rejected from making any adjustment on school's rules for him.

> (Excerpt 3, Satoshi, 3rd interview)
> S: Yes, that's why I sent them an E-mail and we discussed about it today.
> R: What did they day?
> S: They said well, we can't make an exception for you, because if we make an exception for you we have to do it with for a lot of people. I told them TOEIC was in English. But they say you still need Japanese.
> R: They said what? You understand Japanese?
> S: You still need Japanese.

In the above excerpt, Satoshi was describing an English test which he needed to pass to be promoted to the second year. Satoshi was streamed into the top class among English majors and reported that the contents of the English part in the test to be fairly easy. Yet, Satoshi was required to answer all questions in Japanese language which became an obstacle for him and even placed him at risk of not being promoted. It is notable that Satoshi reported no difficulty in communicating with his Japanese NS classmates in Japanese language but the written Chinese characters in Japanese language that were required in the test were difficult for him. It can be said that this English test also institutionally established a NS-oriented system that excludes Japanese speakers who do not reach this NS level criteria and thus benefit Japanese NS students. In addition, school staff rejected Satoshi's negotiation for the reason that it would be 'unfair' for Japanese NS students who have difficulty in English language, so the only way for Satoshi to manage this issue was to 'work more'. The logic of 'fairness' behind the school staff's answer demonstrates a neoliberalist meritocratic ideology as it showed their logic that since Japanese NS had difficulties in this test as well, no adjustment should made for Satoshi's difficulties despite the fact that this was an English proficiency test and the former's difficulty was in in English language proficiency while Satoshi's difficulty was in instrumental Japanese language. The 'fairness' that was emphasized in KOMO reflects the market, which is the school's rule in this context, is believed should be free from any interference, which is any adjustment made by the institution. It can be seen that this neoliberal discourse places NNS students in an educational market with rules that benefits NS students. Apart from that, the suggestions made by staff which require Satoshi to

work hard reflects a meritocratic idea that believes the effort made by an individual rather than luck should be the criterion that decides the success of the individual (Suzuki & Hur, 2021). Consequently, the responsibility was shifted from the institution to migrant students as individuals who are expected to adjust themselves to the educational market. As such, it can be seen that there exists an intertwining between native-speakerist ideology, which the educational system is based on, and a neoliberal meritocratic ideology in that everyone in the market should compete in an identical way so that there is an 'equality of opportunity'. In addition to the justification from Japanese language support system, this intertwining thus enhances the disadvantages that are caused by native-speakerist ideology which provides migrants students with no opportunities to negotiate with the native-speakerist system. Consequently, migrant students showed tendencies of adapting themselves to this system and thus reinforced native-speakerist ideology. The adaption in this intertwining system is best illustrated in Chau's case, who was enrolled in a Japanese language program in an international university.

(Excerpt 4, Chau, 4th interview)
C: In case of university, it's about 100%.
R: In any contexts in the university? Even when you are taking classes?
C: Taking classes, yes. There were almost all Japanese, when I took classes, it's Japanese..everyone is the same, the teacher did not compare, just like a native.
R: You mean teacher didn't treat you differently?
C: Yes, everyone should do the same.
R: Oh, that's interesting, even when you take classes. So you don't have the feeling like if you were a Japanese native, it would be easier for you?
C: Yeah, sometimes. For example, the Chinese characters are so difficult that I have to look them up in the dictionary.
R: But the teacher didn't treat you differently?
C: Exactly.
R: I see. So.. I see. For example, you mentioned last time that you need to write all final papers in Japanese.
C: Yes, all in Japanese.
R: I think you said it was difficult. You mean the teacher didn't treat you differently in that case as well?
C: Yes, no difference. Regular, I think the teacher would just evaluate me as a regular student.
R: The teacher..
C: yes.

R: Oh, can we understand your words this way? You are required, required?.. to perform at the same level as Japanese students?

C: I wished he could be nicer, but he's a strict teacher, there is nothing I can do.

All the participants were asked to self-evaluate on the degrees of nativeness in different contexts of all the languages they use and asked to describe the reason for their evaluation. Similarly, as other participants, Chau evaluated herself at different degrees of nativeness within a single language. The above excerpt demonstrated the reason Chau evaluated herself as 100% Japanese nativeness in the context of her university tasks in that she needed to conduct these tasks entirely in Japanese. On one hand, Chau reported difficulty in Japanese language such as with Chinese characters. On the other hand, Chau insisted that professors would evaluate her in the same way as Japanese NS and that is the reason for her 100% nativeness self-evaluation. In other words, Chau's evaluation demonstrated that rather than the self-recognized Japanese ability, Chau made the evaluation on a salient requirement that she felt the need to perform with 100% nativeness. As Chau expressed that she wished the teacher could be more tolerant of her Japanese language at the end of this excerpt, it can be argued that the Japanese NS requirement was not a pleasant requirement for her. Chau's comments illustrate how native-speakerism is intertwined with neoliberal meritocratic ideology that she was asked to adapt herself to the educational market and how, as a result, Chau internalized this native-speakerist requirement on herself despite the fact that this requirement demonstrates an exclusion of her Japanese language. Given that Yuen also reported the tendency to adapt, it can be argued that native-speakerism preserves itself through intertwining with neoliberal meritocratic ideology in education which forces NNS to adapt themselves rather than challenging this ideology with the fluid reality they carry, despite the fact that this ideology marginalizes themselves and their language use in the first place.

Native-speakerist ideology intertwining with racism

Different from Yuen and Chau, native-speakerism preserves itself through the intertwining with another ideology, racism, in the case of Vladimir who was the only Caucasian-looking participant among the four. Vladimir experienced Japanese native-speakerist ideology inside the educational system and outside in a broader social context where his Japanese language as well as his Japanese speaker-hood was denied. Vladimir internalized native-speakerism in the sense that he repeatedly described his Japanese language as 'horrible'. In addition, Vladimir also internalized

the native-speakerist denial of his Japanese speaker-hood and that he associated himself more as an English NS speaker due to his race.

> (Excerpt 5, Vladimir, 1st interview)
> R: So you asked your teacher about Japanese college that you can learn English.
> V: No, College… the best college in Japan where I can study English.
> R: Why English?
> V: Why English.. Because if I'm, really want to do work in Japan… a foreigner. I MUST know, I must speak English very well.
> 　（Omitted）
> R: So you think Japanese is not enough for foreign?
> V: Of course not, I think.
> R: What.. What made you think so?
> R: I don't know, because many situation you come across, or a media with other foreigners or Japanese, and every one think oh, you are foreigner you definitely know, you definitely speak English. But I can not so… many, not many sometimes funny sometimes strange situations when where I cannot give a clear answer. What 日本語でお願いします[Please say it in Japanese]. So things very strange foreign are asking about Japanese.
> R: You mean people around you expect you to speak English.
> V: Yes very well.. Like a native speaker.. but I'm not.

While Vladimir first visited Japan for the purpose of learning the Japanese language which he assumed would give him additional value in Russian job market, he changed his learning goal from Japanese language to English language. The above excerpt illustrates the reason why Vladimir changed his learning goal is because he is associated with the English language due to his 'foreign identity' in Japan. Vladimir explained that people in his surrounding community expected him to speak like an English NS due to his foreign status. Throughout the interviews, Vladimir described several episodes where Japanese NS he encountered talked to him in either English language or Japanese language mixed with English words despite that fact that they were aware Vladimir could and chose to communicate in Japanese language. Compared with other participants in this study, Vladimir was the only one who reported that he was expected to speak as an English NS. Since Vladimir was the only Caucasian-looking participant, this implies the possibility that the 'foreign status' Vladimir was labelled under was related to his appearance, namely to his race. Race has been argued to be a crucial factor of the NS/NNS label. Regardless of language proficiency, research shows biological features of whiteness tend to be

often associated with the English NS label and that non-whiteness tends to be excluded from the English NS category (Kubota and Fujimoto, 2013). On one hand, most of native-speakerist research focuses on the inferiority attached to racialized NNS and values English NS as associated with whiteness (Aneja, 2018). On the other hand, research has also pointed out the disadvantages of white English NS as they were often objectified in advisements for commercial purposes by language institutions. English NS reported the feeling of being deprived of their professional identity (Rivers and Zotzmann, 2017). As the exclusion of English NS in Japanese society has been exanimated (Hashimoto, 2018) and the distrust towards Japanese NNS has been pointed out (Heinrich, 2005; Kusunoki, 2018), Vladimir's experience magnifies the complex racial elements that impact on the individuals under a native-speakerist ideology.

As Vladimir experienced internalizing native-speakerism in Japanese society which led to his othering experience, he also showed a tendency to reinforce this ideology. This reinforcement was shown that Vladimir denied NNS's qualification of being a language teacher and only regarded NS language as meaningful for his language acquisition. Furthermore, Vladimir placed NS language in a superior place while denying the value of NNS language. This denial, however, is based on a native-speakerist idea that intertwines with white supremacy and sexism.

> (Excerpt 6, Vladimir, 3rd interview)
> R: I'm just curious about things you said before that… You seems kind of positive about the job or things you can do here in Japan, right? But when you mentioned about the Vietnamese girls..
> V: Of course, it depends on the people, but you know in Vietnam they don't speak English.
> R: Don't speak what?
> V: They don't speak in English. Even if they speak very good in Japanese. I. I don't have even one example. I don't know who is among Vietnamese, who has a really good job here.
> R: You don't know?
> V: I don't know. I know a lot of Vietnamese and some of them already have returned to Vietnam, some of them still working hard.
> R: Do you think it's the problem of English or do you think it is a problem of nationality?
> V: I don't know. Language, of course, too, but I think it's something about nationality.

The above conversation occurred when Vladimir mentioned about a woman he encountered in Vietnam who asked him for information about visiting Japan since she planned to come to Japan for the purpose of establishing a career. Vladimir showed a negative attitude towards the Vietnamese woman building her career in Japan claiming that 'They don't speak English'. Vladimir added that it was also related to their nationality, for the reason that even they were able to reach a high proficiency in the English language, their English language proficiency would not guarantee them a satisfying income. It is notable that while Vladimir asserted the English language of the Vietnamese woman as problematic, since they do not speak English as a native language, Vladimir changed his learning goal from Japanese language to English language for the purpose of finding a good job in the Japanese labor market. Since Vladimir does not speak English as his native language either, the different interpretations cast the question of whose English language is valued more highly. When the researcher mentioned this difference to Vladimir, he asserted the reason to be related to race.

(Excerpt 7, Vladimir, 3rd interview)

V: Because I know a lot of Vietnamese who came to Japan and work at some warehouses, factories some *combinis* and other stuff. And after, all of them come here and have to study in Japanese school. Because they need to know, they need to speak in Japanese. Okay, no problem. After, they go to some college and usually this is for Visa, not for their study. And after they find, most of them find some work, but its work, its not the dream work. Not their dream. It's just the usual work. Things like *conbini* or factories or something. Well, they're people of second, second, I don't know.

R: Second?

V: Second…in Russia, we have second sort, second type of people. Second type of people? So, you have different types of jobs.

R: It's like social… hierarchy?

V: I'm not sure that this place is really good for her. Because there.. she can to be a respectful person and everyone will think about her like she's professor or she's a doctor or she's something. But here she is just Vietnamese.

R: But I think you mentioned that you've seen in Japan you don't necessarily have to know Japanese but can find a proper job with English, right?

(Omitted)

V: Even they can speak English, I think it's all about nationality. Same as I know a lot of you… For example, Nepalese. Most of them, not everyone but most of them can speak in English properly, but they can't.. Some of them really good at English because…but they cannot, couldn't find a really good job here. So it's

not only a problem of their…language skills. I think it's something because of their nationality.

R: I see. But do you think nationality is a problem for you? If you want to find a job in Japan.

V: No. No. Because I'm white (laughs). Okay, I see. I'm not a racist. Maybe, maybe, maybe a little bit (laughs). I'm not a racist. But if you look at the world, you can easily find that most of really good jobs do only white people.

R: So, it's not a problem about Japanese society, but the whole world…

V: Of course, it is not 100 percent. But most of them, if you look at the most richest man in the world or top managers of companies...and most of them are white, most of them are men, not women. So, it's different...of…nationality…gender or other stuff.

R: Right. But because in the beginning discussion begins when we talk about the girl wants to come to Japan. So, it's not a problem about Japanese society. Anywhere she went she might have this problem, is that what you mean?

V: It's not only Japanese problem of course. But in Japan, it's more and more clearly. Oh, yes. You can see it more and more clearly.

In the above excerpt, Vladimir explained the reason why he perceived the Vietnamese woman's English language as less valuable than his. To start, he claimed that while Vietnamese people would experience devaluation in the Japanese labor market as their labor value would be erased and end up as 'just Vietnamese' doing manual work rather than mental labor. Vladimir then elaborated his idea of other Asian nationalities whose English language proficiency fails to guarantee income. Compared with these Asian migrants, Vladimir asserted that his English would be valued since he is white. This implies Vladimir's native-speakerist ideology that the English language of white people would be valued while the English language of other racial groups would not be valued in the Japanese labor market. Vladimir also added that not only regarding English language, but the labor market as a whole would prefer white men in higher positions. This is native-speakerism intertwining with racism and sexism leading to Vladimir's devaluation towards the NNS language among Asian migrants and thus reinforces these ideologies. It is notable that Vladimir also suffered from the same ideology as he was deprived of his Japanese speaker-hood and his Japanese language was denied. One possible explanation for his reinforcement towards native-speakerist ideology could be traced back to the experiences Vladimir had in Russia. While Vladimir was positioned and self-positioned in the category of being a white person in an Asian context, it was not

always the case in the Russian context. Vladimir mentioned racial exclusion he experienced in Russian society.

(Excerpt 8, Vladimir, 5th interview)

V: (Omitted) And ah! it's a good example. Probably. It's like …for you as well, like Indian and Nepalis and Bangladesh and Pakistan. For us, they're same they looks same and their speak same. But for them, totally different. Like even different state, different village or different (laughs). So even when I was in Russia. Not everyone, but some of other Russians thought I'm not a Russian.

R: Because you don't look the same as they are?

V: It's because because because because, for example, my skin not 100 percent white. I mean, it's not as white as a white of other white people. I mean, for you it's white. And for other Asian, it's white. And even for me, it's white. But it's a little bit …brownie and I don't know…just a little bit. But it's also…also... important. Like, like my… my hair. It's also a little bit black. What is also like... So, these details makes me like a person from south part of Russia.

R: I see.

V: And, you know, like like more like Ukrainian or it's…or like Turkish. We're like from Greece or some Italian. South part of Europe, south part of Russia. And in Russia, we have some… not everyone, of course, but some people like, you know… if you know, history, there were some Slavic tribes before and they were different types of Slavic tribes. And I don't know why, but traditionally cul, culturally origin Slavic type of …origin, Slavic type is like a white man from north, from north north. It's like white skin, white color, white hai, hair color. It's like blue eyes and or maybe grey blue eyes or something like this (laughs). But at the same time, there were south Slavic tribes and probably I don't know where came my ancestors (laughs). Looks like they were from South (laughs) Slavic tribes. So, for some people, it is it's matter, and they thought you're from Israel. You like, you are, you are. You're Jewish. No, I'm not. I'm not Jewish. I'm Russian or you know, or you are. You're Armenian. And even, even one guy when I was in university, that guy was from Armenia. And after the class he came to here, asked me which village I came from, from Armenia. Which village your parents are live. What? What are you talking about? My, my, my parents, My mother, my grandmother their from Moscow. No no no, I understand that you're living in Moscow now, but which village you came from before. I was like WHAT? I'm not Armenian and I'm Russian. So even even so, even Armenian people thought I'm Armenian. Even Jewish people thought I'm Jewish and Russian people thought I am something someone, somebody else, but not Russian (laughs) even though I'm Russian.

In the above excerpt, Vladimir described his experience of racial exclusion in Russia. First, Vladimir pointed out that there were variations in what is considered to be 'white'. Vladimir mentioned that his skin color, including the color of his hair, did not fit with the racial image of the majority of Russian people who have white skin and blue eyes. This difference would lead to exclusion against Vladimir where he would be positioned as a person from the Southern part of Russia or even as a migrant coming from a country to the south of Russia. This exclusion is based on a fixed nationalist idea towards the relation between race and nationality, which is an assumption behind native-speakerist ideology. Vladimir mentioned the experience of denial towards his Russian identity by other Russians, as well as migrants, despite the fact Vladimir expressed his strong inclination towards a Russian identity, especially an identity associated with the Soviet Union. From Vladimir's description of his racial positioning, it can be seen that being excluded from a Russian identity was not a pleasant experience for Vladimir. This positioning is contrary to the experience Vladimir had in an Asian society where he was positioned as a white English NS under a native-speakerist ideology. Therefore, it can be assumed that in internalizing native-speakerism, his experiences in an Asian context fulfilled his desire of being acknowledged for his whiteness. In other words, in order to avoid alienation caused by a fixed nationalist idea, Vladimir chose to adapt himself to a racially intertwined native-speakerist ideology that is based on this fixed nationalist idea. Vladimir mentioned the relativization among different races as he emphasized that the variation within the 'white' category would be less obvious to Asian people and the variation within the Asian category was less obvious to Russians. It can be seen here that Vladimir was aware of this racial conceptualization in society and justified his stance towards the Vietnamese woman with these relativizations.

Vladimir's case demonstrates a different way of how native-speakerism preserves itself differently from the cases of Yuen and Chau. Although Vladimir also experienced oppressive native-speakerism intertwined with neoliberal meritocratic ideology in an educational institution, Vladimir had a choice of escaping adaption towards the Japanese community. Yet, he still ended up reinforcing native-speakerism in order to avoid being alienated under this ideology. In other words, native-speakerism maintained itself against a challenge, which Vladimir could have fought against with the fluid reality he brought, through an intertwining racism.

Native-speakerist ideology intertwining with English imperialism

In addition to neoliberal meritocratic ideology and racism, native-speakerism is shown in all four cases to be closely tied to English imperialist ideology (Phillipson, 2008). All the participants reported an English-only space in their experience in Japan. Although the university Chau enrolled in was named as an international university, all the international narratives, or the non-Japanese narratives, created within the university were only based on English language. In other words, these narratives are tied to English imperialism. Although migrants with multiple linguistic repertoires were enrolled, English was the only language that was encouraged within the university. This is best illustrated by a space within the university named English plaza where students were able to practice English with teachers or with each other. According to Chau, English teachers in the English plaza were almost all from the United States and other teachers were from Britain or Switzerland. Being as the feature of this international university in its name, English plaza produces narratives of English imperialism and native-speakerism intertwining with each other. First, it produces an English imperialist narrative which forbids all English NNS from speaking their native languages. This narrative thus positions English language itself in a superior position to other languages. Second, English plaza also produces a narrative where English NS are associated more with English teaching as they dominate the teacher positions. Furthermore, the superiority was also enhanced by the teacher-student hierarchy in Japan which students were socialized into form middle school (LeTendre, 1994). Chau described a scene when she visited English plaza to practice English and a teacher from the United States provided her with life advice. The power relation unfolded in this scene showing that NS are positioned higher in a hierarchy than NNS both in terms of English imperialism (English being the only language allowed) and a teacher-student hierarchy.

In a similar fashion, an English-only space was created and promoted in which produced similar narratives on native-speakerism that intertwines with English imperialism. In addition, KOMO also produced these narratives in its faculty composition. KOMO divided the teaching faculties in the English major into two groups. While Japanese NS teachers were assigned with the classes in the morning, English NS teachers were assigned with the afternoon classes. Given the reason that the researcher, who is neither a Japanese NS nor an English NS, was assigned with morning classes, it can be seen here that KOMO creates a distinction between English NS and English NNS classes. This distinction between English NS/NNS

teachers reinforces the stereotypical role attached to teaching faculties under these labels. Yuen reported to have no awareness of this distinction, but the preference emerged after his experience in KOMO. It can be said that English imperialist discourses that were produced in the English-only space enhanced the superiority of English NS in both institutions. Consequently, it would promote the exclusion of NNS and the possible internalization of individuals who experienced it.

Apart from strengthening English native-speakerism through the discourses produced in English-only spaces, English imperialism also tends to reinforce the exclusion of migrant students experienced under Japanese native-speakerism. In addition to Japanese native-speakerism embedded in the educational system which intertwines with a neoliberal meritocratic ideology, Satoshi also mentioned his experiences of exclusion from a Japanese community. Through micro-level interactions with Japanese NS in KOMO, Satoshi experienced denial towards his Japanese identity by Japanese NS who claimed that he was told to change his Japanese sounding name for the reason that he did not look Japanese and did not speak like a Japanese person. This exclusion was under Japanese native-speakerism and its fixed assumption that associates Japanese NS language to Asian racial features, as well as a certain cultural features, while excluding elements that do not fit these standards. While Satoshi experienced this denial towards his Japanese language and Japanese identity, he showed a tendency to internalize it and demonstrated a strong inclination towards an international identity. This international identity was closely tied to English imperialism in the sense that Satoshi demonstrated a strong belief in the instrumentality of the English language.

> (Excerpt 9, Satoshi, 4th interview)
> R: Do you feel English…well the question might be difficult, but what is English for you I mean is that like a ticket that allow you to go to anywhere? What's that?
> S: Well when I was younger, it was, as I have told you it's like a survival tool for me. But now it's different, because ...even if I don't like the word globalization but I still be inspired to be an 'international person'. I feel like if I don't learn well if I haven't learn English, I wouldn't be able like to achieve this goal.
> (Omitted)
> R: But in your case, your Japanese ability has already reached a level, I mean you can work with Japanese. In the future, do you think Japanese is necessary? It may sound abstract but what does it mean to you? I mean learning Japanese.
> S: Well since my father is Japanese, I feel learning Japanese is … it's like coming back to my roots. Although my root is not in Japan. Japan is like...but for me, I

can't say that Japan becomes like France, they are auto sufficient, they don't need another language to work. Unlike French, Japanese can only be used in Japan. French, we can use French in more than 20 countries, which is not the case in Japan. So, this…I don't feel like learning Japanese will be like necessary in 10 or 20 years.

R: I see, so it's different from English, right? Because you call English as an international language just now. So, you feel that way?

S: Yes, I feel like Japanese…well probably in the future, English will be more used in Japan than Japanese itself. Just like...India maybe. Yes, I think I think it will be.

In the above excerpt, Satoshi illustrated the meaning of learning English language for him which he associated with the idea of becoming an 'international person'. According to Satoshi, English serves as an essential tool for him to achieve this goal of becoming an 'international person'. It can be seen that while Japanese language for him is more an identity issue with low instrumentality, English language is a necessary tool for his international identity formation. As a result, Satoshi pointed out the possible replacement of Japanese language for English language in Japanese society. This belief in English imperialism together with Satoshi's experience of exclusion led to Satoshi's avoidance and low investment in acquiring Japanese language. Consequently, Satoshi reinforces Japanese native-speakerism in the sense that he embraced English imperialism and relativizes himself away from the Japanese community rather than challenge it with the fluid reality he carries.

In a similar fashion, English imperialism provided a space for Vladimir to avoid consciously confronting the Japanese NS requirement. As analyzed above, Vladimir embraced Japanese native-speakerism in the sense that he associated himself as a superior English speaker for the purpose of increasing his whiteness, which prevents him from being alienated away from the white race. English imperialism provides a space for this embrace to be possible in the sense that Vladimir found a place to associate himself to the English language rather than Japanese language. Despite living in Japan, Vladimir was recruited into an international company in Japan where English was the common language within the company. This space, however, resulted in further reinforcing native-speakerism in the sense that Vladimir invested less in Japanese language and consequently results in possible negative experiences under Japanese native-speakerism.

As such, English native-speakerism preserves itself from the challenge of migrant students through intertwining with English imperialism. First, it was produced in educational institutions as an English-only space where English NS teachers are positioned as superior to others. The stereotypical roles towards English NS and NNS teachers are also produced in educational institutions. Second, English imperialism which creates English-oriented spaces within Japanese society provides the reason for migrant students to avoid investment in learning or identifying with the Japanese language, which could lead them to more negative experiences under Japanese native-speakerism rather than the intention of challenging it.

Conclusion

This chapter took a constructive perspective towards native-speakerist ideology and unveiles how native-speakerist ideology in English education in Japan preserves itself from the challenge of migrant students who represent a fluid reality that is in contrast to the assumptions of native-speakerist ideology. Examining the experiences of four migrant students who were learning English in educational institutions in Japan, this chapter argues that native-speakerism intertwines with other ideologies such as neoliberal meritocratic ideology, racism and English imperialism. While English imperialism provides a space for native-speakerism to better produce its own discourses, neoliberal meritocratic ideology deprives opportunity for migrant students to challenge it and racism provides opportunity for migrant students to avoid being racially alienated by embracing native-speakerism in various ways. Given migrant student's NNS status under native-speakerist ideology, it can be said that this status tend to reinforce an ideology in which an individual alienates themselves. Adding to David's (2013) concept of internalized oppression, this chapter showed that migrant students, as a minority group under native-speakerist ideology, exert their agency in framing the discourses they encounter and actively reinforces native-speakerism as a result. This thus provides a new perspective to reflect on native-speakerism in the English teaching field.

References

Aneja, G. A. (2018). Doing and Undoing (Non)Nativeness. In B. Yazan & N. Rudolph (Eds.), *Criticality, Teacher Identity, and (In)equity in English Language Teaching: Issues and Implications* (pp. 257–273). Springer International Publishing.

Block, D., Gray, J., & Holborow, M. (2013). *Neoliberalism and applied linguistics*. Routledge.

Calafato, R. (2019). The non-native speaker teacher as proficient multilingual: A critical review of research from 2009–2018. *Lingua, 227,* 1-25.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 401–417.

David, E. J. R. (Ed.). (2013). *Internalized oppression: The psychology of marginalized groups.* Springer Publishing Company.

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction.* London, Verso.

Glasgow, G. P. (2014). Conducting English classes in English in Japan: The roles of Japanese teachers and native English-speaking teachers in the new national curriculum in upper secondary schools [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. University of Queensland.

Hall, S. (1985). Signification, representation, ideology: Althusser and the post-structuralist debates. *Critical Studies in Media Communication, 2*(2), 91-114.

Hall, S. (1996). The Problem of Ideology: Marxism Without Guarantees. In: Morley D and Chen KH(eds) Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies, chapter 1. London and New York: Rutledge, pp.24–45.

Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hashimoto, K. (2018). "Mother Tongue Speakers" or "Native Speakers"?. In S. A. Houghton & K. Hashimoto (Eds.), *Towards Post-Native-Speakerism* (pp. 61–77). Springer Singapore.

Heinrich, P. (2005). Language ideology in JFL textbooks. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 175–176.

Holborow, M. (2015). *Language and neoliberalism*. Routledge.

Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, *60*(4), 385–387.

Houghton, S. A., & Rivers, D. J. (2013). *Native-speakerism in Japan*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Huang, I.-C. (2018). Power and ownership within the NS/NNS dichotomy. In B. Yazan & N. Rudolph (Eds.), *Criticality, teacher identity, and (in)equity in English language teaching: Issues and implications* (pp. 41–56). Berlin, Germany: Springer International Publishing.

Jensen, S. Q. (2011). Othering, identity formation and agency. *Qualitative Studies, 2*(2): 63-78.

Kubota, R., & Fujimoto, D. (2013). Racialized native speakers: Voices of Japanese American English language professionals. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (Eds.). *Native-speakerism in Japan* (pp. 196-206). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). Individual identity, cultural globalization and teaching English as an international language: The case for an epistemic break. In L. Alsagoff, S. McKay, G. Hu, & W. Renandya (Eds), *Teaching English as an international language: Principles and practices* (pp. 9-27). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kusunoki, R. (2018). Japanese native speakers' perceptions of non-native speakers: Communication between Japanese medical professionals and economic partnership agreement (EPA) nurse trainees. In S. A. Houghton & K. Hashimoto (Eds.), *Towards post-native-speakerism* (pp. 113–127). Singapore: Springer.

LeTendre, G. (1994). Guiding them on: Teaching, hierarchy, and social organization in Japanese middle schools. *Journal of Japanese Studies*, *20*(1), 37-59.

Lowe, R. J. (2020). Uncovering Ideology in English Language Teaching: Identifying the 'Native Speaker' Frame. Switzerland: Springer.

Mahbood, A., Uhrig, K., Newman, K. L., & Hartford, B. S. (2004). Children of a lesser English: Status of nonnative English speakers as college-level English as a Second Language teachers in the United States. In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience* (pp. 100-120). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Manara, C. (2018). What should I call myself? Does it matter? Questioning the "labeling" practice in ELT profession. In B. Yazan & N. Rudolph (Eds.), *Criticality, teacher identity, and (in)equity in English language teaching: Issues and implications* (pp. 125–140). Berlin, Germany: Springer International Publishing.

McBeath, N. (2017). Initial teacher training courses and non-native speaking teachers: A response to Jason Anderson. *ELT Journal 71*(2): 247–9.

Mumby, D. K. (1989). Ideology & the social construction of meaning: A communication perspective. *Communication Quarterly*, *37*(4), 291-304.

Penfield, W. & Roberts, L. (1959). *Speech and Brain Mechanisms*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Phillipson, R. (2008). The linguistic imperialism of neoliberal empire. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 5*(1), 1-43.

Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2011). Social inclusion and metrolingual practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 14*(4), 413–426.

Rampton, B. (2014). Conviviality and phatic communication? In J. Blommaert and P. Varis (eds.), *The Importance of Unimportant Language*, Special issue of *Multilingual Margins*.

River, D. J., & Zotzmann, K. (2017). *Isms in language education*. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Seargeant, P. (2013). Ideologies of nativism and linguistic globalization. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (Eds.). *Native-speakerism in Japan* (pp. 231-242). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Shohamy, E. (2013). The discourse of language testing as a tool for shaping national, global, and transnational identities. *Language and intercultural communication*, *13*(2), 225-236.

Suzuki, K., & Hur, H. (2021). Revisiting the old debate: citizens' perceptions of meritocracy in public and private organizations. *Public Management Review*, 1-25.

Todd, R. W., & Pojanapunya, P. (2009). Implicit attitudes towards native and non-native speaker teachers. *System, 37*(1), 23–33.

Volosinov, V.N. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language* (L. Matejka & I.R. Titunik, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Abstract

Within the field of English language teaching (ELT), native-speakerism is shown to be a dominant ideology that exerts influence on individuals involved within ELT (Holliday, 2006), especially in countries where English plays a significant role in the school curriculum as well as entrance exams, such as Japan (Houghton and Rivers, 2013). This chapter takes a constructive perspective towards Native-speakerism and regards it as being produced and reproduced through discourses at the institutional level, such as in school curriculums, teaching policies or teaching methods, as well as at the individual level, such as daily interactions among individuals involved in ELT. Taking a constructive position, this chapter views individuals as possessing the agency to frame discourses and thus to exert impacts on native-speakerist ideology. While native-speakerism was based on an assumption on the existence of a stable community (Seargeant, 2013), scholarship has pointed out fluid phenomena exists in social categories such as language, culture, race and ethnicity due to the increase of mobile populations under the process of globalization. This chapter thus aims at understanding how mobile populations interact with native-speakerist ideology through four cases of migrant students learning English in Japan, who experience both English native-speakerism in ELT and are also exposed to Japanese native-speakerism in Japanese society.

Appendix:

(Excerpt 1, Yuen, 1st interview)

S：對，一開始我聽說學校那邊的說

明就是，一年級一二學期並不會上到翻譯的相關課程。就是想不到是老師自己的教學計劃裡面有翻譯的內容。

R：那就是老師當時跟你講要加強日文的時候是什麼樣的狀況？他是給你寫email呢還是口頭跟你 說？

S：他直接在全班面前這樣跟我講（笑）。

R：天哪！你可以描述一下具體的狀況嗎？如果你記得的話。

S：呃，應該是，是有一次考試的成績很差，老師就一個個發考卷，發到我的時候，他就說

喔，Yuen，你的日文實力就是，全班，全班裡，算是很慘的那個。那因為學校那邊有提供未滿N2的學生，他可以去上一個日文的補救教學。所以其實那時候他第一個是建議我去上這個補救教學這樣子。

(Omitted)

R：好，那你當時就是，我想問一下就是在神田被老師那樣講之後的感受是什麼？

S：很羞辱（笑）。對，但是就是，我能夠理解我那時候的日文實力並不足

夠，就是我沒有想過就是這樣當著，雖然那個時候是下課時間，可能沒有什麼人在注意，但畢竟是當著大家的面前這樣講出來。

(Excerpt 2, Yuen, 1st interview)

R：了解，那你有照老師的建議去那個，那個日文補習的地方嗎？

S：後來問了學校那邊，他是說，就是那時候我已經考過日文檢定N1了，所以他說課程內容對於我來說

會太簡單。最後我並沒有去上。那詢問同班同學，就是有在上這個課程的人，也是說課程內容真的是很簡單，所以也並不推薦那時候的我去上課。

R：也就是說，學校那邊提供的日文的support，無法滿足你的翻譯老師的，或者是說你的英文老師用翻譯教學的這個，這個方法對日文的需求這樣子？

S：對，那時候他們跟我講的，就是日文補習的內容應該是接近能夠

讓你日常過生活沒有問題的程度。

R：我想問你進神田的時候有日文要求嗎？就是有，你一定要過什麼水平才讓你進這個學校之類的嗎？

S：進神田時候我印象中，是日文有過N3還是N2，就可以進來。可是後來實際上去看其他外國學生的狀況，好像又沒有這個硬性條件。應該就是加分項目這樣。

(Excerpt 4, Chau, 4th interview)

C：大学は多分 100 パーセントぐらいです 。

R：大学どんな場合でも？授業取った時とか？

C：授業、はい。なんかほぼ日本人と、後科目とか取ってたら何か日本人…なんかみんな一緒だから、先生そんなに比べないんで native みたいな。

R：あ、先生があんまり区別しないってこと？

C：はい、全員が同じくらいでやってたんです。

R：あ、面白い、でも授業取ってるの時も。例えばなんかこれ日本語ネイティブだったらもうちょっと簡単にできるという感覚はなかったですかね？

C：たまにもあるんです。

例えば漢字が難しすぎて調べないと意味がわかんないけど。

R：でも先生はあんまり区別しないのであんまり。

C：はいそれ。

R：なるほどですね。そうするとなんか、あ、わかりました。例えばこの前その期末レポートで全部日本語で書かなきゃいけない。

C：そうですね、全部日本語で。

R：それ

なんか大変だったみたいな話があったと思うんですけど。そういう場合でもあんまり区別感じない感じですか？

C：はい、あんまり変わんない。一般、なんか一般生徒として採点するかなと思ってますね。

R：先生が？

C：はい。

R：あ、そっかじゃあこういうふうに考えてもいいかな。チャンちゃんはその日本の学生と同じレベルに達することを要求、要求されているというか。

C：もうちょっと優しくなっ、のほうがいいかなと思ったんですけど、でも厳しい先生だからそれしょうがないです。