ABSTRACT

Title of dissertation: BORDERLANDS AND BORDER CROSSING: JAPANESE PROFESSORS OF ENGLISH AND THE NEGOTIATION OF TRANSLINGUISTIC AND TRANSCULTURAL IDENTITY

Nathanael John Rudolph, Doctor of Philosophy, 2012

Dissertation directed by: Dr. Melinda Martin-Beltran

Department of Teaching and Learning, Policy and Leadership

Recent scholarship in the field of ELT posits that critical constructions of the Native Speaker/Non-Native Speaker and Native English Speaker Teacher/Non-Native English Speaker Teacher binaries in the ELT literature have oversimplified and essentialized categories of teacher identity (e.g., Menard-Warwick, 2008; Park, 2012) and as a result cannot account for contextualized negotiations of borders of linguistic and cultural identity around the world. In the interest of addressing this issue, the following study explores the lived experiences of four Japanese professors negotiating their translinguistic and transcultural identities in the field of English language teaching (ELT) in Japan, and how through these experiences they have arrived at challenging who they might be or become as English language learners, teachers and users.

Employing narrative inquiry and the use of semi-structured interviews, the study attempts to provide a sociohistorically-situated account of participants' lived experiences conceptualizing and negotiating borders of being and becoming as

English language learners, users and teaching professionals. In doing so, the study attempts to examine the interplay of local and global discourses of identity implicated in the construction and perpetuation of borders within ELT in the Japanese context. The study seeks to encourage dialogue in the ELT research and teaching community both within and beyond Japan, related to how these discourses might adversely affect learner, teacher and user identity and contextualized language teaching. In addition, the study attempts to contribute to debate within ELT scholarship regarding who "non-native" teachers might be or become and the roles "native" and "non-native" teachers might play in globalized ELT.

BORDERLANDS AND BORDER CROSSING: JAPANESE PROFESSORS OF ENGLISH AND THE NEGOTIATION OF TRANSLINGUISTIC AND TRANSCULTURAL IDENTITY

by

Nathanael John Rudolph

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
Of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2012

Advisory Committee:

Dr. Melinda Martin-Beltran, Chair
Dr. Barbara Finkelstein
Dr. David Imig
Dr. Steven Klees
Dr. Jennifer Turner

Dedication

To Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo

for your willingness to share and your inspiration…

Acknowledgements

I want to express my love and gratitude to my wife Julie, my daughters Liliana and Nora, as well as my mother, father and sister, who have been with me each step of the way during my studies, and have kept me balanced both personally and professionally.

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Melinda Martin-Beltran, for her invaluable input and support during this journey, as well as my dissertation committee members who have both challenged and inspired my along the way. A special thanks to Dr. Barbara Finkelstein for her imagination and powerful influence upon my life.

I would like to express my gratitude to all my friends at the University of Maryland who have provided comfort, insight and wisdom throughout my tenure as a doctoral student. A heartfelt thank you to Jason Yip, Ali Fuad Selvi, Bedrettin Yazan, Rashi Jain, Jessica Bancroft, Dawn Sherman, Ms. Anita and the countless other individuals who have enriched my life and made this experience possible.

Many thanks to my incredible friends and colleagues in Japan who have been there for me during the research and writing process. In addition, a special thank you to Stuart Gibson, whose photos of transcultural Japan gave spirit to both my proposal and dissertation defenses.

Finally, I want to thank God for the strength to endure the weight of teaching loads, professional obligations, and family responsibilities, during the dissertation process. I would not have survived without His grace and mercy.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Approaching the Study

Introduction

> *"I feel I have many circles of identity in my life. They cross each other in different ways at different points, depending on who I am interacting with. These circles are what I imagine as 'being Japanese' 'being American,' etc. … I am a product of the mixture of elements of these different circles" (Tomomi, transcript 1, lines 152-156).*

> *"I'm a threat professionally, but also culturally as well because I am redefining what it is to be a teacher and Japanese" (Tomomi, transcript 2, lines 11-12).*

Tomomi's two quotes approach the ongoing tension over border crossing (Giroux, 1992) in the field of English language teaching (ELT). This tension relates to competing conceptualizations of who language learners are capable of being and or becoming, and who they should be, as users and instructors of English. Historically, mainstream scholars in the field of English language teaching (ELT) have conceived "non-native" language use as deficient in nature, measured by the yardstick of an "idealized Native Speaker" (Chomsky, 1965).[1] The idealized Native Speaker- Caucasian, Western and more often than not, Male- (e.g., Amin, 1999, 1997; Braine, 2010, 1999; Holliday, 2008; Kubota, 1998, 2002, 2011; Kubota & Lin, 2009; Motha, 2006), has served as the standard by which to measure the linguistic and sociocultural knowledge of English users regardless of context (e.g., Canagarajah, 2007; Medgyes, 1994; Leung, 2005). This Native Speaker (NS) "construct" (e.g., Amin, 2000), placing the "ownership" of English in the hands of NSs, has long guided mainstream conceptualizations of policy, materials creation, teaching, assessment, professionalism

[1] I choose to retain the terms "Native Speaker" and "Non-Native Speaker" in the dissertation, as they provide a point from which to both create dialogue about and deconstruct (Derrida, 1976) the binary to which they belong.

and hiring practices in ELT around the world (e.g., Canagarajah, 1999; Cook, 1999; Kachru, 1985; Y. Kachru, 2005; Leung, 2005).

Scholarship has increasingly challenged this NS construct for reasons both critical and practical. In a world ever-globalizing and postmodern, wherein goods, people, techology and ideas flow across time and space (Appadurai, 2000) and "non-native" speakers overwhelming outnumber NSs as both users and instructors of English (e.g., Alptekin, 2002; Crystal, 2003), scholars are calling for a reconceptualization of language ownership, and by proxy, for the reconceptualization of who English language learners, instructors and users might be or become (e.g., Canagarajah, 1999; Cook, 1999; Leung, 2005). Recent work by scholars in ELT (e.g., Higgins, 2003; Menard-Warwick, 2008; Motha, Jain & Tecle, 2012; Park, 2012), has asserted that conceptualizations of the NS construct have oversimplified approaches to teacher identity. Menard-Warwick (2008) and Motha, Jain and Tecle argue, for example, that mainstream and critical constructions of the NEST/NNEST binary neglect teachers' contextualized negotiation of translinguistic and transcultural identity.[2] In line with such thinking, scholars have begun to examine NNSs confronting and negotiating borders in their construction of translinguistic and transcultural identity across contexts (e.g., Menard-Warwick, 2008; Motha, Jain and Tecle, 2012; Park, 2008, 2012), while others have attempted to provide a contextualized description of the NS/NNS binary in the "Outer Circle" (e.g., Higgins, 2003).[3]

[2] I draw upon Willis & Murphy-Shigematsu (2008) and Motha, Jain & Tecle (2012) in employing the terms "translinguistic" and "transcultural," emphasizing movement across linguistic, cultural and national borders.

[3] In his three-concentric-circle model attempting to explain the historical spread of English around the world and the development of new Englishes, Kachru (1985) describes the "Inner Circle" as consisting of native-speaking Western nations the "Outer Circle" consisting of the former colonies of Englsh-speaking nations, and the "Expanding Circle" as countries which had not experienced colonialization on the part of an English-speaking nation. This is detailed further in Chapter 2.

The Nature and Purpose of the Study

Japan, as with other English language learning contexts around the world, is a country wherein scholars have described the NS construct as the framework guiding English language-related research, policy, curriculum and materials development, teaching, assessment, use and hiring practices (e.g., Braine, 2010; Kubota, 1998, 2002, 2011; Matsuda, 2003a, 2003b). Scholars have situated the NS construct within the context of larger social and academic discourses4 in Japan (e.g., Kubota, 1998; Seargeant, 2011). I[5] contend, however, both within and beyond Japan, there are few contextualized descriptions of learners, teachers and users conceptualizing and negotiating borders of identity, in the confluence of local and global discourses attempting to define who they might and/or should be and become as learners, teachers and users of English.

In the interest of contributing such an account, I have chosen to focus on the lived experiences of Japanese university-level professors of English who are publically challenging prevailing constructions of language ownership, learning, use and instruction in the field of ELT in Japan. My choice of these participants is purposeful, in that their lived experiences contextualize dialogue related to the encountering and challenging of discourses that establish borders of linguistic and cultural identity in Japanese society and within ELT situated therein.

In approaching the study, I have chosen to employ post-structuralism-informed narrative inquiry, wherein my participants and I co-construct (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003) narratives exploring their lived experiences negotiating

[4] In using the term "discourse," I draw upon postmodern uses including Morgan (2007). See Chapter 2.

[5] In this study I use the first person "I" when referring to myself, as this is in line both with my ontological and epistemological commitments, as well as with narrative inquiry, my methodology of choice (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

translinguistic and transcultural identities, that have in the process brought them to challenge borders within ELT at the university level in Japan. The following four research questions guide my approach:

Research Questions

1) How do participants construct their translinguistic and transcultural identities as ELT professionals?

2) How and why have participants, as ELT professionals, arrived at challenging prevailing discourses guiding ELT in the Japanese setting?

3) How do participants describe their lived experiences challenging these discourses?

My fourth research question relates to my own positionality as a Caucasian, Male, North American English speaker living in Japan, actively seeking to problematize and challenge discourses within ELT, both critically and practically:

4) How am I, as the researcher, contributing to the co-construction and restorying of narratives, in light of my past experiences and experiences during the research, reflection and writing process?

Outline of the Study

In Chapter Two, I detail the conceptual framework that guides this study, and provide a literature review related to the NS construct in the ELT-related literature. In Chapter Three, I explore English and discourses of identity in Japan. In doing so, I describe the pervading, sociohistorically situated discourses in Japanese society that have shaped constructions of "Japan," "Japaneseness," and Japan's relationship with the world beyond its shores, and by proxy, conceptualizations of English language learning, use and instruction. In Chapter Four, I outline my methodological approach to the study. In Chapter Five, I present the co-constructed and restoried (Creswell, 2008) narratives of Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo negotiating and constructing their translinguistic and transcultural identities and in the process encountering, confronting and challenging borders in the field of ELT and in Japanese

society. In Chapter Six, I approach the excavation of "resonant threads" (Clandinin, 2010) grounded in my participants' narrations of lived experiences negotiating transcultural and translinguistic identities. These threads are storylines of conceptualizing and negotiating borders both within university-level ELT and in the Japanese society in which it is situated. I then discuss some of the implications grounded in my participants' narratives related to critically-oriented theoretical conceptualizations of the NS construct, the purpose of and audience for critical scholarship in ELT, and contextualized language teaching. In addition, I discuss my self-reflexivity and ongoing negotiation of translinguistic and transcultural identity in light of the study. I follow with what I view the contributions of this study are to the ELT literature. Finally, I conclude with future directions for research.

Notes on Terms

Key Abbreviations

There are a few specific abbreviations that will appear throughout the study:

ELT: English language teaching

NS: Native Speaker

NNS: Non-Native Speaker

NEST: Native English Speaker Teacher

NNEST: Non-Native English Speaker Teacher

NS Construct: Native Speaker construct

Japanese to English translations

In the literature review in Chapter Three and in Chapters Five and Six, I have written translations of Japanese terms. The translations in Chapter Three were

provided in the literature, while the translations in Chapters Five and Six I have provided. I have written the translations in either quotation marks or parentheses.

Chapter 2: Conceptual Framework

According to Maxwell (2005), a conceptual framework is, "A system of concepts, assumptions, expectations, beliefs, and theories that supports and informs your research" (p. 33). In the following framework, I first outline the theoretical lens through which I am approaching the study: post-structuralism. I follow with a literature review of the NS construct in the ELT literature, including critically-oriented approaches to moving beyond the NS for critical and practical purposes.

Theoretical Framework: Post-structuralism

My approach to this literature review and study is informed by post-structuralist theory, an umbrella term (Pavlenko, 2002, p. 281) associated with the work of individuals including Bakhtin (1981, 1984), Bourdieu (1977, 1991), Derrida (1976), Foucault (1978, 1980, 1984), and Lacan (1977).[6] Post-structuralism, according to Morgan (2007), is postmodern "in its critique of universal notions of objectivity, progress, and reason," as well as "in its attentiveness to the dynamics and disjunctures of social categories" (p. 951). Post-structuralism rose in response to structuralist notions of language, grounded primarily in the work of Ferdinand de Saussure (e.g., 1966, 1983). Post-structuralism includes a wide variety of theoretical approaches that "focus on the role of language in the construction of reality and identity" (Swain & Deters, 2009, p. 827). As Norton (2010) writes, language for the post-structuralist, "is not conceived of as a neutral medium of communication, but is understood with reference to its social meaning" (p. 350); this is what post-structuralists term "discourse." Morgan (2007) defines discourse as: "systems of power/knowledge (Foucault, 1982) that regulate and assign value to all forms of

[6] Ivic (2009) notes the majority of these individuals have rejected the term "poststructualist" and/or "postmodernist" as applied to their work (p. 111). Peters and Humes (2003) call post-structuralism "an Americanism that tends to obscure the often deep-seated differences and styles of thinkers grouped together under this term" (p. 109).

semiotic activity for instance, oral/written texts, gestures, images, spaces, and their multimodal integration" (p. 952). Bakhtin (1981, 1963/1984) describes language as situated in dialogue, with meaning negotiated and constructed with others; words are inscribed with power and values. Drawing from Bourdieu (1977), Norton (2010) argues:

> "Every time we speak, we are negotiating and renegotiating our sense of self in relation to the larger social world, and reorganizing that relationship across time and space. Our gender, race, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, among other characteristics, are all implicated in this negotiation of identity" (pp. 350).

This is a challenge to static terms for identity, as well as "binary oppositions" (Ivic, 2009), including male/female, objective/subjective and Native Speaker/Non-Native Speaker.

Interested in uncovering the root historical and cultural origins of the discourses of "truths/knowledge" that dominate in societies, post-structuralists posit that studying an object, and the context and knowledge that produced such an object, are equally important in order to approach understanding how something gains status in society.[7] The post-structuralist is therefore "deconstructing" discourse in the interest of examining its origin and structure in terms "cultural," social and political context (Derrida, 1976). Newman (2001) contends that deconstruction, "is a way of reading texts – philosophical texts – with the intention of making these texts question themselves, forcing them to take account of their own contradictions, and exposing the antagonisms they have ignored or repressed" (p. 2). The relationship between knowledge and power, and the role of power in society, envisioned by Foucault (1984), is an oft-cited post-structuralist approach to exploring discourse. Power,

[7] The examination and interpretation of such will further pass through the lens of the explorer. Scientific research, as a result, can be a "potential source of injustice" (Morgan, 2007, p. 951).

according to Foucault (1984), shapes societal views of what is "normal" and acceptable. Truth is not universal, but rather a political and economic construct presented by those forces that wield power within a given context. In a society, there are "regimes of truth," which Foucault (1984) describes as the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true (p. 73). Referring to Western societies, Foucault (1984) describes the creation and perpetuation of truth as possessing five elements:

> "Truth" is centered on the form of scientific discourse and the institutions which produce it; it is subject to constant economic and political incitement (the demand for truth, as much for economic production as for political power); it is the object, under diverse forms, of immense diffusion and consumption (circulating through apparatuses of education and information whose extent is relatively broad in the social body, notwithstanding certain strict limitations); it is produced and transmitted under the control, dominant if not exclusive, of a few great political and economic apparatuses (university, army, writing, media); lastly, it is the issue of a whole political debate and social confrontation ("ideological" struggles)" (p. 73).

Foucault, when applying his concept of regimes of truth to the human and social sciences, according to Hobbs (2008) was not stating that all regimes of truth are pseudoscientific and evil in nature. Foucault believed "not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous" (p. 343). Hobbs (2008) argues that Foucault's conceptualization pointed to the fact that "regimes of truth, such as those of the human sciences, are infused with relations of power and, thus, ways-of-seeing (like all knowledge formations) that impact on the object of inquiry, which, in this case, is the human subject" (p. 11). Understanding the role of power in the creation and perpetuation of "truths" was to understand how and why truths gain footing in

societies.

Foucault's approach to power has been critiqued by individuals such as feminist scholar Nancy Hartsock (1987), as failing to move toward an epistemological foundation for agency. Hartsock (1987) argues that Foucault theorizes from the perspective of the colonizer, failing to take into account the plight of the colonized. Others, such as Norton & Toohey (2001) and Pavlenko (2002), take the view that post-structuralism's overall approach to identity and subjectivity does indeed "create the possibilities for autonomy and resistance" (Morgan, 2007, p. 952).

Peters (2004) notes that Foucault, in recognizing the issue of agency, shifts from speaking of regimes of truth (Foucault, 1984) to a focus on "games of truth" (Gauthier, 1988, p. 3). These games of truth according to Foucault are, "an ensemble of rules for the production of truth … It is an ensemble of procedures which lead to a certain result, which can be considered in function of its principles and its rules of procedure as valid or not, as winner or loser" (Gauthier 1988, p. 15). For Foucault, "it is these games of power that one must study in terms of tactics and strategy, in terms of order and of chance, in terms of stakes and objective" (Foucault, cited in Davidson 1997, p. 4). Foucault's move towards a focus on "games of truth" is a move towards recognizing how individuals interact with regimes of truth and assert agency in the process.

Culture in Post-structuralism

Norton's (2010) argument regarding the inseparable nature of the "self" from larger social forces draws upon post-structuralist-informed work, including that of Homi Bhabha, who explores the nature and construct of culture. Bhabha (1994) describes "localized" culture as constructed through interchange and collision with

other cultures. According to Bhabha (1990): “Meaning is constructed across the bar of difference and separation between the signifier and the signified. So it follows that no culture is full unto itself, no culture is plainly ...not only because there are other cultures which contradict its authority, but also because its own symbol-forming activity, ...always underscores the claim to an originary, holistic, organic identity” (p. 210).

What is culture in itself? Appadurai (2000) presents culture as consisting of “situated difference” in a given time and place (p. 12). This difference, in the form of “a practice, a distinction, a conception, an object, or an ideology,” is a type of human discourse that “exploits difference to generate diverse conceptions of group identity” in the interest of maintaining boundaries (pp. 12-13). Appadurai (2000) argues against the notion of static, stable “cultures,” instead emphasizing the transitive nature of inscribed behaviors and migration: “The apparent stabilities that we see are, under close examination, usually our devices for handling objects characterized by motion. The greatest of these apparently stable objects is the nation-state, which is today frequently characterized by floating populations, transnational politics within national borders, and mobile configurations of technology and expertise” (p. 5). Gupta and Ferguson (1992) call such a reconceptualization the problematizing of “the unity of the "us" and the otherness of the "other" (p. 14), whether in terms of a received tradition, ethnicity or nation-state. Appadurai (2000) posits a framework for exploring global cultural flows, and the relationships between these flows, which he terms “scapes.” There are five scapes, including ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, financescapes and ideoscapes. The dynamic, interconnected interaction of these “scapes” is the setting in which Appadurai examines gender roles, violence,

nationality, patriotism, consumption and the inseparable interplay between locality and globality.

The post-structuralist approach to culture found in the work of Bhabha (1992, 1996), Appadurai (2000) and Gupta and Ferguson (1992) among others, is the direct result of post-colonial studies of the interaction between the colonizer and colonized, and the cultural hybridity that has resulted on the part of both groups. In this vein, Bhabha challenges the concept of multiculturalism, as such a notion ignores the space between the boundaries of different "cultures," effectively rendering individuals who find themselves in the "in-betweens" deficient. According to Gupta and Ferguson (1992), "'Multiculturalism' is both a feeble acknowledgment of the fact that cultures have lost their moorings in definite places and an attempt to subsume this plurality of cultures within the framework of a national identity" (p. 7). Multiculturalism assumes, "The distinctiveness of societies, nations, and cultures is based upon a seemingly unproblematic division of space, on the fact that they occupy "naturally" discontinuous spaces" (Gupta & Ferguson, 1992, p. 60), which does not allow space for hybridized culture. In contrast to the notion of multiculturalism, Bhabha (1996) presents the idea of cultural "in-betweens" wherein "borderline negotiations" (p. 54) of cultural hybridization are constantly occurring. In Bhabha's (1994) words,

> "These 'in-between' spaces provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood - singular or communal - that initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself. It is in the emergence of the interstices - the overlap and displacement of domains of difference - that the intersubjective and collective experiences of *nationness*, community interest, or cultural value are negotiated" (pp. 1-2).

Post-structuralism and SLA/Applied Linguistics

Post-structuralism first appeared in the Second Language Acquisition literature, in the form of Alistair Pennycook's (1990) call for "the need to rethink language acquisition in its social, cultural and political contexts, taking into account gender, race, and other relations of power as well as the notion of the subject as multiple and formed within different discourses" (p. 26). Subsequent post-structuralism-informed work on language identity, language ownership and subjectivity, include scholarship by Blackledge and Pavlenko (2001), Canagarajah (2006a, 2006b, 2007), Firth (2009), Kubota (2001), McKay & Wong (1996), Menard-Warwick (2008), Miller (2004), Morgan (2009), Norton Peirce (1995), Norton (1997), Norton (2000) Pavlenko (2002), Siegal (1996) and Simon-Maeda (2011). Pavlenko (2002) notes that post-structuralism-informed theory and research rejected the tenets of structuralism, including: the notion of a world "consisting of homogenous and monolingual cultures or in-groups and out-groups," and of the idea that an individual must "abandon one's first language and culture in order to learn the second language and acculturate to the TL (target language) group" (p. 279); the assumption that learners of English are seeking to become acculturated members of a target group; the separation between the "social" and the "psychological"; the static and stable nature of constructs such as motivation and identity; a static, homogenous view of culture; the "idealized and decontextualized" view of language learning (p. 281).

The work of Weedon (1997), a feminist post-structuralist scholar, has greatly affected the way post-structuralism applies to the study of identity, and "subjectivity." Language, according to Weedon (1997), constructs an individual's identity, or "subjectivity" (p. 19). Subjectivity, for the post-structuralist, is "precarious, contradictory and in process, constantly being reconstituted in discourse each time we think or speak" (p. 32). In other words, subjectivity –a sense of identity- is

continually negotiated and renegotiated, not static. As Norton (2000) argues: "When language learners speak, they are not only exchanging information with target language speakers, but they are constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world" (p. 11). Weedon (1997) describes the interplay between language and subjectivity as such: "As we acquire language, we learn to give voice—meaning—to our experience and to understand it according to particular ways of thinking, particular discourses, which pre-date our entry into language" (p. 32). Norton (2010) argues the term and concept of "subjectivity" is important, as it reinforces the idea that there is no individual or "real me" (Bhabba and Appignanesi, 1987), but rather an individual as "either subject *of* a set of relationships (i.e. in a position of power) or subject *to* a set of relationships (i.e. in a position of reduced power)" (p. 2) (see also: Bakhtin, 1981, 1984).

Summary of Theoretical Approach

Post-structuralist-informed approaches, in concert with feminist and post-colonialist theory, has served to re-conceptualize culture and identity, (e.g., Canagarajah, 2007, Pavlenko, 2002), which has in turn shed critical light upon the way in which the nature and role of language, and its acquisition, instruction, and use have been approached within the realms of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), applied linguistics and ELT research and practice (Firth, 2009). For many years, scholars have explored and debated the issues of language proficiency and language ownership. Such inquiry has informed frameworks for challenging the regimes of truth dictating who and what might be the cultural and linguistic targets of instruction, who is a valued instructor, who "owns" English, what might be considered deficiency in terms of linguistic and cultural or ability and knowledge, and how such knowledge and ability might be assessed (see Canagarajah, 2006a, 2006b, 2007; Norton, 2010;

Pavlenko, 2002; Swain & Deters, 2007). Firth (2009) contends:

> "post-structuralism provides a metatheoretical basis for reconfiguring and reconstituting key concepts and assumptions within our field, including, though not limited to, assumptions of an ascendant native speaker, the viability of interlanguage, notions of ''target'' language and target competence, the nature of learning and being an L2 learner, the prevalence of the view that NNSs are deficient communicators, the assumption that NS communities are the legitimate and exclusive source of norms, the perception of ''non-standard'' forms, and more besides" (p. 165).

It is through this lens I now approach the NS construct and ultimately, this study.

Literature Review: The NS Construct

The idealized Native Speaker has long reigned supreme in the world of English language acquisition theory and research, and has served as the cultural and linguistic target for learning, instruction, assessment and use both within and beyond the classroom (e.g., Canagarajah, 1999; Cook, 1999; Kachru, 1985). Calls for a reconceptualization of an idealized Native Speaker as an appropriate cultural and linguistic target for acquisition are increasingly audible. This desire to move beyond the regime of truth (Foucault, 1984) placing the Native Speaker on a pedestal, is directly linked to the use of English in a multiplicity of contexts in an ever-globalizing postmodernistic world (Canagarajah, 2006c). In addition, scholars and teachers are challenging the notion of an idealized speaker, often Western and Caucasian in nature, as the owner of English, and by proxy a focus on his or her culture and language. As such, the drive towards a reconceptualization of the ownership of language, of "identity" and "culture" are increasing in intensity (e.g., Canagarajah, 2006a, 2006b; Norton, 1995, 1997, 2006).

Furthermore, advocacy calling attention to the plight of Non-Native English Speaker Teachers (NNESTs) is also building momentum (e.g., Braine, 1999; 2010; Canagarajah, 1999). Researchers are highlighting issues of employment-based

discrimination (e.g., Braine, 1999, 2010; Canagarajah, 1999), the assessment of NNEST proficiency (e.g., Firth, 2009; Lowenberg, 2002), teacher training (e.g., Leung, 2005) and contextualized linguistic and cultural targets for instruction (e.g., Canagarajah, 2007). Yet, according to critical views in the literature, the Native Speaker construct remains dominant, and endures as the framework for a great majority of English language-related theory, research, policy, teacher training, practice, creation of materials and hiring practices.

Objectives of the Literature Review

The following literature review aims to synthesize literature related to linguistics, applied linguistics and ELT, that posits an idealized NS as the linguistic and cultural target for English language learning, use and instruction. I examine how this idealized NS has been constructed in the literature as the owner and gatekeeper of English (e.g., Widdowson, 1994; Leung, 2005), and the yardstick by which all users of English might be measured, regardless of context (e.g., Canagarajah, 2007; Medgyes, 1994; Leung, 2005). I then review literature that has sought to describe and challenge the negative effects of the NS construct upon non-native learners, teachers and users of English. I close with a brief overview of critical challenges to the way in which this construct has been conceptualized.

Scope/Delimitations

I would like to set a few specific parameters around my approach to the following literature review. First, I will not delve into arguments countering a desire to move beyond the Native Speaker construct. Davies (2003), for example, contends that "Non-Native Speakers" necessarily need a reference or standard to guide their

language learning. Debating the back and forth between scholars attempting to give credence to the NS construct, and those seeking to move beyond its premises, is beyond the scope of my purposes here.

In addition, I do not intend to review literature that explores issues of equity regarding who can be classified as a NS within the NS construct. In deconstructing the NS construct, researchers are acknowledging the marginalization that occurs for those who do not fit the "idealized" NS label. The argument is therefore to move beyond placing ownership of English in the hands of the few privileged by a regime of truth, and instead moving towards ownership for all, whatever that may look like (e.g., Canagarajah, 2007).

The NS Construct: Theoretical Roots, Lasting Influences

In this section, I explore the nature and prominence of the NS construct in English language-related theory, research, policy, teacher training, practice, creation of materials and hiring practices. In doing so, I examine how scholars have defined communicative competence as related to English, and by proxy, language ownership.

The term 'communicative competence' has evolved and taken on many different forms over the course of the last few decades. The linguist Noam Chomsky (1965) spoke of language competence in terms of competence and performance. Competence is the knowledge possessed by an ideal (native) speaker/listener within a homogenous speech community; performance refers to the underlying rules of performance, and not use:

> "Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interests, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance" (Chomsky, 1965, p.3).

In this model, linguistic knowledge exists apart from socio-cultural elements.

Hymes (1972) responded to the Chomskian competence-performance model, taking issue with the notion of an 'idealized speaker' of a language, the lack of a place for the socio-cultural features of a language, as well as with the confusion over the nature of 'performance.' According to Hymes (1972), who first coined the term communicative competence, competence involves four components: the formal *possiblility* of something in use; the *feasibility of something* in terms of cognitive resources and time; the *appropriateness* of something in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated; the *actual use* of something within a speech community. Hymes, an anthropologist, made a few key observations related to competency. Referring to the language issues of marginalized children, Hymes noted, "When a child from one developmental matrix enters a situation in which the communicative expectations are defined in terms of another, misperception and misanalysis may occur at every level" (p. 287). Children "develop a general theory of the speaking appropriate in their community, which they employ, like other forms of tacit cultural knowledge (competence) in conducting and interpreting social life" (p. 279). Furthermore, "The competency of users of language entails abilities and judgments relative to, and interdependent with, socio-cultural features" (p. 277). Hymes was therefore negating the notion of an ideal speaker, as well as pointing to the fact that competency included much more than the grammar and lexis of a language, in contrast to the model proposed by Chomsky. Socio-cultural factors were not to be overlooked, as they were intertwined with structure and lexicon.

Frameworks for language teaching and research

Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) brought the notion of communicative competence into Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theory, presenting such competence as consisting of four elements: grammatical, discourse, sociolinguistic and strategic. *Grammatical competence* relates to sentence-level rules, while discourse competence refers to the ability to connect sentences in order to form a meaningful utterance. *Sociolinguistic competence* refers to pragmatics; the knowledge of the socio-cultural rules of language and discourse. *Strategic competence* involves "the verbal and nonverbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or due to insufficient competence" (Canale & Swain, 1980, p. 30). Brown (2000) notes that Canale and Swain's theoretical approach to communicative competence earned doctrinal status in Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching (ELT), a notoriety that continues to present (Leung, 2005).

With an eye on the frameworks posited by Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983), Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) proposed the addition of *actional competence*; the ability to act as both a producer and receiver of speech acts. Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) modify the sociolinguistic component of competence to become sociocultural competence, which involves the relation of cultural knowledge to interpreting language, as well as the notion of grammatical competence to linguistic competence, in order to include the sound system of the language and its lexicon, as well as grammar (Celce-Murcia, 2007). Celce-Murcia (2007) notes that within the framework, the inter-relational nature of competencies is stressed, in a manner absent in previous frameworks.

Later in the same year, Celce-Murcia (1995) modified the framework to highlight knowledge of formulaic language. Pawley and Syder (1983) point out that within language, what is lexical is sometimes not grammatical, and what is grammatical is sometimes not lexicalized. Furthermore, Pawley and Syder theorize the language used in interaction consists of hundreds of thousands of lexicalized and semi-lexicalized stems called upon to create fluent speech; language chunks, or Multi-Word Units (Nation & Meara, 2002). Nattinger (1980) states: "for a great deal of time anyway, language production consists of piecing together the ready-made units appropriate for a particular situation" (p. 341). Celce-Murcia (1995) sees such language as integral to the comprehension of the target language.

The Celce-Murcia et al. (1995)/Celce-Murcia (1995) framework includes linguistic, actional and sociocultural competence interacting with discourse competence and connected to strategic competence. A decade later, Celce-Murcia (2007) proposed a revision of the 1995 model. Here, sociocultural, formulaic, linguistic and interactional (actional competencies interact with discourse competence and are connected to strategic competence). This model, argues Celce-Murcia (2007), takes into consideration the importance of discourse, context and culture as well as the formulaic nature of language employment by target language (NS or native-like) users, and the way these users do interaction.

Bachman (1990) elaborates on the theoretical model of language competence or 'language ability' (Bachman & Palmer, 1996), in the interest of approaching language assessment. Bachman establishes three major categories of knowledge, including organizational, pragmatic and strategic knowledge. Organizational competence is the manner by which written and spoken discourse is organized. *Grammatical* knowledge relates to phonology, syntax and vocabulary, while

discourse or textual knowledge (Grice, 1975; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Hatch, 1978; Hatch & Long, 1980; Richards & Schmidt, 1983) refers to the cohesive flow of written and spoken language. Pragmatic competence, is the relation of written and spoken language both to communicative goals and the features of the setting in which the language is being used. Pragmatic competence is divided into *illocutionary knowledge* (speech acts: Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969; micro and macro language functions: Halliday, 1973), related to communicative goals and *sociolinguistic knowledge* (Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983); the relation of language to the setting of the language use. Finally, strategic competence (Faerch & Kasper, 1983) includes *assessment* (the achievability of communicative goals and surmising which linguistic tools are required), *planning* (retrieving and planning for the use of items) and *execution* (employing the tools based on the plan). Bachman's strategic competence differs from Canale and Swain (1980), in that it describes the processes taking place within strategic competence. Bachman also speaks of psychophysiological mechanisms, visual and auditory, allowing for production and reception. Building upon the framework presented in Bachman (1990), Bachman and Palmer (1996) expand the category of 'strategic competence' to include *goal setting* (identification of the tasks which individual will perform). 'Competence' is changed to 'knowledge,' as in 'Pragmatic *knowledge.'* In addition, 'Illocutionary competence' is re-titled 'Functional knowledge.'

Within the frameworks for communicative competence proposed by Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983), the native speaker is assumed to be both the cultural and linguistic target for the acquisition and use of English (see: Jenkins, 2006b; Leung, 2005). Canale and Swain (1980) note, for instance, that "[k]nowledge of what a native speaker is likely to say in a given context is to us a crucial

component of second language learners' competence to understand second language communication and to express themselves in a native-like way..." (p. 16). Bachman (1990), Bachman and Palmer (1996) and Celce-Murcia et al. (1995), Celce-Murcia (1995) and Celce-Murcia (2007) also root their frameworks in the notion of a target language, target language users and a target culture. According to Seidlhofer (2004, in Jenkins, 2006b), scholarship influenced by the notion of an idealized speaker labels English used by Non-Native Speakers deviant and conceptualizes their language use as containing error and/or fossilized error.[8] English use on the part of such speakers is termed "interlanguage," which is "the observable output resulting from a speaker's attempt to produce a foreign norm, i.e., both his errors and non errors (Selinker, 1992, p. 231).

Jenkins (2006b) among others (e.g, Y. Kachru, 2005) notes that the idealized NS permeates mainstream[9] SLA theory as such theory generally accepts that,

> "Differences between NS and NNS (non-native speaker) production (and reception), whether linguistic, pragmatic or sociocultural, can, in this sense, be considered errors that result from incomplete L2 acquisition and that require remediation, and code-switching/code-mixing as primarily the result of gaps in knowledge of the appropriate NS forms" (p. 139).

Kachru (2005) argues, "The theorizing in SLA, however, has not transcended the bounds of ideologically entrenched bias".[10]

The idealized NS, as conceptualized theoretically, is an abstraction. Who is this idealized Native Speaker, whose linguistic and cultural knowledge is to be

[8] Fossilization, according to Selinker (1992), is "the permanent non-learning of TL (target language) structures, of the cessation of IL learning (in most cases) far from expected TL norms" (p. 225).

[9] "Mainstream" for Jenkins (2006b), entails psycholinguistic, cognitive approaches. Jenkins does not include sociocultural theorists and researchers under the banner of mainstream SLA. She feels that sociocultural approaches offer much to accommodate moving beyond the NS-as-target. She quotes from Zuengler and Miller (2006), noting that at the moment however, sociocultural approaches to theory and research and "mainstream cognitive" approaches exist in "two parallel SLA worlds" (p. 35). Swain and Deters (2007) argue that a "new mainstream SLA theory" (p. 820) is emerging as a result of the contributions of sociocultural approaches.

privileged? Scholars including Amin (1997, 1999), Braine (1999, 2010), Kubota (1998, 2002, 2011), Kubota & Lin (2009) and Motha (2006), argue that the NS in question is Caucasian and Western. In this construction of the NS, he/she is deemed the owner and gatekeeper of English (e.g., Widdowson 1999; Leung, 2005), and the yardstick by which all users of English might be measured, regardless of context (e.g., Canagarajah, 2007; Medgyes, 1994; Leung, 2005). This "NS construct," also referred to as the NS-as-target framework (Kachru, 2005), the "Standard English" [11] framework (see: Davies, 2003; Canagarajah, 2006b) and "International English" view (Davies, Hamp-Lyons & Kemp, 2003),[12] prevailing in much of mainstream SLA theory and undergirding its research (Jenkins, 2006b), serves as the "*bedrock of transnationalized ELT*" (Leung, 2005, p. 128, emphasis added). Communicative Language Teaching, according to Leung (2005), traces its roots to Canale and Swain's (1980) notions of communicative competence, which in turn has proved a catalyst for approaches to Task-based Language Teaching, which Block (2002) believes many scholars intend to be a method for world-wide use. Scholars such as Bruton (2005) and Davies (2003) argue that Native Speaker (Western) varieties of English need necessarily serve as a yardstick by which to compare the English of other users and learners of the language. Such a sentiment, according to Jenkins (2006b), prevails amongst mainstream SLA researchers, who are actively seeking "ways of facilitating the acquisition of as near native-like competence as required by the learner, teacher, or 'system', be this by means of tasks, scaffolding,

[11] The term "standard," according to McArthur (1998, as cited in Kachru, 2005), first related to the flag of the King of England, later to weights and measures, and eventually to language and literature.

[12] The "Standard English" (SE) or "International English" (IE) perspective has also confusingly been called the "English as an International Language (EIL)" approach by individuals including Pakir (2009). Though both the SE and IE perspectives priviledge the idealized NS, EIL is nearly always ontologically and epistemologically grounded in a move away from the NS (e.g., Jenkins, 2005, 2006; McKay & Bokhorst-Heng, 2008; Seidlhofer, 2004).

comprehensible input/output, or whatever" (p. 139). Indeed, the notion that a selection of NS-ing individuals within the Inner Circle "own" English, is, according to Jenkins (2006) "held by the majority of English teachers, teacher educators, and SLA researchers, not to mention the ELT examination boards and publishing industry" (p. 172), whether "Native" or "Non-Native."

Challenging the NS Construct

Over the past few decades, challenges to the NS construct have emerged and increased in number. These challenges fluidly combine practical questions regarding the usefulness of the construct in real world contexts, as well as critical questions related to the perpetuation of the construct as a regime of truth, actively marginalizing in the interest of maintaining power and influence.

Alpetkin (2002), Canagarajah (2006a, 2006b), Kachru (2005), Lowenberg (2002) and Savignon (2007) challenge attempts to apply the NS construct in contexts around the world. In such contexts, norms are developing and varieties of English are emerging (see for example: Brutt-Griffler, 2002; Canagarajah, 2006a, 2006b; 2006c; Hill and Parry, 1994; Jenkins, 2000; Lowenberg, 2000),[13] rendering the concepts of "interlanguage" and "fossilization" useless (Jenkins, 2006b). Researching multilinguals, scholars have argued that achieving native speaker-hood cannot nor should not be a learner's goal for proficiency (e.g., Cook, 2006, 2007a, 2007b). Instead, the proficiency of multilinguals might instead be conceptualized in terms of the linguistic and cultural knowledge they possess, and how this knowledge shapes the way they employ their first and subsequent languages (e.g., Cook et al., 2003; Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2009; Martin-Beltran, 2010a, 2010b). As a result, the "multi-

[13] Kachru (2005) describes nativization as "the interface of contact and convergence" between local languages and English (p. 158).

competent" speaker is reconceptualized as proficient and unique as an individual seeing the world via his or her linguistic and cultural knowledge and language journey.

Crystal (2003) posits that there are around 320–380 million speakers of English in which the language is dominant, 300–500 million speakers who reside in a former colony and use English, and 500 million to 1 billion users in contexts beyond. Alptekin (2002) and Crystal (1997) state that English is now spoken more in intercultural communication between Non-Native Speakers than between Native Speakers. Crystal also estimates that 80% or so of English around the world is spoken by Non-Native Speakers. In the same vein, speaking of business, Charles (2007) writes, "Arguably, more international business is actually done in English between Non-Native Speakers than between Native Speakers" (p. 262). Kachru (2005) calls the perpetuated belief that English users around the world will primarily use English with Western native speakers, a "myth" (p. 163). In light of such information, Alpetkin (2002) views communicative competence based on a native speaker model, "as utopian as the notion of the idealized native speaker-listener" (p. 59).

Kachru (1985) attempts to highlight the diversity of English in his creation of a three-concentric-circle model of English use around the world. Kachru viewed the Inner Circle of native-speaking Western nations as norm-providing, the Outer as norm-developing, and the Expanding (countries which had not experienced colonialization on the part of an English-speaking nation), as norm-dependent. Kachru (1985) attempts to roughly demarcate the boundaries of colonial power, post-colonial nation and other, thereby calling attention to English varieties developed/developing in the post-colonial "Outer Circle." Though questioned for

placing the "Native Speaker" at the center of the English world (see: Canagarajah, 2006a, 2006b; Jenkins 2006a, 2006b; Rajadurai, 2005), the model was nevertheless an important means for envisioning an alternate world of English; that of World English*es*, or the existence of multiple contexts, negating the notion of universal norms (Leung, 2005).

According to Leung (2005), Hymes' (1972) concept of communicative competence was created in the interest of ethnographic exploration; it "advocated the need to investigate and understand language use in specific social and cultural contexts" (Leung, 2005, p. 127). Though claiming to build on Hymes, SLA/ELT scholars have "operationalized" competence, as seen in Canale and Swain's (1980) framework. Dubin (1989) argues that, "it is apparent that over time there has been a shift away from an agenda for finding out what is happening in a community regarding language use to a set of statements about what an idealized curriculum for L2 learning/acquisition should entail..." (p. 174). Leung (2005) argues, "The transfer of this concept from research to language teaching has, however, produced abstracted contexts and idealized social rules of use based on (English language) native-speakerness" (p. 119). Hymes (1977), himself, stated the following:

> "One cannot take a linguistic form, a given code, or even speech itself, as a limiting frame of reference. One must take as context a community, or network of persons, investigating its communicative activities as a whole, so that any use of channel and code takes its place as part of the resources upon which the members draw" (p. 4).

Hymesian communicative competence emphasized the diversity of culture and context underpinning language use, and the need for such to be explored in order for the true nature of language to be revealed (Leung, 2005).

Rampton (1987) points out that traditional approaches to SLA theory have focused on the speaker and his or her language in a psycholinguistic sense, causing

researchers to "focus their attention on examining and explaining the grammatical (and other) differences between NNSs and NSs" rather than investigating the regularities and normalities of their successful language use in "the world around them" (Leung, 2005, p. 146). Thus, the social, in mainstream SLA theory, has been divorced from the linguistic. As such, researchers and (consequently English language instruction) have tended to focus on the speech acts of the idealized NS, and to teach such "rules" to learners. Leung (2005) argues that such may prove misguided in terms of learner needs. Furthermore, defining such a NS would prove impossible. Leung (2005) writes that "while there are clearly native speakers of English (as there are native speakers of other languages), there isn't a universal model of native speakers' use of language" (p. 130), a point supported by Leung, Harris and Rampton (1997) and Rampton (1990). Instead, the NS and his or her variety of English is that of a "self-elected elite" of researchers and teachers (Widdowson, 2003, p. 37).

As a result of the NS construct, culture becomes "reductionist, static and homogenous" terms (Pavlenko, 2002, p. 280). Alpetkin (2002) notes that the attempt at presenting one "monolithic" set of cultural ideas and behaviors as the yardstick by which competence is to be measured, is to neglect the diverse nature of language (and in this case English) found in the many different communities that employ it. Often in language teaching, according to Kramsch (1995), teachers "often teach language and culture, or culture in language, but not language as culture" (p. 83), however, not recognizing that language and culture are in and of each other. Alptekin (2002) argues that in teaching the NS's language (and culture by proxy) as target, one is marginalizing, if not completely ignoring, the culture of the learner. In a similar vein, Kramsch (1998) notes that if language users are prohibited from injecting their own cultural beliefs and behaviors into their language use, they may likely view such

action as "a rejection of their social group and their culture" (p. 3). Widdowson (2004) states that such is "the authoritarian imposition of socio-cultural values which makes learners subservient and prevents them from appropriating the language as an expression of their identity" (p. 361).

In further critical inquiry into the spirit of the NS construct, scholars have probed the degree to which such a construct is practical in terms of determining the nature of communicative competence, and how to assess such competence. With specific reference to pragmatic knowledge/competence, Alptekin (2002) rhetorically asks how socio-cultural information such as Anglo-American eye contact and acceptable social distance between speakers, British politeness, or discourse ripe with "culture" would benefit individuals in contexts beyond such contexts in their interaction with each other. Widdowson (1998) argues that what might be real and "authentic" for NSs, will most certainly not be so for learners, as "when people use language appropriately, in a normal pragmatic way, they localise it, they key it into what is familiar in the communities they belong to" (p. 708). In other words, the transfer of NS pragmatic "norms," for example, will not suit the localized needs of those individuals. As Widdowson (2004) writes, "one objection to insisting on conformity to native-speaker norms is that to do so sets goals for learners which are both unrealistic and unnecessary" (p. 361).

Canagarajah (2006a) notes that as language use is directly connected to culture, identity and context, theorizing, researching and assessing English based on idealized NS norms is largely irrelevant. Tests created by Educational Testing Service (ETS), such as the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC), are attempting to assess learner competence that does not relate to their immediate needs and context (Lowenberg, 1992). Many scholars argue that

assessment tools must reflect the diverse, localized uses of English, and contextual realities (e.g., Alptekin, 2002; Canagarajah, 2006a, 2006b; Leung & Jo Lewkowicz, 2006; Lowenberg, 2002; Seidlhofer, 2004), and support the increasing call for a move away from the NS as a baseline for assessment, pointing to the fact that English users outside of Kachru's (1985) Western, Inner Circle contexts, "do not seem to defer to inner-circle norms when they communicate with each other in English" (Canagarajah, 2006b, p. 24). According to Canagarajah, (2006b), "As multilingual speakers focus more on intelligibility rather than on grammatical correctness, they are developing new norms of English that are different from both the local and the metropolitan varieties" (p. 234). According to Widdowson (2004), "insisting on conformity to native-speaker norms is that to do so sets goals for learners which are both unrealistic and unnecessary" (p. 361). As Canagarajah (2006a) notes, whether or not scholars choose to re-conceptualize communicative competence and the foci of their research, the nature and role of English around the world has been changing and continues to evolve.

Some researchers have moved beyond critiquing theory, to focusing on the maintenance of the NS construct as a purposeful perpetuation of power. Rajagopalan (1999) describes the framework as "at best a convenient myth the linguists have got used to working with, and at worst the visible tip of an insidious ideological iceberg" (p. 203). Phillipson (1992) calls the NS-as-target construct, as an active ideology around the world, the "Native Speaker Fallacy." As a result of this perpetuated myth, Widdowson (1994) argues that "ownership" of English has been traditionally placed in the hands of NS, rendering the "NNS's" culture and use of the language deficient and marginalized. In such a situation, "the standard always wins, the 'comparee' always loses" (Nelson, 1985, p. 249). Canagarajah (1999) notes how the fallacy

grants NSs default expertise as language teachers, researchers and users, thereby privileging NSs by birth, and not by professional training. By way of their status as NSs, these individuals are excused from,

> "understanding the local languages, cultures, and social conditions of the communities where they are teaching. They are not under any compulsion to develop their pedagogical practice in terms of the larger social, political, and cultural conditions of the communities where their students come from" (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 84).

In turn, according to Pennycook (1994) and Phillipson (1992), teacher education programs do not broach subjects related to sociology and culture, thus diminishing teacher training that prepares instructors for the field, let alone learners for the contexts in which they will use English.

Kachru (1992) states that the Native Speaker Fallacy has been extended to include individuals such as the developers of ELT materials, who in turn perpetuate notions of the necessary centrality (and superiority) of the NS. Nayar (1997) argues that publishing companies and other materials developers have exploited the NS construct, mass producing materials, for sale around the world, wherein the idealized NS is supreme, and whoever controls the flow of such materials controls the wealth of the field. Kachru (2005) concurs, noting the "tremendous cultural, economic and political advantages" the control of such affords a target country (p. 160).

Reconceptualizing SLA Theory

Scholars have made calls for and attempts toward providing new frameworks by which to approach communicative competence and meeting the contextualized needs of learners, as well as to address issues of social justice within English language-related research, policy, practice and professionalism.

A seminal article by Firth and Wagner (1997) takes issue with the way in which mainstream SLA theory has rendered English users and learners deficient, as juxtaposed against a NS. Firth and Wagner's (1997) challenge to the nature of SLA theory building, increased the fervor on the part of many scholars to pursue what Block (2003) calls the "social turn" in SLA. Literature related to sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978), and its application in conceptualizing, interaction, the nature, construction and location of meaning, and the learning process (e.g., Donato, 1994; Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Appel (1994); Swain, 2000, 2006; Swain & Deters, 2007) has gained significant momentum over the past twenty or so years. Zuengler and Miller (2006) point out that at the moment, sociocultural-informed research and theory and "mainstream cognitive" perspectives are located in "two parallel SLA worlds" (p. 35). Swain and Deters (2007) argue, however, that a "new mainstream SLA theory" (p. 820) is emerging.[14] Sociocultural theorists and researchers are doing work moving beyond the NS construct, according to Jenkins (2006b). Norton (2006) argues for transformation *within* the sociocultural perspective as well, promoting the inclusion of identity as a sociocultural construct. Norton (2006) points to five characteristics of such a sociocultural (and post-structuralism-informed) construct, found in SLA research:

1) A sociocultural conception of identity conceives of identity as dynamic and constantly changing across time and place.

2) Much research on identity conceives of identity as complex, contradictory, and multifaceted, and rejects any simplistic notions of identity.

3) Most researchers note that identity constructs and is constructed by language.

[14] Examining the ideological and theoretical struggle within SLA in depth, however, is beyond the scope of this literature review.

4) Most researchers note that identity construction must be understood with respect to larger social processes, marked by relations of power that can be either coercive or collaborative.

5) Much research seeks to link identity theory with classroom practice.

Post-colonialist, feminist and post-structuralist-informed work has actively challenged mainstream notions of who owns the English language and who might be considered a competent and valid speaker and instructor (e.g., Alptekin, 2002; Canagarajah, 1999; Canagarajah, 2007; Firth, 2009; Norton, 2010; Widdowson, 1994, 2004). Many have attempted at creating new vocabulary to describe users of English, in the interest of moving away from loaded terms such as "NS" and "NNS" (e.g., Melchers & Shaw, 2003; Modiano, 1999; Rajadurai, 2005; Rampton, 1990). Scholars have confronted the NS bias in SLA theory and research (e.g., Canagarajah, 2007; Firth, 2009; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Jenkins, 2006a; Leung, 2005; Norton, 2006), and have brought attention to the many nativized and nativizing varieties of English around the world –World English*es*- (e.g., Jenkins, 2005, 2006a; Kachru, 1985; Y. Kachru, 2005), as well as to who and what might be considered the linguistic and cultural targets for acquisition in each setting (e,g,, Alptekin, 2002; Canagarajah, 2006a, 2000b; Kramsch, 2006, 2008; Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008; Leung, 2005; Widdowson, 1998). Researchers and teachers are conceptualizing English use between people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds in a manner that seeks to move beyond the NS construct, as seen in the English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), English as an International Language (EIL) and Lingua Franca English (LFE) (e.g., Firth, 1990, 1996; House, 2003; McKay, 2005; Meierkord, 200; Seidlhofer, 2004) literature.[15] Some have challenged the NS as the standard by which to assess

[15] The body of literature related to World Englishes, ELF, EIL and LFE has grown large, and is becoming more widespread and widely read as scholars, teachers and students broach the issue of the NS construct. Tracing the growth of these lenses is beyond the scope of this literature review.

the linguistic and cultural knowledge of learners (e.g., Canagarajah, 2006c, 2007; Leung, 2005; Leung & Jo Lewkowicz, 2006; Lowenberg, 2002). Many have challenged the notion of a one-size-fits-all approach to teacher preparation (e.g., Braine, 2010) and the present connection between NS-oriented theory and research, and practice (e.g., Block, 2002; Canagarajah, 2006b, 2007; Jenkins, 2006b; Leung, 2005).

Canagarajah (2006c) is representative of the long-developing argument for a complete re-conceptualization of communicative competence. Canagarajah (2006c) prefaces the case for an alternate approach in the following manner:

> "The combined forces of technology, globalization, and World Englishes raise new questions for our profession. What does it mean to be competent in the English language? What do we mean by correctness? What is the best corpus of English or communicative genres for teaching purposes? What do we mean by language identity and speech community?" (p. 26).

In attempting to address these questions, Canagarajah (2006c) calls for the conceptualization of linguistic divergence, as "exploration of choices and possibilities" (p. 27) and for the encouragement of students to "represent their voices and identities" in their language learning and use" in the interest of contributing to a "we" perspective (Holliday, 2005) of English as a global language. He emphasizes that "norms" are in themselves, "relative, variable, and heterogeneous" (Canagarajah, 2006b, p. 26). Competence, according to Canagarajah (2007), is: "always in a state of becoming and, therefore, acquisition is emergent. There is no end point to learning, where one can say a person has mastered all the modalities and dimensions that shape communication in the diverse contact situations." (p. 933). Canagarajah (2007) also argues that, "The new context, featuring transnational affiliations, diaspora communities, digital communication, fluid social boundaries, and the blurring of time–space distinctions has… created an urgency to understand acquisition outside

homogeneous communities" (p. 937). An SLA keenly aware of the processes of globalization and the transcending of linguistic and cultural borders is therefore urgently required (Canagarajah, 2007).

As competence is re-conceptualized, so might be instruction (Alptekin, 2002; Canagarajah, 2006a, 2000b; Kramsch, 2006, 2008; Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008; Leung, 2005). Language research and instruction would necessarily broach "meaning, relations, creativity, subjectivity, historicity and the trans- as in translingual and transcultural competence" (Kramsch, 2008, p. 405). Kramsch (2008) recommends one would as a necessary result "conceive of what we do in ways that are more appropriate to the demands of a global, decentered, multilingual and multicultural world, more suited to our uncertain and unpredictable times" (pp. 405-406).[16] Teaching would necessarily be contextualized (Alptekin, 2002; Leung, 2005; McKay, 2003), with "curricula and pedagogies that have local relevance" (Canagarajah, 2006a). Pedagogy would treat English as an international language; one of "global appropriacy and local appropriation" (Alptekin, 2002, p. 63). Learners would ideally be "both global and local speakers of English" who would "feel at home in both international and national cultures" (Kramsch & Sullivan, 1996, p. 211, as cited in Alptekin, 2002, p. 63). This would include exposing members of the Inner Circle to World Englishes in their respective educations as well (e.g., B. Kachru, 1997b in Kachru, 2005; Y. Kachru, 2005). All would be done in the interest of moving beyond the NS-as-target, and toward a re-conceptualization of the nature and role of English around the globe, in its plethora of contexts.

Acknowledging issues of power, identity and ownership (Block, 2003; Norton, 1997, 2000; Widdowson, 1994, 2004) in the conceptualizing of who owns

English, what linguistic and cultural competence look like, what research might look like (e.g., Jenkins, 2006b, Kumaravadivelu, 2006), who might contribute to research (e.g., Canagarajah, 2006b; Holliday, 2005; Widdowson, 2004), and who is employable as a teacher (Canagarajah, 1999), is the first step from theory into advocacy for the NNES and NNEST. Canagarajah (2006c) stresses that all flavors of English speakers, as researchers and practitioners, must be involved in the orienting of English language research and teaching:

> "Orthodoxy can't be defined one-sidedly by experts from centers of scholarship and research, divorced from pedagogical ground conditions, but must be decided in negotiation with practitioner knowledge in actual settings. We need to learn from diverse traditions of professionalization in different communities to develop a richer TESOL discourse" (p. 27).

Addressing the NS/NNS dichotomy in such a manner will be one step toward addressing "the plethora of linguistically colonialist attitudinal sins of the past" (Nelson, 1985, p. 250).

The NS Construct and NNESTs

Drawing upon sociocultural, postcolonial, and post-structuralist-informed theory seeking to move beyond the NS construct (e.g., Crystal, 2003; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Hymes, 1972, 1977; Jenkins, 2005, 2006b; B.B. Kachru, 1985, 1992; Medgyes, 1983, 1992, 1994; Nelson, 1985; Norton, 1995, 1997, 2009; Pennycook, 1994, 1998, 1999; Phillipson, 1992; Rampton, 1987; Seidlhofer, 2004; Widdowson, 1994, 1999, 2004), researchers have worked to highlight the critical nature of the debate over language ownership and communicative competence as it pertains to NNESTs (e.g. Braine, 1999, 2010; Canagarajah, 1999; 2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2007; Firth, 2009; Leung, 2005). Books broaching the subject of both the theoretical and practical marginalization of NNESTs have appeared in the last decade or so (e.g., Braine, 1999,

2010; Llurda, 2005; Mahboob, 2010; Medgyes, 1994). Researchers, particularly NNSs, are calling attention to the NS/NNS binary both in the field and in the classroom (e.g., Braine, 1999, 2010; Canagarajah, 1999; Matsuda, 2003a). This includes the way in which NNESTs construct their identities in light of and in response to the NS construct (e.g., Park, 2008, 2012). Professionally, the organization Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), the largest English teaching body in the world, now contains an NNEST Special Interest Group. TESOL has issued two position papers related to the NS/NNS binary, including one brief statement on discrimination in employment (2001) and one regarding the equitable treatment of NNSs (2006). There are NNEST caucuses in California and the Washington, D.C. area.

Yet fundamentally around the world, according to the critically-oriented literature, for countless Native and Non-Native speakers alike, in linguistics, applied linguistics and ELT literature, in educational institutions, publishing and other companies, and in government settings, the NS construct still remains dominant (e.g., Braine, 2010; Firth, 2009; Mahboob, 2010). Firth (2009) highlights the dilemma facing NNSs and NNESTs resulting from the construct:

> "What then of the ''non-native speaker'' and ''interlanguage'' epithets? These categorizations are closely allied to SLA research which, as vented in a series of co-authored publications (Firth and Wagner 1997, 1998; Wagner and Firth 1997), is weighed down by native-speakercentric, monolingual, modernist and structuralist biases, exemplified perhaps most clearly in the view that NNSs are perforce deficient communicators who are perpetually, agonizingly, chronically struggling, like Sisyphus and his stone, to ascend the steep incline of their ''interlanguage'', the goal being the promised land of ''target competence'', that hallowed place reserved for the fabled and idealized native speakers (Firth and Wagner 1997; Cook 1999)" (p. 151).

According to critical approaches to ELT found within the literature, NNESTs face particular challenges as a result of the NS construct. They may self depreciate their linguistic proficiency in concert with being rendered deficient via the influence of the NS construct (Braine, 2010). Their viability and validity as instructors and full members of the English language teaching and research community may be challenged either by themselves or by NSs (Canagarajah, 1999). As confidence becomes an issue, NNESTs often rely heavily on textbooks, though such textbooks may reinforce a feeling of deficiency, as NNESTS may lack the linguistic and sociocultural knowledge prioritized within (e.g., Braine, 2010). In addition, many NNESTs travel to Core countries to study and gain some semblance of authority (Braine, 2010). Even with such training, NNESTs face difficulties in finding employment, as their professional standing as researchers and teachers is denigrated by nature of their identities and origins (Canagarajah, 1999). NNES-ing teachers may, like many of their NS counterparts, come to serve as "gatekeepers" (Widdowson, 1994) of the English language, mediating between the world of the Native Speaker and that of their students. In such a case, ownership of English rests with the idealized NS (Widdowson, 1994) and the NNEST may only serve as a deficient shadow of such an individual (Leung, 2005; Nelson, 1985). Therefore, according to the literature, while NNESTs advocate (at times in concert with NSs) for a move beyond the NS construct, they are simultaneously rendered deficient by its discourses.

The NS Construct, Constructed in the Literature

The NS construct, as conceptualized critically in the literature, is a framework that privileges an idealized NS as the owner of English and therefore the cultural and

linguistic yardstick by which language learners, instructors and users might be measured. This idealized NS is most often conceptualized as Caucasian and Male. The NS construct, as embedded in every aspect of ELT from theory to practice empowers a select group of individuals, while rendering NNSs deficient. Though attempts at challenging the construct for both critical and practical reasons are under way, the construct remains dominant in English language-related theory, research, policy, curriculum development, materials creation, assessment and practice.

There have been, in recent scholarship, challenges to the way in which the NS construct has been critically conceptualized, however. Scholars including Menard-Warwick (2008) and Motha, Jain and Tecle (2012), have posited that critical conceptualizations of the NS construct in the literature, while meaningfully attempting to reconceptualize language ownership, learning, instruction and use, have oversimplified the NS/NNS and NEST/NNEST binaries, neglecting identity. As such, these scholars argue for an emphasis on the contextualized, ongoing negotiation of translinguistic and transcultural identity on the part of English learners, teachers and users. This is an approach I will explore and ultimately connect with in Chapters Three and Six.

Chapter 3: English and Japan

In the following chapter, I provide a brief account of the entry of English into Japanese society. I situate this account in the context of a Japan negotiating its identity -internally and internationally- and place on the global stage. In concert with this historical contextualization, I will describe some of the sociohistorically-situated discourses that have given shape to English language education and use in Japan since the Meiji period (1868-1912). In addition, I touch upon alternate constructions of Japan and Japaneseness both within Japanese society and ELT. I conclude by examining how dialogue concerning language, culture and identity is far from complete, as Japanese society continues to wrestle with globalization and by proxy, with conceptualizing the nature and role of English in Japan.

Framing the Nature and Role of English in Japan

According to Iino (2002), English likely reached Japan first in 1600 with the arrival of an English speaker in the south of the country. English as a subject of study, however, did not occur for another two hundred years with the beginning of contact with the British in 1808. It was the signing of a treaty related to 'Amity' and 'Commerce' with Commodore Perry of the United States in 1858 that set Japan on the pursuit of English (Kitao & Kitao, 1995). Japan then opened its doors to the West in 1867, ushering in the Meiji period (1868-1912). Following the opening of Japan to the West, social, political, economic and educational discourses within the country intensified around the subject of the nature of Japanese identity and culture and Japan's relationship with the world beyond its shores. Japan was, "suddenly and involuntarily faced with a need to define its place in the modern world" (Heinrich, 2012, p. 3). Such discourses fuelled Japan's drive toward modernization and the rise of nationalism.

One discourse that emerged was that of "Datsu-A-Ron." In early 1885, an editorial appeared in the Japanese newspaper *Jiji Shinpo* ("Current Events"), detailing the steps Japan would need to make in order to confront Westernization. The author, later identified as Yukichi Fukuzawa (Fukuzawa, 1885 cited in Banno, 1981), was an influential author, educator and political theorist who had witnessed first-hand Japan's grappling with its new place international realm. *Datsu-A Ron*, Fukuzawa's editorial, noted that in the interest of modernization and standing on equal footing with Western nations, Japan needed to leave Asia politically, socially and philosophically, focusing its attention instead on what Western civilization was offering. Fukuzawa believed that there was no time to wait for an Asia-wide enlightenment, through which Asia might modernize and develop, though he had previously been a supporter of a pan-Asian resistance to the West (Ge, 2007). This opinion was due in large part to the failure of reform in Korea, which Fukuzawa had supported (Banno, 1981). Fukuzawa's notion of 'leaving Asia,' created in a time of great social and political tension, related to what he believed involved the potential death of Japanese civilization (Ge, 2007). Other scholars were thinking along similar lines as well. Arinori Mori, an ambassador to the United States and Japan's first Minister of Education, proposed in 1872 that Japan adopt English as its official language, replacing Japanese (Heinrich, 2012), with the ultimate goal of securing Japan's viability into the future.

Debates regarding Japanese identity and Japan's relation to the world beyond its shores were greatly influenced by neo-Confucianist[17] thought firmly entrenched in Japanese society (e.g., Hawkins, 1998; Khan, 1997; Varley, 2000). Neo-

[17] The Confucianism that first entered Japan in the late Kamakura period (1185-1333) (Craig, 1998) is termed "neo-Confucianism," as it was a reformed Chinese approach to Confucius' original ideas (e.g., Hawkins, 1998; Khan, 1997; Varley, 2000).

Confucianism sought perfect moral and social order in the world, in humanistic fashion. This was achieved through the taming of one's 'ki': "a force governed by the passions and other emotions that produce evil" (Varley, 2000, p. 171), which in turn allowed for an individual's 'ri' -his or her inherently good principles or nature- to emerge (Varley, 2000). Neo-Confucianism experienced its most robust growth as an influential philosophy during the Edo period under the Tokugawa shogunate (Sawada, 1993), guiding moral and other forms of education. Its discourses focused primarily on "the conduct and affairs of people in the here and now" (Varley, 2000, p. 172). In the interest of maintaining social order and as a result conformity, neo-Confucianism focused on the five primary relationships of father-son, ruler-subject, husband-wife, older (brother)- younger (brother), and friends (Varley, 2000).

In the Meiji period, faced with the opening of Japan to the West, the Japanese government re-emphasized Confucianist thought in Japanese education via the Imperial Rescript on Education (1890). The Rescript reinforced the importance of morality and the relationships in which social order might be attained, and emphasized a commitment to the Emperor and the Nation (Khan, 1997). Neo-Confucianism therefore played a role in Japan's drive toward nationalism in and beyond the Meiji period (Hawkins, 1998).

During the Meiji period, Law (1995) notes that English, taught primarily by native speakers, served as a conduit for the transmission of Western knowledge and philosophy into Japan. English was the property of Caucasian Westerners and was as foreign as the individuals who spoke it. In the interest of fuelling Japan's drive toward modernization (Iino, 2002), of establishing a firm position vis-à-vis the West, and of preserving "Japanese civilization," English was a critical subject to study. By the early 1900's, however, in concert with Japan's military victories over China and

Russia, nationalism became an increasingly dominant discourse. As a result, Japanese teachers and scholars replaced internationals and educational materials from abroad. Japanese became the primary medium of instruction in tertiary education (Iino, 2002).

In the Taisho and early Showa periods, English was a subject to study, much like history. Students learned English for the express purpose of comprehending imported written material, and not for the purpose of interaction. During this period, English became an integral part of educational assessment in Japan, serving as an element of examinations controlling entrance into prestigious academic institutions (Kitao & Kitao, 1995). Learning and instruction focused on passing such entrance examinations (Iino, 2002). Eventually, immediately before the Second World War, both the government and individuals within Japanese society voiced displeasure with the study of English, as it was an enemy language (Iino, 2002). Whether in its newfound role as a gatekeeper within Japanese society as a vehicle for the import of linguistic and cultural knowledge from the West, or as an enemy language, English was clearly property of the "Other." That "Other" was White and Western.

Following World War II, the neo-Confucianism underpinning education in Japan fell under scrutiny, as it had promoted nationalist sentiment (Hawkins, 1998). Indeed, the National Rescript on Education was repealed at this time. Yet neo-Confucianism continued to maintain a powerful influence on the Japanese education system; an influence that continues to present (Hawkins, 1998; Wray, 2008). Neo-Confucianism in Japanese education seeks to limit individualism (Nemoto, 1999) in the interest of uniformity and consistency both on the part of students and teachers (Hawkins, 1998). This is grounded in an Edo-era emphasis on the value and pre-eminence of the 'expository lecture,' first established in neo-Confucian education in

Japan by Ansai Yamazaki (Sawada, 1993). As such, after the War, classes were (and at present are often) taught in the Grammar-Translation method, conducted largely in Japanese, working grammar and lexis from English to Japanese and the reverse (Gorsuch, 2000). In such a classroom, the teacher is the authority, imparting knowledge to students whose role is receptive in nature (Nguyen et al., 2006).

Globalization, Identity and English

During the years immediately following the War, Japan again found itself attempting to define its identity in relation to the ever-globalizing world in which it was situated. Japan focused its energy away from military affairs and set about a course of economic growth popularly referred to as the "Economic Miracle," which lasted from around 1955 until the late 1970's (Fujimoto-Adamson, 2006). During this period, business leaders called for the prioritization of English in the name of better communication in international business (Imura, 2003). Teachers from the U.S. entered Japan, and the government focused on English language education. Standardized testing, such as the STEP (Society for Testing English Proficiency) Test and later the TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) test became commonplace in Japanese society (Fujimoto-Adamson, 2006). TOEIC scores became a common measure of the English proficiency of company recruits and employees. In addition, English became an integral component of high school and university entrance examinations (Kitao & Kitao, 1995).

Building upon social discourses in Japan that had sought to establish its position in the international realm vis-à-vis the West, new dominant discourses emerged related to Japan and globalization. Globalization, as in the Meiji period, related to Japan and its relationship with Western nations. Appearing immediately after World War II and building momentum in the 1960's, *nihonjinron* (Befu, 1993, 2001;

Sugimoto, 1999) sought to portray the "sociological, psychological and linguistic uniqueness" of the Japanese (Kubota, 1998, p. 300). According to Sugimoto (1999), nihonjinron "tends to use three concepts- nationality, ethnicity and culture- almost interchangeably" (p. 82). "Japanese culture" is the sole property of those deemed "ethnically Japanese," which excludes not only "foreigners" but minority groups within Japan, such as the Ainu and Okinawans, who are not "ethnically Japanese" (Sugimoto, 1999). Noted politicians in the 21st Century continue to describe Japan in such a manner. In 2005, for instance, Taro Aso, then foreign minister and now a former Prime Minister, described Japan as "one nation, one language, one culture and one race" (Daily Yomiuri, 2005), unlike any other nation on earth. In addition, in 2008, Tourism Minister Nariaki Nakayama argued that Japan is an ethnically homogenous country that dislikes foreigners (Fukada, 2008).[18]

Grounded in the discourses of nihonjinron, another discourse -*kokusaika*, or "internationalization" (Kubota, 1998; Oliver, 2009)- emerged during the 1980's in Japan as a result of the nation dealing with its status as a new world economic power. According to Kubota (1998):

> "Japan as a world economic power experienced a need to communicate better with its international partners in order to ensure its economic prosperity while maintaining its own identity. A strategy that Japan employed in order to fulfill this need was neither to subjugate the nation to the West nor to seek a counter-hegemony against the West; it was to accommodate the hegemony of the West by becoming one of the equal members of the West and to convince the West and other nations of its position based on a distinct cultural heritage" (p. 300).

Kokusaika involved the perpetuation of nihonjinron as a projected identity to the West, with the purpose of carving out a unique place at the "global" table.

[18] The belief in and perpetuation of nihonjinron transcends social status and political affiliation in Japan. It is propogated both within and beyond Japan by Japanese and non-Japanese alike (Sugimoto, 1999).

In 1985, again due to concerns regarding the ability of Japanese students to use English communicatively, MEXT (called the Ministry of Education or MOE until shortly after the turn of the century, when it combined with the Ministry of Science and Technology) began to promote communicative competence and with such, interest in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) increased. The MOE established the Japan Exchange and Teaching Program (JET) in 1985 (Riley, 2008), wherein native speakers of English are brought to Japan to work as Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs). Such was done with the goal in mind of fomenting and nurturing the communicative ability and international understanding of students (Koike & Tanaka, 1995, paraphrased in Riley, 2008). According to current statistics on the JET Programme Website (2009), 98% of participants in the Jet Programme (the overwhelming majority of these being Assistant Language Teachers, or ALTs) are from Western, English-speaking countries (other language groups are represented within the statistics as well). Of these individuals, nearly 63% are American. In addition, fuelled by kokusaika, English language conversation schools or "eikaiwa" spread rapidly across Japan (Mizuta, 2009). In *eikaiwa,* or "English conversation schools" and their affiliates, NSs –typically Western (Kitao & Kitao, 1995; Kubota, 2011) and often white males (Kubota, 2011)- dominate. NSs were and continue to be the selling point of such institutions (Kubota, 2011).

Once again, in 2000, debate regarding English language education emerged as a result of pressure from the business community who felt Japanese learners of English were yet ill-prepared to successfully engage in interaction (Yoshida, 2003). Such pressure, "culminated in the report of the *Japan's Goals in the 21st Century* Committee (2000), in which a proposal was made to make English the second official language in Japan" (Yoshida, 2003, p. 291), though this proposal was rejected.

During this period, scholars and officials discussed the study of English for purposes of taking entrance examinations vs. English for communicative ability (Butler & Iino, 2005), and an increase in English study in schools. There was much skepticism related to the potential harm an expanded role for English study would potentially perpetrate upon Japanese culture and the preservation of the status of the Japanese language (Tsui & Tollefson, 2007). In 2002, MEXT explicitly expressed its dissatisfaction with the state of English education, claiming that such instruction has not produced desired outcomes (MEXT, 2002). As such, the majority of the Japanese population studying English was unprepared for interaction with diverse populations using the language. In devising the plan, MEXT invited the input of experts related to English education, and held round-table committees which discussed the opinions of further visiting experts. These committees, "formed the basis for the attached strategic plan to cultivate "Japanese with English abilities" (MEXT, 2002).

In its 'plan of strategy,' MEXT (2002) revealed its intention to emphasize communicative ability in English, in order to adequately prepare the Japanese people for life in a "globalized" community.[6] In order to do so, MEXT recommended steps including increasing the number of ALTs working in schools, and increasing required Test Of English for International Communication (TOEIC) scores for Japanese teachers.[19] The TOEIC test is widely used around the world to assess the English proficiency of its test takers, and Japan is no exception (ETS, 2009), with particular relation to Japanese companies. In addition, the plan called for instruction to be carried out largely in English, and for English education at the elementary level to commence. Butler & Iino (2005) further point out that in the Action Plan proposed by

[19] The plan has been criticized, within the NS construct paradigm, for issues including its emphasis on TOEIC scores, which likely do not reflect an individual's communicative proficiency (Yoshida, 2003) and for the fact that teachers and students alike may opt to focus on English for entrance examinations and tests such as the TOEIC, over communicative competence (Murphey, 2004).

MEXT, the Japanese language is explicitly established as the foundation for intellectual activities, in the presumed interest of allaying fears of a loss of Japanese language and culture.

English Language Education at Present

As with a conceptualized globalization focusing on Japan's relationship with the West, multilingualism in Japan equates with 'English-Japanese Bilingualism' (Kubota, 2002, p. 12). Foreign language study in Japan is compulsory, from the 7th to 12th grades. English is the primary language offered around the country (Iino, 2002), however, as English is a major component on high school and university entrance examinations (Kitao & Kitao, 1995, paraphrased in Iino, 2002). Junior high and high school English education is meant to provide students with a grasp of written and spoken English, as well as exposure to the socio-cultural knowledge underpinning the language (Kitao & Kitao, 1995). According to Parmenter and Tomita (2001), guidelines for the contents of textbooks at the junior high and high school level are strictly outlined by MEXT, as is final textbook choices. Within these textbooks, the linguistic and cultural knowledge overwhelmingly corresponds to the West (Yamanaka, 2006). The goal of instruction at the junior high and high school level almost exclusively relates to students succeeding in passing the entrance exams. Many students, as a result, study in cram schools to supplement their secondary studies (Pettersen, 1993).

In 2002, English became an increasingly common subject of study at the elementary school level in the 5th and 6th grades, finally becoming compulsory once-a-week subject at the elementary level (Fennelly & Luxton, 2011). According to Butler (2007), discussion of English at the elementary level, "began largely as a response to pressure from business and political sectors; they had repeatedly called

for changes to Japan's English education in order to be competitive in both business and politics globally" (Butler, 2007, p. 10). The responsibility for teaching English falls to the homeroom teacher, according to MEXT, though he/she may be supported by an ALT or member of the surrounding community. This has caused many elementary school teachers to complain of a lack of training and English skills to fulfill their language teaching duties (Fennelly & Luxton, 2011).

In public elementary, junior high and high schools, Japanese teachers comprise the majority of instructors, while Native Speakers largely participate as ALTs (Riley, 2008). Some companies act as intermediaries between schools and NSs, hiring "dispatch" teachers to teach in one or more locations during the week (Takahara, 2008). A small number of NSs work full-time at private schools, both Japanese and international in nature. Non-Japanese NNESTs are highly uncommon.

At the university level, departments choose the curricula in which their students will participate (there is no MEXT oversight). Students are often required by their departments to complete one to two years of language study. This may or may not include the study of another language as well; all depends upon the university and department in question (Kitao & Kitao, 1995). The primary concern of students at the university level is their achieving a "high TOEIC score" in order to secure the type of employment they desire.[20] Studying for the TOEIC is a pursuit many employees embark on after graduation, whether in company classes or in private language schools (Kitao & Kitao, 1995).

In terms of full-time university professors teaching English, NSs are most often on limited-term contracts, with their Japanese colleagues more often than not on

[20] Students may also take the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), a standardized test typcially used by North American educational institutions for assessing international student applicants.

tenure (Aldwinckle, 1999). According to Hall (1997), there were more foreign professors tenured at George Washington University in Washington, D.C., than at the dozens of national public universities in Japan combined.[21] Thus, the majority of faculty members are Japanese. In addition, universities rely heavily on the services of part-time NESTs and Japanese NNESTs (Aldwinckle, 1999). As with primary and secondary education, non-Japanese NNESTs are uncommon.

"Business" and English in Japan

The business community continues to promote the necessity of English in sustaining Japan's ability to compete in the global business world, as it since the end of World War II. Grounded in the belief that without a large percentage of English speakers Japan is, "at risk of losing its competitive edge in the international business and political world" (Mori, 2011, p. 68),[22] Japan-based, international companies such as Kyocera and Rakuten[23] have prioritized the English proficiency of their employees.

In 2010, Rakuten president Hiroshi Mikitani, a Harvard Business School graduate with significant overseas experience, officially announced English as the new primary working language of the company (Neeley, 2011). Mikitani called his decision and philosophy "Englishnization," which he explains in a book he has published on the subject (Mikitani, 2012). Mikitani's expressed desire is not only to

[21] The commonplace nature of limited-term contracts for foreign teachers has been a subject of discussion amongst such individuals for many years (e.g., Aldwinckle, 1999; Hall, 1994, 1997; McCrostie & Spiri, 2008), something which Hall (1994) has labelled 'academic apartheid.' This is a very complex matter that is beyond the scope of this literature review, though it is directly related to the social discourses juxtaposing Japan against the West. In an Asahi Newspaper article, Shinichiro Noriguchi, a University of Kitakyushu English professor described the logic of separate academic tracks for native speaker teachers, arguing, "native speakers who have lived in Japan for more than ten years tend to have adapted to the system and have become ineffective as teachers" (Noriguchi, 2006).

[22] The discourse of "*Nihon Chinbotsu*" or "Sinking Japan" is a do-or-die discourse that, like nihonjiron, prevails in Japanese society. This discourse, which takes its name from a 1973 sci-fi movie, argues that, "Japan would sink, doomed unless it changed fundamentally" (Curtis, 1999, p. 42) as a result of the forces of globalization.

[23] Kyocera is a company specializing in electronic parts and products, while Rakuten is a global market site where a customer can search for and purchase almost any kind of item.

increase his company's ability to grow and compete; he desires to change Japanese society as a whole, believing that Rakuten "can be the role model for a new Japan" (Neeley, 2011, p. 4). In addition to believing that English is the future for business, Mikitani also argues that English is a way to alter what he terms "the conservative customs and systems of Japan" (Neeley, 2011, p. 4). He asserts that Englishnization is a manner to do so as, "the Japanese language is a barrier to information that comes from outside Japan and to a more objective view of the world" (Neeley, 2011, p. 4). Though initially received with shock, Mikitani's announcement has led for a push amongst employees to improve their English, both on their own and in language schools. The company uses the TOEIC test to assess reading/writing proficiency, and monitors the spoken proficiency of its employees via observations (Neeley, 2011). Overall, the Japanese media has celebrated Rakuten's flexibility in the global market, allowing the company to hire talented individuals from around the world and enter markets where other Japanese companies might struggle to do so (Neeley, 2011).

Another push toward "globalization" occurred in 2009, when the Japanese government, with encouragement from the business community, undertook the "Project for Establishing Core Universities for Internationalization" (Mori, 2011). The fundamental purpose underpinning the project was to establish English-medium university courses to attract international students and faculty to Japan, to play a role in the internationalization of Japanese society (Mori, 2011). English was chosen as the medium instruction due to its perceived status as the global language; the language of business and of research (Mori, 2011). The Japanese government initiated the program as a result of worries regarding Japan's declining birthrate and its ability to attract international talent, both of which affect Japan's ability to complete on the global stage (Mori, 2011). The government voted in late 2010,

however, to “abolish” and “restructure” the program, due to budget cuts and issues with finding potential participating universities (McNeill, 2010).

The Japanese government and the business community are also, at the moment, discussing decentralization. This decentralization would reform the system of 47 prefectures within the country established in the Meiji period (Niikawa, 2006), replacing it with a regional government system (“doshusei”) comprised of seven regional blocs (Yokomichi, 2008). Proponents of decentralization argue that such a move would strengthen local autonomy, render the administrative system more efficient, and would make each region more globally competitive (Yokomichi, 2008). According to Furukawa (2002), “democratization, globalization, and public-sector reform have contributed most to decentralization” (p. 23), as the relationship between the local and the global becomes increasingly intertwined.

The discourses regarding Japan’s relationship with and role in a globalizing world are also connected to another issue that has lingered in Japan since the end of World War II: territorial disputes with Russia, China, South (and North) Korea and Taiwan. These disputes are constructed by a complex web of issues related to national sovereignty, Japan’s colonial past, and specifically that of national resources including fishing and natural gas and petroleum deposits (Sylvester, 2007). In the last decade nationalist sentiment within Japan has increased, fuelled in part by right wing groups and politicians, are challenging the Japanese government to defend Japanese sovereignty (Matthews, 2003; Bouthier, 2012; Fackler, 2012, MacKinnon, 2012). Tokyo Governor Shintaro Ishihara and Osaka Mayor Toru Hashimoto, two such influential politicians, are also integral participants in promoting decentralization in Japan (Ishihara, 2004; MacKinnon, 2012; Pulvers, 2012; Wagner, 2012).

The dominant sociohistorical discourses in Japan guiding sociocultural, political

and educational approaches to identity have constructed an essentialized Japan, which has then been juxtaposed against the West. The borders around conceptualizations of what constitutes "Japan," "being Japanese" and what is "other" have permeated Japanese society, essentializing who and what might be considered Japanese. The discourses both embedded within and shaping English language education are no different. In concert with the discourses of "us and them," English language learning and instruction have prioritized the linguistic and cultural knowledge of an idealized, white, Western native speaker (Kubota, 1998; Oda, 1999), while reinforcing the gap between Japan and the world beyond, linguistically and culturally and eliminating space for individuals who do not fit the native speaker model and who are not Japanese (Rudolph & Igarashi, 2012).

Reconceptualizing Language, Culture and Identity

Indeed, essentialized constructions of language, culture and identity related to Japan and the world beyond, permeate business, politics and society in general. Yet such constructions have not gone unchallenged. These challenges shed critical light on Japanese society, being Japanese, and as a consequence, on the nature and role of English in Japan.

Perhaps the most powerful challenge to constructions of Japanese culture and identity, are embodied in the people who do not fit nihonjinron-inspired conceptions of who is Japanese. Sugimoto (1999) argues that, "Globalization has brought into view many kinds of Japanese of whom Nihonjinron lost sight and who pose a fundamental challenge to its core assumptions" (Sugimoto, 1999, p. 88).[24] This includes the indigenous Ainu minority, the people of the Ryukyus who are ethnically

[24] As Arudou (2007) notes, the members of the "foreign" community in Japan, becoming increasingly visible, have been scapegoats at times for the ills plaguing Japnese society, including issues related to crime, employment and education.

and linguistically distinct from "the Japanese," Koreans and Chinese who were forcibly brought or emigrated to Japan before and during World War II, and the Burakkumin or "defiled" who have, since the Edo period, been relegated to the fringes of Japanese society marked by their occupations, lineage and where they are from (Willis & Murphy-Shigematsu, 2008).

At present, marriages between Japanese and non-Japanese now comprise one out of twenty (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2010). These families are adding to the diverse fabric of what Japan is and what it is becoming. There are also over two million immigrants living in Japan, for the short and long term. Over 250,000 Brazilians and 50,000 Peruvians, with at least one family member on a Japanese ancestry visa, are currently living in the country. Over 500,000 Chinese and 300,000 Filipinos reside in Japan as well (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2010). In concert with other internationals and other members of Japanese society, these individuals are redefining the nature of Japan and Japaneseness.[25]

As a result of the global flows of people, finances, technology, ideas and information (Appadurai, 2000), hybridization is occurring in Japan leading to "trans-local, Creole and creolized cultures" (Willis & Murphy-Shigematsu, 2008, p. 31).[26] In their book "Transcultural Japan: At the Borderlands of Race, Gender and Identity," Willis and Murphy-Shigematsu (2008) describe Japan in the following manner:

[25] In line with discourses shaping Japan's relationship with the "outside world," here are a couple interesting facts according to (Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, 2010): There are 570,000 Japanese in Western countries, while around 123,000 Westerners live in Japan. There are 1,371,000 Asians living in Japan, but only 193,000 Japanese living in Asia. 93% of Japanese permanent residents overseas live in North America.

[26] Another recent development has altered life in Japan greatly: the triple disasters (earthquake, tsunami, radiation) of March 11, 2011 in north-central Japan. On or around that date, over 100,000 "radiation refugees" (Meyer, 2011) scattered across Japan, losing their sense of location, community and "culture." Since the events, the nature of "Japan" and "Japaneseness" has been a continued topic of discussion in the media.

> "The dividing lines between Japanese and Others, including conceptions of what is 'pure' and 'impure,' are no longer so clear as they were once assumed to be. These new and complex contexts reveal a transcultural world that is overlooked when we are preoccupied with conceptual dichotomies and dialectical oppositions. What we are seeing instead is a transcultural, transnational society with fluid boundaries, constant change, and often innovative cultural formations" (p. 5).

What is Japan? What is being Japanese? These are few of the questions that emerge in the deconstruction of the social discourses that have essentialized identity, language and culture in Japanese society.

Approaches to ELT seeking to move beyond the NS construct, are approaches that are concomitantly challenging essentializing discourses within Japanese society in general. Scholars have first and foremost questioned the necessity for such an intense focus on English study for the general population, as for the majority of these people English plays little or no role in their lives (e.g., Oda, 2007; Yano, 2011). Oda (2007) asserts that the "world" Japanese English learners are being prepared for is a myth; a myth that perpetuates the power of the NS construct. Other scholars including Kubota (1998, 2002, 2011) have connected the perpetuation of the NS construct in ELT to larger societal discourses related to Japan's juxtaposition vis-à-vis the "world" (the West).

Recently, scholars have been critically examining language ownership (e.g., Matsuda, 2003a; Simon-Maeda, 2011), and language and identity (e.g., Kubota, 1998, 2002, 2011; Murahata & Murahata, 2008; Rudolph & Igarashi, 2012; Simon-Maeda, 2004, 2011; Willis & Murphy-Shigematsu, 2008), assessment grounded in a NS-centric approach (e.g., Matsuda, 2003b), curriculum and materials privileging the language and culture of an idealized NS and ignoring the Outer and Expanding

Circles (e.g., Matsuda, 2003b, Yamanaka, 2006),[27] and the NS-centric nature of some professional ELT organizations (Oda, 1999) in Japan. Scholars are also examining the effect of globalization on language policy in Japan, both in terms of Japanese and English (e.g., Heinrich, 2012; Seargeant, 2011). Such work is creating space for border crossing; for reimagining who Japanese learners, users and teachers of English might be or become. Yet within the larger social and academic discourses of ELT in Japan, such discussions and issues are far from mainstream and potentially threatening to those who might attempt to do so (Rudolph & Igarashi, 2012). Murahata (2008) notes that the overwhelming majority of dialogue related to the NS/NNS binary takes place in the West and not in contexts such as Japan.

At Present, Into the Future

The debate over language, culture and identity in Japan is far from complete. As Willis and Murphy-Shigematsu (2008) argue, "Japan is moving in two seemingly contradictory directions at the same time, one of increasing isolation… and the other of opening more doors, symbolic and real" (p. 31). In this context, via discourses within Japanese society and those embedded within a globalized ELT, the nature and role of English continues to be negotiated.

[27] Kachru (1985) proposed a three-concentric circle model attempting to explain the historical spread of English around the world and the development of new Englishes. Kachru (1985) describes an "Inner Circle" as consisting of native-speaking Western nations, the "Outer Circle" as consisting of the former colonies of English-speaking nations, and the "Expanding Circle" as including countries which had not experienced colonialization on the part of an English-speaking nation.

Chapter 4: Methodology

Introduction

In the following chapter, I begin by revealing my subjectivities in undertaking this study. I then introduce the methodological approach I employ in the interest of approaching my research questions. In doing so, I address questions related to participant selection, data collection, data analysis and "validity," as well as ethical considerations related to the data collected and analyzed during the course of the study.

Approaching and Revealing My Subjectivities

In the interest of providing insight into why I am choosing to study the lived experiences of Japanese ELT professionals as the university level, and in light of my ontological and postmodern epistemological commitments to examining and revealing my subjectivies and positionality in relation to my participants and my work (Hesse-Biber, 2006; Lather, 1993; Sultana, 2007), I must necessarily share my personal and professional background.

I am a Caucasian male in my mid-30's from a small town near Seattle, Washington. I grew up in a middle-class, Christian family. From a young age I had always been enthralled with "culture" and diversity. I was a very restless soul, and never content with whom I felt I was supposed to be. Into my early high school years I constantly sought out friends different than me in form and experience. I was rejecting regimes of truth guiding social norms, mainstream philosophies and religious beliefs, as well as notions of static political and identities. My response was to begin to negotiate a fictionalized, hybridized identity for myself. Not ever having travelled outside of the Pacific Northwest, and keenly aware of my physical features

and upbringing, I chose to view myself as a transcultural being in motion, while lying to others to perpetuate a myth built upon how I felt inside.

After studying Japanese, culture, history and politics in a small state school, I embarked on a study abroad experience in Guadalajara, Mexico. My life would never be the same. In Mexico, my roommates, classmates and friends confronted me with a startlingly different version of America, socially, economically and militarily. It was at this point that I began to feel that the angst I had felt in terms of wrestling with my identity, had much to do with the regimes of truth that I had experienced, in terms of ethnic, social, religious and political affiliations. I had been resisting the border police (Fine, 1994) perpetuating such regimes, though in a very shallow and uneducated fashion.

My return from Mexico marked the birth of an ontological and epistemological shift in my life. After working for a year in the U.S. Census Bureau's minority partnerships division in Seattle, I returned to my alma mater to do an M.A. in Latin American history. During this time, I married my girlfriend. After graduation, we moved to Japan to teach English. Living in Japan for an extended period of time, and interacting with expats from all over the English-speaking world, furthered my ontological and epistemological transformation. I transitioned from describing myself as a Republican, to imagining myself in the ranks of the left of the Left. I returned to Christianity, but in a way completely detached from what I considered the White, conservative, cultural Christianity I had known as a child. I became extremely passionate about world affairs, social justice and postmodern approaches to history and the construction of knowledge. I traveled to many different parts of the world with my wife, exploring Asia and Europe. I also became hypersensitive to who I was and what I represented to those around me.

Indeed, I was navigating new influences upon my life, yet in my professional life there was little change. After being accepted into a doctoral program in Latin American history, and declining to study due to a lack of funding, I had decided in 2004 to complete a Master's in TESOL. I had come to love living and teaching abroad. I loved meeting and interacting with people, relished studying and chatting about language and culture, and was hungry to become a better teacher. I wanted to master what I saw as "my" language and culture, which I was "imparting" to the good people of Japan. Ownership of the language was exclusively mine- mine to sell and mine to share in the interest of enlightening others- a very colonialist sentiment. I completed an M.A. program at Temple University's Osaka campus, during which I worked at a couple of different universities in the area.

A few years later, I grew restless. As a part-timer working a full-time "adjunct" schedule (no security, no benefits), I was frustrated with the fact that I had no ability to influence curriculum or policy decisions, nor did I have the ability to share my opinion about what was transpiring both within and beyond the classroom at the universities where I was employed. With the encouragement of old friends of mine who were TESOL professionals, I decided to head to the Washington, D.C. area to complete a doctorate in Second Language Education and Culture. With my wife and now two small daughters in tow, we made our way back to the U.S. I had chosen D.C. over a couple of other areas, with the idea in mind that I wanted my family and I to live in a diverse place and different part of the U.S. from that which we knew all too well. It was in this program that my professional transition began.

In the first two years of my studies I was working full-time for the English language institute on campus, teaching academic writing to international graduate students. I also began to teach TESOL-related content courses in the Department of

Curriculum and Instruction. As the semesters progress, I got to know my peers in my program well. I would guess that around 90% of these individuals were internationals. Two people had a real effect on me during the first year: one, a female from India, and the other a male from Turkey. I admired their intelligence, relished our friendships and began to see the field of TESOL in a different light. I was particularly intrigued by their involvement in the NNEST movement, and jumped at the chance to read what they recommended. These individuals introduced me to literature relating to the reconceptualization of communicative competence, as well as to the notions of World Englishes (postcolonial theory-inspired literature) and NNES/NNEST issues. As a result, I began to seriously reconsider my views on language ownership, policy, research, theory and practice.

During my second year, I delved into the literature on language ownership (e.g., Cook, 1999; Leung, 2005; Widdowson, 1994) reimagining communicative competence and NNES/NNES issues. While I read, I took a class on the epistemological foundations of education research. I could see that I was moving from an "objectivist," post-positivist worldview, towards a critical theory-underpinned version of constructivism. I began to focus on the perpetuation of power in TESOL, and how such was a part of the larger discourses of economic, cultural and as a result linguistic imperialism. My negotiation of identity, forever ongoing (even to this moment and beyond) was still churning on.

In year three of my program, I decided to accept a position at the university in Japan where I currently teach. In the fall, I was completing my comprehensive examination (on the subject of the reconceptualization of communicative competence and its implications for research, theory, policy and practice), teaching full-time for the department and the English language institute, and taking three classes. One of

my three courses was on transcultural education policy and practice. Incredibly, while taking this fantastic course that drew upon postcolonial and postmodern approaches to identity, culture and marginalization, I was reading about post-structuralism for the theoretical framework portion of my comp. In addition, I embarked on the beginning of a pilot study journey, interviewing a self-identified "NNES-ing" student, teacher and scholar about their experiences with advocacy and marginalization. These academic explorations drove me willingly toward a postmodern worldview. Here I now find myself, viewing culture, identity and power through a new lens.

I have now dedicated my academic life to postmodern approaches to language, culture and identity in the field of ELT. In approaching the field in such a manner, I am working to challenge constructs that seek to limit or render deficient linguistic and cultural border crossing. This includes examining concomitant critical and practical issues related to who teachers and students can and should be, and what glocalized, contextualized language teaching and learning might involve. Yes, I am currently in Japan in a position afforded to me in part by virtue of a widely-held belief in the supremacy of a white, male, native speaker. This is something I struggle with each and every day. I am both a symptom of the problem, as an individual privileged by dominant sociocultural and academic discourses in TESOL and in Japan, and an advocate for an alternative to what I represent in the minds of many.

Pilot Study

The origins of my proposed dissertation study are grounded in my experiences conducting a pilot study related to an NNES-ing student, teacher and scholar's experience negotiating personal and professional identity in an institution of higher education in the United States, grounded in the opening question: "*How would you*

describe your experiences negotiating identity, both personal and professional, as a "Non-Native" English-speaking international graduate student, scholar and teacher trainer in the field of TESOL?" During the study I employed post-modernist-informed narrative inquiry (Bell, 2002; detailed below). Halil and I co-constructed our interviews (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003). After the coding and reading of transcripts of the two interviews, and in concert with correspondence and member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) with my participant over the course of six months, I found a few specific themes.

The first apparent theme was the notion that my participant, "Halil," negotiated advocacy and marginalization in a fluid manner. In other words, Halil articulated a feeling of experiencing empowerment and disempowerment concomitantly, sliding back and forth on a continuum. Halil also makes one point very clear: he had created space for agency in a situation wherein he was rendered powerless and deficient by the regimes of truth that guide who is an ideal language teacher/teacher trainer, graduate student and scholar; a borderland (Anzaldua, 1987) of his own construction. Halil had made a definitive choice to challenge the Native Speaker construct, and its ontological and epistemological underpinnings, directly.

Methodology

Narrative inquiry

Grounded in my experiences during my pilot study, and inspired by scholars presenting the stories[28] of individuals challenging regimes of truth within English language-related theory, research, policy and practice (e.g., Braine, 2010; Lee & Simon-Maeda, 2006; Lu, 2005; Park, 2008, 2012; Tsui, 2007), I have chosen to

[28] I follow the lead of Riessman (2008) and Spector-Mersel (2010) who use "story" and "narrative" interchangebly.

employ a postmodern-influenced narrative inquiry in my study, with a poststructural focus on how individuals negotiate identity in and through their lived experiences.[29] Narrative inquiry generally seeks to explore these experiences, and to provide individuals with voice through their stories (Creswell, 2008). Canagarajah (1996), referring to academic scholarship, argues that narratives are also vehicles for groups located in personal and professional peripheries, affording them opportunities to, "participate in knowledge construction in the academy" (p. 327). What distinguishes narrative inquiries from each other, however, are their ontological and epistemological commitments guiding how they construct and value knowledge, conceptualize the "individual," view the relationship between the researcher and participant (Spector-Mersel, 2010). This ultimately affects how researchers approach analysis of the narratives (an issue I address here in the sections on validity and data analysis).

Narratives or stories, from a postmodern approach to narrative inquiry, according to Clandinin and Rosiek (2007), "are the result of a confluence of social influences on a person's inner life, social influences on their environment, and their unique social history" (p. 41). From a postmodernist perspective, narrative inquiry is not about uncovering "truths." Postmodernists take issue with the modernist, positivistic, Enlightenment-inspired belief in the existence of universal "truths" (e.g., Bredo, 2006; Fontana, 2003; Lather, 1991, 1993). With specific reference to post-structuralism (framed here as "antifoundationalism"), Fish (1989) explains:

> "questions of fact, truth, correctness, validity and clarity can neither be posed nor answered in reference to some extra

[29] Agger (1991) articulates the difficulty of cleanly separating 'postmodernism' from 'post-structuralism,' noting the "substantial overlap" between the two which focuses on "aversion to clean Positivist definitions and categories" (p. 112). Agger describes 'postmodernism' as a "theory of society, culture and history," and 'post-structuralism' as a "theory of knowledge and language" (p. 112).

> contextual, a historical, non situational reality, or rule or law, or value; rather anti-foundationalism asserts that all these matters are intelligible and debatable only within the precincts of the contexts or situations or paradigms or communities that given them their local and changeable shape" (p. 344).

In addition, postmodern-influenced narrative inquiry also takes issue with what Haraway (1991) describes as "a unitary subject, consciously capable of self-knowledge -the Enlightenment subject" (p. 193). Though postmodernism and post-structuralism, does envision the "self" as inseparable from context and the world beyond, it need not destroy the notion of an individual altogether. As Lather (1991) writes, post-structuralism has not posited "the death of the subject" (p. 120). What is being challenged is the notion of a "unified, monolithic, reified, essentialized subject capable of fully conscious, fully rational action" (Lather, 1991, p. 120, cited in Kusch & McVittie, 2002, p. 199).

Holstein and Gubrium (2003) posit, with reference to narratives and interviewing, that respondents, "are not so much repositories of knowledge- treasuries of information awaiting excavation- as they are constructors of knowledge in collaboration with interviewers" (p. 68). Davis and Harre (1994) argue, "An individual emerges through the process of social interaction, not as a relatively fixed end product but as one who is constituted and reconstituted through the various discursive practices in which they participate" (p. 46). Experience and reality, according to Clandinin and Rosiek (2007), are, through the postmodern narrative lens, "relational, temporal and continuous" (p. 44). The stories individuals tell are, "the result of a confluence of social influences on a person's inner life, social influences on their environment, and their unique social history" (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, p. 41). Referring to post-structuralism, Peters and Humes (2003) elaborate that, "Post-structuralism does not 'liquidate' the subject; rather it inquires into where it comes

from and how it functions- it analyses its positionality, its discursive formations and its historical becomings" (p. 111). For researchers employing such an approach to narrative inquiry, narratives are therefore co-constructed (Ellis & Berger, 2003), or are what Fontana and Frey (2000) call a "negotiated accomplishment" (p. 663). The researcher and participant are, in effect, "working the hyphen" between them (Fine, 1994). What emerge from such inquiry are historically situated accounts of given experiences in given contexts.

"Validity"

Approaching narrative inquiry through a post-structuralist lens generates what I believe to be one complex, primary question related to "validity": that of the "crisis of representation" (Marcus & Fischer, 1988), and as a result, of positionality.

In terms of validity, I align myself with Lather (1993) who, drawing upon Scheurich (1991), chooses to retain the term and reinscribe it with new meaning. Lather (1993) seeks, "to reinscribe validity in a way that uses the antifoundational problematic to loosen the master code of positivism that continues to so shape even post-positivism (p. 674). For qualitative researchers, the debate over the "crisis of representation" (Marcus & Fisher, 1988) is paramount; the challenge of representing "accurate view and confident knowledge of the world" (pp. 14-15, in Lenzo, 1995). The challenge lies in the fact that the researcher's influence upon the researched and what is produced from their interaction is ever present (Alvermann, 2000). Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed various approaches to detaching qualitative research from a post-positivist-inscribed notion of validity, and instead sought to attain trustworthiness. As Seale (2002) notes, however, Guba and Lincoln (1989, 1994) subsequently wrestled with reconciling their relativist beliefs about

reality, identity and representation. As such, Guba and Lincoln (1989, 1994) introduced the concept of "authenticity"; fairness in the representation of different realities, a "thick description" of a context (Geertz, 1973, p. 5), and prompting of action and further discussion. The meaning of concepts within Guba and Lincoln's authenticity, such as "fairness," are yet challenged by postmodernists. The point, however, is that qualitative researchers were engaging the deeply-rooted connection between post-positivism and validity.

Approaching the crisis of representation from a post-structuralist perspective, Lather (1993) writes, "the 'crisis of representation' is not the end of representation, but the end of pure presence… It is not a matter of looking harder or more closely, but of seeing what frames our seeing- spaces of constructed visibility and incitements to see which constitute power/knowledge" (p. 675). Lather (1986, in Lenzo, 1995) points to self-reflexivity as vital for a researcher to pursue. Reflexivity, according to Hesse-Biber (2006):

> "is the process through which a researcher recognizes, examines, and understands how his or her own social background and assumptions can intervene in the research process. Like the researched or respondent, the researcher is a product of his or her society's social structures and institutions. Our beliefs, backgrounds, and feelings are part of the process of knowledge construction" (p. 129).

Sultana (2007) prompts the researcher to "reflect on how one is inserted in grids of power relations and how that influences methods, interpretations, and knowledge production" (p. 376). Through my use of field notes and in and through interactions with my participants, I therefore sought to reflect upon the perceptions and biases I brought both to my participation in the study and the creation of my dissertation. I believed this particularly important, as I was drawing upon interviews and interview transcripts.

Positionality in my study is, as a result, an important issue to explore. As Hesse-Biber (2006) reveals about herself in her study, I would consider myself both and insider and outsider.[30] As such, I am fully aware that my inscribed status as a white, male, non-Japanese, Western "native speaker" of English positions me as an outsider in many complex ways. My educational and cultural background may further render me an outsider to my potential participants. My position as a limited-term contract assistant professor at a Japanese university places me either higher or lower on the societal scale of respect, depending on who I am interacting with, as does my age (37). At the same time, my visible advocacy challenging the power embedded in the NS/NNS and NEST/NNEST binaries, affords me some degree of insider status with individuals participating in similar professional activities in Japan. I have also lived in Japan on and off for seven years and speak Japanese fairly well. In addition, my wife (originally from Seattle) and I have two daughters who were born in Japan and are attending Japanese kindergarten and public elementary school. Our daily lives are deeply rooted in the country, though the degree to which this affords me insider status is questionable.

I have been challenged, in the past, by peers from a wide variety of backgrounds and holding ontological and epistemological commitments both similar and different to my own, as to the viability of me researching a population of which I may not or may only partially be a member. This is similar to what Lather (2008) describes (drawing upon Dillard, 2000 and Wright, 2003), when referencing the tension over who might research a given population, and the ambivalence a group might feel towards postmodern approaches to such research. Such challenges may also stem from a wariness towards scholars employing data from researched groups in the

[30] Hesse-Biber (2006) writes, "It is interesting and important to note that one's insider/outsider status is fluid and can change" (p. 143).

interest of furthering their own personal and professional agendas (e.g., Canagarajah, 1996; hooks, 1990). One could also misinterpret my desire to research challenging the NS construct as an attempt to be relevant, or even worse, to maintain the influence of a privileged group, as a "member." My research could also be viewed as an attempt on my part to be a "Great Liberator" (Foucault, 1980). From a postmodern perspective, I will not be presenting "the" story, but rather a multi-vocal story co-constructed with my participants in a given context at a given time. I also acknowledge that there is nothing complete about what will come of this study, in terms of getting a handle on "truth" (Denzin, 1997).

In order to address my positionality in my recruitment of participants, in our interaction, in my data analysis and the creation of my study, I committed to the following actions:

1) To be open with my participants about my background, experiences and research agenda, and to answer any questions they have for me, either personal or professional, as it relates to the study. In doing so, I would be working to build trust and rapport with my participants (Ellis, 2004).

2) In line with Sultana (2007), I constantly reflected on my place in the study, on my relationships with my participants, and upon how what I am expressing both in written and spoken form is affected by my commitments and experiences.

3) Throughout the study, I sought to maintain dialogue with my participants as to what was "going on" (Koch & Harrington, 1998, p. 889) in my analysis and restorying (Creswell, 2008) of our co-constructed narratives (described further in my data analysis section).

Data Collection

At the onset of this study, I had planned to conduct interviews, elicit written narratives, and attempt to have focus groups wherein participants might discuss their lived experiences. In the end, however, I made the decision to forgo the use of written narratives and focus groups. There are a few reasons. After chatting with my participants informally, I concluded that eliciting written narratives was not reasonable to ask of them due to their personal and professional schedules. I made the methodological decision to remove the focus group component for two primary reasons. The first related to one participant's objection to participation in a focus group. The second stemmed from the shift in focus of my study, away from the analysis of shared experiences of my participants challenging the Native Speaker construct, to a focus on their ongoing negotiation of translinguistic and transcultural identity (which I describe in detail in Chapter Six). In line with scholars including Dobson (2008) and Trahar (2009), I chose to continue my study employing interviewing as my primary means of data collection.

Interviewing

In approaching interviewing from a postmodern perspective, I took the position that I was collaborating (Ellis & Berger, 2003) with my participants in shaping the direction of the interview. Mishler (1986) states:

> "The discourse of the interview is jointly constructed by interviewer and respondent… Both questions and responses are formulated in, developed through, and shaped by the discourse between interviewers and respondents… An adequate understanding of interviews depends on recognizing how interviewers reformulate questions and how respondents frame answers in terms of their reciprocal understanding as meanings emerge during the course of an interview" (p. 52).

As a result, I view the interview narrative that emerge as co-constructed (Ellis & Berger, 2003); a "negotiated accomplishment" (Fontana & Frey, 2000, p. 663). The

interview afforded my participants the opportunity to create, and not reveal, their selves (Atkinson & Silverman, 1997).

During our chats, I aimed towards what Gubrium and Holstein (2003) call a "symmetrical interview." The symmetrical interview does not assume that participants in an interview are on even footing power-wise. Rather, the symmetrical interview is an approach to the flow of an interview, and a researcher's awareness of the potential to control and/or dominate participants. As a result, I planned my interviews to be semi-structured. In approaching the semi-structured interview, I first provided my participants four general questions in the interest of providing direction to our interaction (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006; Weiss, 1994). These questions were the following:

1) How would you describe yourself, professionally?

2) Please describe the journey that has led to your status as an ELT professional at the university level in Japan.

3) What has inspired you to challenge prevailing discourses related to language ownership, learning, use and instruction?

4) Please describe your lived experiences challenging such discourses.

When approaching the interviews, however, I was mindful, of the potential threat of my taking over the interview, which I believed would harm the possibility for a collaborative interview and the emergence of *co*-constructed narratives. One particular threat, from a postmodern perspective, stems from the use of labels within an interview, and within the question itself. Alvesson and Skoldberg (2001) argue that categories of identity can be exclusive. Alvesson and Skoldberg (2001) state that, "Identities or categories are themselves problematic: they fix and exclude" (p. 187, as cited in Popoviciu et al., 2007, p. 409). As such, I desired to avoid labels such as "NNEST and "Non-native" in my opening question both in the interest of allowing

my participants to identify themselves as they choose, and to allow my participants maximum space to articulate their lived experiences in the way the chose to do so.

In order to set up any informal chats and to conduct interviews, I planned to establish agreed upon times and dates. I was prepared to travel, if necessary to interview participants, or to facilitate interviews in another manner such as via Skype. I planned for interviews to last approximately 60-90 minutes, with two or more interviews likely necessary. As per my consent form, I asked my participants for permission for multiple interviews (with audio recorded), as well as for permission to stay in contact with them, in the interest of further dialogue and co-construction related to the study. During the interviews, participants would be free to use both English and Japanese.

Field Notes

Throughout the study I kept field notes relating to the interviews and my own experiences both directly and indirectly related to the study. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) define such field notes as, "ongoing, daily notes, full of the details and moments of our inquiry lived in the field, [they] are the text out of which we can tell stories of our story of experience" (p. 104). My notes served as a record of the research process, from my setting up interviews and reflecting upon interviews, to reflecting on my positionality as related to my participants and the contents of the dissertation in general. I drew upon the field notes to create the following section on how Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo became participants, as well as to write portions of my implications section touching upon self-reflexivity and positionality.

Participants

The participants in my study are Japanese university-level professors of English in Japan who are publically challenging prevailing constructions of language ownership, learning, use and instruction in the field of ELT in Japan. I recognize that indeed, many teachers and scholars may be doing so in very localized and perhaps unnoticeable ways. In this study, however, I focus on individuals who are writing about and/or participating in publically observable ways.

Locating Participants

In choosing to pursue a study that touched upon the perpetuation and challenging of power, I was very aware that recruiting participants could prove difficult. The first issue related to the lack of a formal community or venue in which to locate Japanese scholars who are working towards reconceptualizing language ownership, learning, use and instruction. The second major issue had to do with my ability to establish relationships with potential participants. E-mailing such individuals, even with a lengthy written introduction, is in general an unacceptable approach to establishing interpersonal relations, and proved to be so during my recruitment efforts.[31] I therefore chose to focus on seeking participants through relationships I had been building. As a result, I located three individuals (Tomomi, Yoshie and Hiroyuki) who committed to participation.

Desiring one further participant, however, I continued to peruse ELT-related literature produced in Japan. I came across an article on NNEST issues that garnered my interest, and I decided to take a chance and e-mail her (field notes, lines 141-142). In a twist of fate, Mitsuyo responded and eventually agreed to participate (field notes,

[31] One one occasion, I wrote a lengthy introduction to an individual highly regarded and highly visible in terms of challenging dominant discourses within ELT. This was an individiual with whom I had imagined I might connect rather easily. I was wrong; I received no reply. The questionable nature of this approach was confirmed by Mitsuyo, my eventual participant.

lines 171-181). During our initial informal face-to face conversation, Mitsuyo confirmed my worries regarding participant recruitment as a stranger and non-Japanese, telling me that if it hadn't been for a person we both knew, who happened to know me, she would have never replied to my message; he had vouched for me and had said that I wasn't (that) strange (field notes, lines 182-189).

After nearly a year of locating participants, I had four: Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo.

Becoming Participants

Tomomi

My relationship with Tomomi, culminating in her participation in this study, began when we first met through a mutual friend in early 2009. Sharing both a connection to Japan and similar academic interests, Tomomi and I subsequently corresponded now and again until we both found ourselves in Japan once more. In November of 2011, we met at an international language teaching conference in eastern Japan, and chatted at length about events in our lives, personal and professional (field notes, lines 66-72). Following our chat, Tomomi and I began speaking via Skype about the places in which we were working and our professional activities (field notes, lines 85-90). This included, in particular, Tomomi's thoughts regarding negotiating her personal and professional identity after returning to Japan (field notes, 90-94). Toward the end of February 2012, I asked Tomomi to be participant in my study, to which she agreed (field notes, lines 149-151). By that time, Tomomi and I had built a friendship that extended beyond academia. We decided upon Skype as our means of completing our interviews, as it was free and both of us were preparing for teaching in spring semester. Tomomi and I had an interview via Skype lasting around 30 minutes, at the end of February 2012 (field

notes, line 157). Having had problems with intelligibility due to our Skype connection, we had a second, 90-minute chat in early March 2012 (field notes, line 191) during which we reviewed much of what we had previously discussed. Then, in mid-March, we had our third and final interview via Skype, which lasted roughly another 90 minutes (field notes, line 228).

Yoshie

I first met Yoshie in the spring of 2011, when we were introduced to each other by mutual friends. As we were both working in west-central Japan at the time and crossed professional paths on occasion, we slowly got to know each other. Much of this was grounded in the fact that we were both familiar with the Pacific Northwest of the United States and British Columbia, Canada (field notes, lines 28-29). In our chats, however, we realized that we shared academic interests in common, and that our worldviews approaching ELT intersected in many ways. At that time, I considered asking her to participate in the study I was about to undertake. She, I discovered, viewed herself as a "transcultural being" (field notes, line 37), which served as the basis for her approach to her own identity and our profession.

By December of 2011, I was getting to know Yoshie quite well, and became aware of the quantity of research and publishing she was doing on the subject of challenging the NS construct. At that time, Yoshie informed me that the only other person she shared this with was her research partner (field notes, line 38). Yoshie worried about revealing such information to others, as such threatened her professionally, and as a result, personally (field notes, lines 40-42). Though not sure how she would respond, I invited Yoshie to be a participant in my study at the end of February 2012, and she accepted. During the course of two initial, informal chats with Yoshie in March (field notes, line 208; lines 219-220), she said she could be

available for two interviews (field notes, lines 219-220). We had our first formal interview/chat at her university in her office on March 29th lasting roughly 80 minutes (field notes, line 257), and a second in the same location on April 5th lasting nearly two hours (field notes, line 273).

Hiroyuki

In the late spring of 2011, I met Hiroyuki during a social activity at my place of work (field notes, lines 329-330). I chatted with Hiroyuki for a while about my return to Japan. Subsequently, as we slowly developed a friendship, he began to share bits and pieces of his research interests and worldview regarding language acquisition, use and instruction (field notes, lines 336-337). In June 2012, I decided to ask Hiroyuki to be part of my study, and he agreed (field notes, line 352), noting he could make himself available for one chat; two if necessary (field notes, 352-353). At the end of July, Hiroyuki and I sat for two different interviews in his office at his university, the first of which lasted 90 minutes and the second, 95.

Mitsuyo

In February of 2012, I came across an article on NNEST issues in an ELT-related journal published in Japan (the first I had seen formally addressing the topic). I subsequently attempted to contact the author, as I felt she would potentially be a valuable candidate for my study. A few days later Mitsuyo contacted me, and agreed to meet in the future in order for us to get to know each other (field notes, lines 172-175). In late March, Mitsuyo and I decided to meet to chat. She was moving temporarily to the area where I was working, and would be willing to come to my office for a conversation (field notes, lines 249-151). During our first chat, Mitsuyo informed me that she knew a colleague of mine. When Mitsuyo had received my e-mail of introduction and had seen my university affiliation, she had inquired with this

colleague as to what kind of person I was, and this colleague had vouched for me (field notes, lines 182-189).

In April, Mitsuyo and I got together for an informal chat. During that chat we discussed how I had located her, our shared research interests, and the purpose of my study. At the end of the conversation, Mitsuyo agreed to participate in my study, as she found the subject matter interesting (field notes, lines 288-291). Mitsuyo committed to being available for two interviews on two specific days, as she was extremely busy with her new apartment, a new position and personal commitments (field notes, lines 293-295). These interviews, conducted in my office, lasted 90 minutes (field notes, line 293) and 120 minutes respectively (field notes, line 324).

Benefits to Participants in the Study

Through my interaction with my participants, I came to believe there is one primary benefit to their participation in this study. Each has an opportunity to share their lived experiences and play a role in knowledge construction within their field (Canagarajah, 1996). In doing so, they are potentially able to use another platform to share their worldview. I contend this platform, through its provision of anonymity, minimizes personal and professional threats while providing a vehicle to create dialogue.

Data Analysis

Scholars have pointed to the potential incompatibilities between post-structuralism and narrative inquiry (e.g., Luke, 2004 in Poetter & Bird, 2004). Spector-Mersel (2010) asserts that this has to do with the murky nature of which narrative inquiry has been characterized throughout the professional literature across disciplines. Spector-Mersel (2010) notes that there has been disconnect between the

ontological and epistemological commitments underpinning approaches to narrative inquiry. I would argue that the primary issue relates the idea of "themes." Riessman (2005) and Ellis (2004) warn that the search for "themes" in narrative inquiry may indeed be a step back towards post-positivism for the qualitative researcher viewing research through a postmodern lens. Others such as Willis (2008) argue, however, that the issue is not with the use of themes, but rather with the meaning poured into "theme" via one's worldview. Speaking with relation to themes and post-structuralism, Willis (2008) contends: "Post-structuralists may still look for patterns, structures and organizing frameworks… but post-structuralists are much more likely to think of any organizing structure as a construction of creative humans who were influenced by their culture, their context and their purposes" (p. 291).

My approach to methodology in this study has been a product both of my interaction with such tensions related to narrative inquiry in the literature, and my time with my participants. In the beginning stages of this study, I had planned to use thematic analysis in approaching the co-constructed narratives, which is in effect, "treating stories as data and using analysis to arrive at themes that illuminate the content and hold within or across stories" (Ellis, 2004, p. 196). In order to do so, I intended to code themes (Creswell, 2009) located in the narratives. Immediately, however, I sensed a dissonance between my ontological and epistemological commitments and such an approach to methodology. With the guidance and support of two of my committee members, I opted to remove thematic analysis and coding from my methodology. The tension between my worldview and the direction of the study did not disappear, however. I encountered a similar problem upon interacting with my participants and reading their transcripts. I found myself attempting to shove their experiences into neat little thematic categories that stripped their experiences of

their power and meaning. In other words, I was returning to what I had attempted to remove from my study before. After expressing concern to two of my committee members, I finally comprehended the full extent of the tension between my ontological and epistemological commitments. The issue was with the way in which I was *conceptualizing* the study, and had nothing to do with "themes or not themes" (personal communication, August 19th, 2012).[32] These experiences prompted me to completely rethink my approach to data analysis.

As a result, in the following chapter, I first present each individual co-constructed narrative exploring "temporality (past, present and future), sociality (the dialectic between inner and outer/the personal and social) and place (the concrete physicality of the place or places in which experiences are lived out and told)" (Connelly & Clandinin, 2006, summarized in Huber et al., 2011, p. 12). I have restoried (Creswell, 2008) my participants' lived experiences based on transcripts that I produced from our interviews.

Throughout the data analysis and writing process, I referred to my field notes in the interest of self-reflexivity. In addition, I sought to continue the dialogue my participants and I had begun to construct before and in and through our interviews. While doing so, I asked my participants at times for clarification as to what they had expressed. I provided opportunities for my participants to see transcripts of our interviews. I discussed the direction and contents of my study with my participants. Most of all, I continually attempted to be self-reflexive and to examine my positionality. I facilitated this dialogue in person with Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo, and via Skype with Tomomi.

[32] I explore this issue further in the discussion section in Chapter 6.

Originally, I had planned to call these actions "member checking" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), as I had in my pilot study (2011). I found myself, however, wrestling with member checking as an ontologically and epistemologically compatible component of my methodology. This has to do with the fact that member checking assumes that the researcher is validating a given truth with the participant, who serves as a vessel containing fixed, knowable truths (e.g., Lenzo, 1995). Koch and Harrington (1998) argue that member checking aims for a post-positivistic rigor, which I contend is not in line with the ontological underpinnings of this study. Sandelowski (1993) asserts that "validation is less a technical problem that a deeply theoretical one" (p. 2), and is conceptualized study by study by those who review the contents of each (Koch & Harrington, 1998; Sandelowski, 1993).

In line with Koch and Harrington (1998) I therefore chose to share with my participants "what is going on" (p. 889) during research, as well as to be self-reflexive throughout the research process (Koch & Harrington, 1998; Rolfe, 2006). In similar fashion, I have aimed to share with the readers of this study what has transpired in terms of my decision-making and self-reflexivity. I was not attempting to verify emergent truths stemming from interviews with my participants. Instead, my participants and I engaged in a sort of "co-constructed reflection," through which we reflected upon what we had co-constructed together during our interviews, and continued the dialogue we had begun in our informal chats and formal sessions together. In this way, I sought to allow my participants to add to what they had shared, comment upon what was constructed in our interviews, or to even take our dialogue in a different direction if they chose to do so. In doing so, I found that my participants did not feel the need to alter what they had said in any way, shape or form. They instead viewed the narratives incorporated into this study as

conversations constructed at a given time, in a given space, neither serving as a beginning nor an ending.

In my IRB Consent Form, I asked my participants for their permission to record audio of our conversations, in the interest of creating written transcripts of the narratives. Oliver et al. (2005) argue that one's approach to transcription should be in line with one's research goals, while Lapadat (2000) notes that ontological and epistemological commitments inform one's choice of how to transcribe. I therefore produced "denaturalized" transcripts (Bucholtz, 2000), which are transcripts that include all the features of oral English, such as pauses, "ums" and "ers." I followed all guidelines laid out by the University of Maryland's Institutional Review Board (2011) detailing the protection of participants' identities and information. Though nearly all of the interview contents were in English, I have translated a few words in the narratives, placing their English equivalents in quotation marks or parentheses.

Following the individual narratives, I attempt through the lens of "poststructural storytelling" to, "excavate the power and knowledge that are used to construct versions of humanity" (Goodley, in Goodley et al. 2004, p. 101). I seek to excavate some of the "resonant threads" (Clandinin, 2010) in the narratives relating to my participants' ongoing negotiation of translinguistic and transcultural identity. These threads do not relate to categories I was imposing, such as "marginalization" or "agency." Instead, the threads approach how my participants describe the journey that has led to their becoming ELT professionals at the university level in Japan, what has inspired them to challenge prevailing discourses related to language ownership, learning, use and instruction, and how they articulate their lived experiences challenging such discourses. I do so with caution, noting, as Derrida (1979) argues,

that texts are "a fabric of traces referring endlessly to something other than itself" (p. 84), and not static, holistic accounts of experience.

Participatory and Ethical Considerations

I would like to address three specific topics related to participatory and ethical considerations: 1) preservation and protection of the data I collect, 2) preserving the anonymity of my participants beyond the data, and 3) addressing Japanese privacy laws concerning the handling of personal information.

In the interest of preserving and protecting the data I collected, I used the following protocol, in line with the University of Maryland's Institutional Research Board's (2011) guidelines:

1) I recorded all interviews directly on to my Mac laptop's hard drive. I created a key linking the recordings to individuals, as well as to corresponding transcripts and field notes. Only Dr. Melinda Martin-Beltran, principal investigator, and I, have access to the data and key, unless a participant asks for access to his or her recording or transcripts;

2) I have stored all data on my laptop, kept in a secure location in my locked office at the university I work at in Japan. The laptop is password-protected;

3) Printed transcripts and field notes have been held in a locked drawer in my locked office in Japan. Any printed transcripts no longer in use were immediately destroyed;

4) I will retain the data, including recorded interviews, typed transcripts, printed transcripts, documents derived from the interviews, for five years. After five years, I will erase the electronic material and shred the printed and written documents.

As to preserving the anonymity of my participants beyond the data, I will not share any information about my participants that might render them identifiable. This

has been noted as a particular concern of one participant. As a result, I have sought to limit the inclusion of any personal or professional details that might reveal who they are.

In addition, this study has taken place in an international context. According to the Institutional Review Board at the University of Maryland, College Park (2011), any research conducted outside of the United States must necessarily follow laws governing research with human subjects, as well as those protecting personal information. I have therefore followed the guidelines laid out by the Japanese government's Personal Information Privacy Act (1993), which IRB guidelines satisfactorily cover. In Japan, there is no specific category outlining research involving human subjects beyond medical and clinical research (see: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2011) "International Compilation of Human Research Protections").

Chapter 5: Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki, Mitsuyo in Narrative

In this chapter, I present the co-constructed narratives of Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo. These narratives approach my four participants' lived experiences encountering, challenging and crossing linguistic, cultural, academic and national borders as language learners, users and as ELT professionals. I assert that the contents of the co-constructed narratives address the three participant-oriented questions guiding my study: 1) How do participants construct their translinguistic and transcultural identities as ELT professionals; 2) How and why have participants, as ELT professionals, arrived at challenging prevailing discourses guiding ELT in the Japanese setting; 3) How do participants describe their lived experiences challenging these discourses. Within the narratives themselves, I have chosen not to impose thematic subheadings to serve as points of organization or reference. Instead, the narratives flow in a relatively chronological fashion, following the progression of lived experiences my participants shared in our interviews.

Tomomi's Narrative

Tomomi is a self-described thirty-year old university-level English professor from Kyushu, currently living and working on the same island (transcript 1, lines 1-2). Immediately after her birth, Tomomi's family moved to the United States for two years, where her father completed a Master's degree in ELT. Tomomi's father had been working at a high school, but was unhappy and had wanted to study English in the States. According to Tomomi, "Mom told him that if you really want to do that, then go for it…" (transcript 1, lines 21-23). As a result, her parents saved money and headed overseas. Upon their return to Japan, the family returned to Kyushu and eventually settled in the south where Tomomi's father found employment at a junior college.

Tomomi's language learning journey began at the time of her birth, though she was too young to remember her time in the United States. Though raised by parents who were good English speakers (transcript 1, lines 16-17), Tomomi's active interest in studying English was fuelled by her own desire to learn the language. In Tomomi's words, "My parents didn't actively encourage me to be bilingual. Language was something they just did when they needed to such as when they were in America" (transcript 1, lines 18-19). While in elementary school, Tomomi asked her mother to "teach me the alphabet and simple grammar," (transcript 1, lines 6-7), after which own she "found a radio program where I listened to radio English conversation" (transcript 1, line 7) after "my mom said that she didn't want to teach me anymore" (transcript 1, lines 13-14). Tomomi described her desire to learn English as two-fold: first, "my parents used to talk a lot about foreign countries, so I always had an interest" (transcript 1, lines 9-10), and second, "I used to like North American literature such as Little Women and Anne of Green Gables, so I really wanted to visit another country in the future and I thought it would be a good idea to start studying earlier" (transcript 1, lines 10-13).

At the age of 13, Tomomi began her English studies in junior high "like other Japanese do" (transcript 1, line 5). Upon entering high school, Tomomi won a scholarship to study abroad at a prep school in the eastern United States for five weeks during summer. At the school, Tomomi met a lot of Spanish-speaking students and students from different parts of Asia, though I didn't really meet any (prep school) students, because it was the summer" (transcript 1, lines 47-49). During the experience Tomomi felt inspired to pursue English studies beyond high school. As a result, she "went to uni to study English language and English literature in the Tokyo area" (transcript 1, lines 56-57).

At university, Tomomi's education consisted of "a lot of English classes, but none of them satisfied me. We sang songs in English, but didn't study writing… We talked about movies. In my literature classes, it was too easy. We read in English, but only an average of 3 sentences per class" (transcript 1, lines 65-69). Tomomi "was very disappointed in the whole experience" (transcript 1, line 71), though she did receive a diploma and license to teach secondary school English courses. Despite her frustrations, however, Tomomi remained interested in studying English. After pondering working part-time and further education, Tomomi decided to apply to graduate school in the United States. During chats with her parents, Tomomi's mother and father "encouraged me to study abroad" as they saw it as something fruitful and constructive for her to pursue (transcript 1, lines 77-79). Tomomi then applied to one graduate program and got accepted.

Tomomi's foray into graduate level study presented her with challenges the likes of which she had not faced previously. The largest challenge related to the content within her new program: "it was different than I had thought it would be… I thought I would be studying SLA and teaching methods that I could use in Japan, but I found that what we studied at --------- was focused on students who were going to teach in the United States. And I discovered that in order to get good scores in class, I had to have knowledge of the U.S.- about North American educational philosophies, education, students, etc" (transcript 1, lines 82-88). Such was the case, though "over half of the students in the class were international students" (transcript 1, lines 88-89). Tomomi "went into the program expecting to learn things to bring back to Japan to teach" (transcript 1, line 107) but quickly surmised, "They were using a one-size-fits-all approach. They were preparing an idealized teacher to teach an idealized student- if you teach 'this' knowledge, your students will be successful…" (transcript 1, lines

99-100). Tomomi was upset by the lack of attention to her specific needs and the context from which she had come: "(the program) didn't value my experience/educational background. I always thought this was contradictory, because what they taught us was to make a bridge between school and students, but what they did was completely different" (transcript 1, lines 92-94). Tomomi felt she "had little support. I was expected to conform to the core" (transcript 1, line 101).

While in the program, Tomomi "started thinking about context, culture and identity" (transcript 1, line 108), and "changes in me occurred little by little" (transcript 1, line 109). Tomomi realized, "I had to change myself to meet someone else's standard, and that was really not what I wanted to do. I wanted to be myself… I always had a conflict regarding what success was supposed to be and who I was supposed to be in my field and relationships" (transcript 1, lines 110-114). Tomomi "wrestled with the idea of am I good enough" (transcript 1, line 133) with relation to her profession, measuring herself "against the NS as reinforced by my studies" (transcript 1, lines 133-134). Tomomi's "worldview was continuing to change" (transcript 1, line 136); she, "felt empowered as myself, though disempowered by how others saw me and what my studies said about me" (transcript 1, lines 134-135). Then, in the second year of her program, Tomomi met a NS with whom she started to chat about the NS binary and NNEST issues. According to Tomomi, "I was amazed and thankful when exposed to the topics: it was a comfortable space for me to talk about these things and it fit my changing view of language, culture and identity" (transcript 1, 190-192). Tomomi describes being exposed to a world, "where people view reconceptualizing culture or identity as a positive thing, not deficiency" (transcript 1, lines 174-175). Tomomi noted that, "change in my worldview was ongoing" (transcript 1, line 141).

Upon graduating, Tomomi returned to the island of Kyushu. After applying for many different positions, Tomomi found work at two universities "part-time- I teach seven courses" (transcript 1, lines 181-182), though she "felt unprepared to teach in Japan as a result of the program in (the U.S.)" (transcript 1, line 132). Freshly arrived in Japan, Tomomi felt her identity had been greatly shaped by her time outside Japan: "I found myself negotiating two worlds that are now my world- I am crossing boundaries that other people see as hard and fast on a daily basis, as far as what being Japanese is, for example" (transcript 1, lines 144-146). In Tomomi's words, "I feel I have many circles of identity in my life. They cross each other in different ways at different points, depending on who I am interacting with. These circles are what I imagine as 'being Japanese' 'being American,' etc. … I am a product of the mixture of elements of these different circles" (transcript 1, lines 152-156). Such elements included everything from her taste for Mediterranean food, to watching films in English without subtitles. Tomomi quickly ascertained that her worldview was one that many of the Japanese with whom she came into contact did not understand: "People who have never experienced being an outsider cannot see the things that those who have can see" (transcript 1, lines 176-177). One example in her everyday life related to men. According to Tomomi, "If I talk to an average Japanese man, for instance, I find that he quickly becomes disinterested in me" (transcript 1, lines 164-165) whether because of the fact that she had dated an international while in the States, or due to the fact that she did not enjoy stereotypically popular things such as Japanese pop music (transcript 1, lines 162-164). As a result, Tomomi felt she had to "keep things to myself about myself, depending on who I am with" (transcript 1, line 166). Feeling "more compatible with people who have gone a lot of places" (transcript 1, line 172), Tomomi found "I am not compatible with people who believe

the world is supposed to be one way" (transcript 1, lines 170-171). Tomomi has therefore found herself limited in terms of friendships, though she does get together with friends from her days in primary and secondary school.

Tomomi's navigation of her professional context mirrors that of her experience outside academia. Tomomi believes her colleagues, both part- and full-time perceive her as a threat: "I'm a threat professionally, but also culturally as well because I am redefining what it is to be a teacher and Japanese. I think that is the biggest part of why I am a threat" (transcript 2, lines 11-12). Tomomi believes that this involves her status as a female, her age and lack of a terminal degree (transcript 2, lines 85-86), and her divergent worldview of language, culture and identity (transcript 2, line 79). Therefore, Tomomi concludes, "Just by being who you are, you are a threat" (transcript 2, line 105).

Tomomi is convinced that in the Japanese context, where, "ELT and society are dominated by men" (transcript 2, lines 91-92), she is concomitantly "challenging the social structure of the culture and profession, ruled by old guys" (transcript 2, lines 90-91). She firmly believes that Japanese men who study abroad and return to Japan to work experience a very different reception in the English teaching world in Japan (transcript 2, lines 40-42). In such a context, according to Tomomi, women are to appear conservative and not give away their age. Tomomi lamented, "I think I need to get a pair of glasses and get my hair cut shorter… My father says 'professional' women do not have long hair" (transcript 2, lines 92-94). In her workplaces, she has felt she has been looked down upon as a result of the clothing she wears: "some teachers think that I do not fit the model of a traditional teacher- I am supposed to look more geekish… very old-woman like- navy, black, brown colors" (transcript 2, lines 95-97). Tomomi notes that she has "not experienced sekuhara" (sexual

harassment), though she has interpreted the reception of her appearance as oppressive (transcript 2, line 95). Women, according to Tomomi, ought not be assertive in sharing their feelings and opinions. Tomomi believes many of her colleagues "think I will behave spontaneously because I was educated in the U.S. They assume I will contest things with them or refute them" (transcript 2, lines 6-8). In one case, for instance, Tomomi was party to an attempted conversation between a part-time NS teacher and a full-time Japanese professor. The NS had attempted to strike up conversation with the Japanese professor, but this individual responded only with silence and what appeared to be a cold shoulder. Knowing both teachers, Tomomi injected herself into the situation, seeking to make both individuals comfortable (transcript 1, lines 209-212). A while later, however, Tomomi was mildly scolded by the Japanese teacher, who noted he "was tired, wasn't ready to think in English and didn't know the guy well" and therefore felt no inclination to interact with the NS (transcript 1, lines 213-215).

Tomomi also contends that her youthful age, coupled with her status as a female, is also a strike against her: "People say 'You are a young woman- what do you know" (transcript 2, lines 91-92). In the Japanese context, Tomomi argues, respect is dictated in large part by the Confucian notion of regard for seniority and authority, including that of women to men (transcript 2, lines 85-86). This is further complicated by her lack of a terminal degree in her field: "People don't listen to me because I am a little girl without a Ph.D." (transcript 2, line 87). In Tomomi's opinion, the Japanese social and educational system, as influenced by Confucianism, "allows professors to protect themselves and give themselves legitimacy" (transcript 2, lines 88-89), including using Tomomi's age, status as female and lack of a Ph.D. as a means to "actively minimize threats to stability" (transcript 2, line 78).

In addition to being young, female and without a Ph.D., Tomomi's approach to the classroom has brought her into conflict with the NS construct and static notions of who a Japanese teacher of English is supposed to be and behave like: "a person who teaches completely by the textbook and you are supposed to be able to explain everything in the textbook (grammar explanation, maybe cultural explanation related to the unit)" (transcript 2, lines 58-60). Tomomi argues that this notion of a "Japanese" professor of English is rooted in feelings of deficiency stemming from the NS construct (transcript 2, lines 9-10). As a result of the power of the construct, Tomomi feels the "culture" of the Native Speaker is prioritized (transcript 2, line 63), there is "no connection to students and their needs" in the classroom (transcript 2, line 65) and English is taught "for no specific purpose" other than for students to get a degree (transcript 2, line 62). This, Tomomi argues, "becomes an excuse to not offer classes that are more contextualized. Teachers don't have to consider who their students are… They can offer anything…" (transcript 2, lines 72-73). When Tomomi attempted to tailor classes to her students in one case, she was told "the students would not use English after university and so there was no reason (to do so)" (transcript 2, lines 67-68). In addition she, as with all other Japanese teachers in her two universities, is exclusively assigned to composition, listening and reading classes. This is in spite of Tomomi's desire to teach classes normally assigned to NSs, such as debate and discussion courses: "I find myself limited by what the department wants me to be. They don't care about what I can teach- they have an idea of what they think I can teach" (transcript 2, lines 49-50). According to Tomomi, "People are not hired as successful English users with good education, but rather for how they look on paper and how they can fill a particular role" (transcript 2, lines 55-56). Tomomi believes that "this allows them (Japanese teachers) to insulate themselves from threats

to their professional standing" (transcript 2, lines 74-75). "My passion" according to Tomomi, "is pointless to such individuals- yeah, but what's the point- this (ignoring her passion) is a form of pushback" (transcript 2, lines 75-76).

Another issue related to the classroom is Tomomi's interaction with students, exemplified when Tomomi interviewed for a position with a longer contract. The interview consisted of teaching a demo lesson to a group of professors. In the lesson, Tomomi encouraged them to interact with each other actively in what she conceded could have been perceived as "an American way" (transcript 2, lines 14-15). In addition, Tomomi spoke "very frank and honestly with them… I told them how I feel about teaching… I thought it was a good idea and that I did more than okay" (transcript 2, lines 16-18). The response she received was that "that was not the thing they wanted. They wanted someone who played a role and fit into their program, which is different from me." (transcript 2, line 19-21). As previously mentioned, Tomomi believes that the professors around her are "actively minimizing threats to stability" in terms of their role and value as teachers and holders of knowledge (transcript 2, line 78). When asked if she was perhaps perceived as a threat because she had gained a portion of the knowledge of the NS and had spent considerable time overseas, Tomomi insisted, "I am a threat because I am defining what it is to be Japanese" (transcript 2, lines 22-24) and "what I do is very different to who they are and what they do" (transcript 2, line 29).[33]

As a result of her lived experiences and studies, Tomomi now believes that "I have learned how the game works" (transcript 2, lines 34-35). She is now attempting

[33] Tomomi asserts that studying abroad did not privilege her or cause her to be viewed as threatening in terms of her linguistic and cultural knowledge of English, or academic knowledge. She notes that the prestige of the institution where one studies, whether in Japan or abroad is most important (transcript 2, lines 52-55).

to “play the game- to earn respect so that you are given more roles and influence” (transcript 2, line 111). Tomomi is dressing more conservatively, and keeping her opinions largely to herself noting, “I have to disguise myself until I get a good position. I have to play being one of them” (transcript 2, lines 82-83). This includes pondering entering a Ph.D. program. In concert with disguising herself, Tomomi notes that her “agency is to be patient” (transcript 2, line 85). Tomomi asserts that, “after getting a position where I have more power, I can promote change” (transcript 2, lines 83-84). Tomomi describes her patience as active, wherein she “learns from each situation- observing colleagues, students and the classroom” (transcript 2, lines 107-108). In doing so she is “seeking ways to create dialogue in a way that makes the field more equitable and allows for change but in a way where you don’t bring the whole world against you” (transcript 2, lines 107-109). In one of her two workplaces, Tomomi has slowly built an academic relationship with a full professor that has blossomed into frequent chats regarding reconceptualizing language, culture and identity. Tomomi and this professor discuss topics ranging from “tailoring classes to students’ contextualized needs” (transcript 2, lines 198-199), to “the fact that it isn’t necessary for students to write like and be judged against North Americans” (transcript 2, lines 199-200). This relationship has proven to be a welcome outlet for Tomomi to express herself. Tomomi firmly believes, however, that if she is hired with tenure, her ability to affect change in her workplace would greatly increase (transcript 2, lines 47-48). At present, as a “hijyoukin” (part-time employee), she feels “my views can be silenced easily” (transcript 2, lines 44-45). Being without tenure also threatens Tomomi financially, as she is on contract and can be let go at any time (transcript 2, lines 45-46).

In the classroom, Tomomi finds herself concomitantly filling the role she was hired to play (transcript 2, line 58), and shaping her courses in a manner discreetly influenced by her worldview. Tomomi "focus(es) on the practical, while keeping in mind the critical" (transcript 2, line 112). When discussing the classroom both within and beyond her universities, Tomomi keeps such in mind as she feels "people want to know how what are you saying affects the classroom" (transcript 2, lines 113-114). This has greatly affected the way Tomomi approaches her scholarly activities. When discussing critical issues at ELT conferences in the Japanese context, she contends, the few people who attend are already in agreement with her: "you are essentially preaching to the choir" (transcript 2, line 197). The majority of individuals and professional organizations, in Tomomi's opinion, "have little interest" in her work (transcript 2, line 197). This opinion was confirmed for Tomomi by her father (now a full professor at a major university in southwestern Japan), who told her that both he and professional organizations in the Kyushu area had little interest in changing views of ELT (transcript 2, lines 195-196).

As a result, Tomomi has chosen to focus primarily on topics such as academic writing, as underpinned by her worldview of moving beyond the NS and viewing students "not as deficient communicators" (transcript 2, lines 204-205). Yet while focusing on the practical, Tomomi has faced pushback in the form of editorial feedback on her writing that specifically criticizes her worldview (transcript 2, lines 205-206). Tomomi has not given up on seeking to confront the NS construct directly in her professional activities. In concert with a colleague, for instance, she presented on the subject of the NS/NNS binary at a recent international language teaching conference held annually in Japan (transcript 2, line 193). In whatever venue, Tomomi's philosophy is to "provide opportunities for dialogue and reflection for

people, and not to force outcomes" (transcript 2, line 111). With patience, anticipation and with hope, Tomomi looks to the future. Believing in who she is both personally and professionally, Tomomi chooses to continue challenging dominant perspectives of language, identity and culture in Japanese society.

Yoshie's Narrative

Yoshie describes herself as a "female Japanese professor of linguistics/ELT from the northeast of Japan" (transcript 3, lines 1-2). Yoshie's relationship with English began in a public junior high, where she enjoyed studying English (transcript 3, lines 3-4). Upon graduation from high school she decided to go to a vocational college, where she studied banking and English for two years. Her choice of vocational college over study in a traditional four-year college had to do with her desire to "experience society… I decided I didn't want to spend four years studying" (transcript 3, lines 10-11). Following her time in the vocational college, Yoshie found employment as a bank clerk. While working at the bank, Yoshie continued to study English: "I didn't want to lose my English ability so I went to English conversation school for three years in the evening" (transcript 3, lines 14-15).

After working at the bank for three years, a friend approached Yoshie and asked her if she was interested in a position teaching English to children. Excited at the prospect, Yoshie said yes (transcript 3, lines 17-19). In Yoshie's new workplace, three of her colleagues were native English speakers. One of the three was a female from western Canada. After initially getting to know her, Yoshie found out that the young woman was interested in ikebana (flower arrangement). Yoshie had been taking such a class, and invited the woman to come along. After their inaugural visit, "we decided to go to the class together, and we started to get closer and closer" (transcript 3, lines 19-21). One day, Yoshie confided in her colleague/friend that she

"wasn't satisfied with my English level, and I really wanted to go to university- I hadn't really gone to university" (transcript 3, 21-23). In response, the young woman suggested, "oh, why don't you go to Canada?" (transcript 3, line 28). Yoshie was aware that returning to university as a non-traditional student in Canada would not diverge from the norm as it would in Japan: "You know that in Canada, age is not an issue- you can go to uni at any time… I was thirty at the time" (transcript 3, lines 28-30).[34] It was at that moment that Yoshie "decided to go to university" (transcript 3, line 34).

Yoshie was apprehensive not due to the international move, but rather regarding her proposed return to academia: "I hadn't studied for ten years… this was an issue for me- particularly the studying" (transcript 3, lines 34-35). On the advice of her same friend, Yoshie decided to enter an ESL program prior to attending a four-year university in Canada. This was due not to her level of English, but rather to the demands of North American academia, including academic writing (transcript 3, lines 35-37). After receiving brochures from a community college in British Columbia from her friend, Yoshie enrolled its ESL program and embarked on her journey (transcript 3, 38-39). Yoshie finished the program in one year. At the end of the program, she took the TOEFL test and received a score that allowed her to enter the local four-year institution (transcript 3, lines 42-44). During this period, Yoshie was searching for a room to rent. She found a suitable living situation wherein she met her eventual husband, a Canadian of English descent (transcript 3, lines 44-46).

[34] In Japan, according to MEXT (2010), approximately 87% of Master's students and 60% of doctoral students are under 30, while the overwhelming majority of undergraduates entered university immediately after high school. Rugen (2010) notes, however, that as a result of the current socioeconomic climate in Japan, more and more of these "nontraditionals" (over 25 years old) are studying at the graduate level.

At university, Yoshie majored in political science. She chose this major because, "I wanted to know why so many countries went to war. I was interested in the war issue because of my mom's experience in the fire bombing of Tokyo. Everything was burned. She moved with my father to his home in ----- (the northeast) because food was easier to get" (transcript 3, lines 49-52). In her fourth year, a friend told Yoshie about an easy course- a grammar course- that she found to be both easy and enjoyable (transcript 3, line 55). In her political science program, Yoshie was a bit uncomfortable: "poly sci students had pressured me a bit as I was slower to think, speak and write" (transcript 3, line 56). In the linguistics department, however, Yoshie felt very comfortable. Studying political science did have one payoff for Yoshie, though when she took a course in Canadian politics that she had put off until her final year: her discovery of Canada's bilingual policy debate (transcript 3, lines 58-60). Bilingualism was something that caught Yoshie's interest, and was located both in the realm of political science and sociolinguistics: "I thought that if I did sociolinguistics, I could connect my previous education to issues such as language policy, bilingualism and language minorities" (transcript 3, lines 64-66). In the linguistics department there happened to be a sociolinguist who was Japanese, and discussed the topic in relation to Japan as well, further sparking Yoshie's interest (transcript 3, lines 63-64).

As a result of her experiences in the linguistics department, Yoshie switched her major to Linguistics, with a minor in Political Science. Her area of study within the department was sociolinguistics, with a focus on bilingualism and language policy (transcript 3, line 69). In Yoshie's words, "I thought Canada was a great place to study that. And (my university) had a great Canadian linguist who could speak Japanese and had had a Fulbright scholarship to Japan" (transcript 3, lines 70-71).

Yoshie applied to the MA program, and asked this individual to be her advisor. In the program, Yoshie found that her prior education and experience in Japan were drawn upon and valued, where as in the political science program, "This was not the case for me. They only talked about Western theories and values" (transcript 3, lines 76-77). Yoshie greatly enjoyed the department. After completing a thesis on the subject of "bilingual education for Brazilians in Japan" (transcript 3, line 81), Yoshie immediately entered the Ph.D. program. At first hesitant to do so, Yoshie completed the program on the advice of her advisor and friends: "they told me that perhaps it is better to get a Ph.D. to get a job at a university and continue research" (transcript 3, lines 85-88). Yoshie's dissertation was on the transcultural nature of katakana and the way in which words were perceived and used by internationals (transcript 3, lines 82-83).

During her tenure in Canada, Yoshie's worldview in terms of language, culture and identity shifted profoundly "through my interaction in the department, as well as with people in my immediate surroundings from diverse backgrounds" (transcript 4, lines 100-101). Yoshie describes the change in her worldview in Canada in the following manner: "While in Canada, my sense of international borders disappeared. People, ideas, etc. flow freely in daily life… I had a fundamental shift in the way I think, away from categorizing people by nationality and culture" (transcript 4, lines 88-91). The critical lens through which Yoshie views her field was shaped by her department, which "was really interested in native languages in North America-language rights, etc." (transcript 4, lines 93-94). She believes the department's awareness of issues related to social, cultural and economic capital "translated to our academic environment" (transcript 4, line 96), wherein Yoshie felt she was valued. Yoshie came to believe that in the field of linguistics "nearly everything linguistics-

related is analyzed from a Chomskyian, North American or British perspective" (transcript 4, lines 89-90). Yoshie felt, as a result, "a disconnect between the context I was from and the content in linguistics" (transcript 3, lines 90-91). She was thankful that her department provided an alternative perspective. As a result of her experiences, Yoshie came to believe that "anyone can own a language. We construct culture- we put barriers around what things are 'Japanese' for example" (transcript 4, lines 64-65). Referring to Japan and the construct of "uchi-soto" which establishes the notion of a firm separation between insider and outsider in social and political terms, Yoshie asserts, "Uchi-soto is not friendly to border crossing, but crossing linguistic and cultural borders is not deficiency to me" (transcript 4, lines 55-56).

After thirteen years in Canada, Yoshie returned to Japan. Due to work, her husband decided to remain in Canada. She and her husband agreed to fly and visit each other during school breaks. Her return to Japan was due in part to the fact that she "realized my parents were aging… They asked me to come back" (transcript 4, lines 1-2). This was not the only reason, however. Confronted with the fact that "getting a position as a linguist in Canada was tough to do" (transcript 4, lines 2-3) and not thrilled with considering the U.S. as an option (though counseled to do so), Yoshie decided on a move to Japan with the support of her advisor (transcript 4, lines 3-6). Yoshie was curious to see what changes had occurred in Japan, as at the time "the government was starting to pursue internationalization" (transcript 4, lines 7-8). Upon her return, however, Yoshie felt little to nothing had changed.

Armed with her newly minted Ph.D., Yoshie found part-time work in the Tokyo area (transcript 4, lines 176-177). Yoshie quickly began to see herself as an outsider and a threat, an example of which manifested during one job interview: "I went to do a teaching demonstration for a tenured job- I did it in English a people were scared-

they are scared of new theory and approaches- I was viewed as a threat professionally. I can speak English comfortable with confidence, and I have content knowledge" (transcript 4, lines 16-20). In terms of theory, Yoshie noted, "Theory is behind in Japan. They know Chomsky, but other more progressive perspectives and approaches are rare" (transcript 4, lines 12-13). Yoshie believes that when her Japanese colleagues evaluated her linguistic and academic knowledge, "they were measuring themselves and me against a Native Speaker, whoever they think that is" (transcript 4, lines 20-21). Yet Yoshie's own perspective of language, culture and identity challenged such a view of language, culture and identity.

The power of the NS construct in Japanese academia quickly became visible to Yoshie. This manifested, for Yoshie, in the authority both vested in and barred from Japanese and Native Speaker teachers of English. With regard to NSs, Yoshie noted that, "Native speakers are brought to Japan to play a role. They are largely hired because of their color and status as native speakers. They often lack appropriate context-related education and experience..." (transcript 4, lines 131-134). Yoshie had been quite bothered when Canadian colleagues of hers had been hired as Assistant Language Teachers in Japan: "I was mad. My qualifications were better, but because I am not a native speaker I wouldn't be hired… that happens here" (transcript 4, lines 134-136).

Yoshie feels that this privileging of the NS, "contributes to a de-professionalization of ELT in Japan" (transcript 4, line 137). Yoshie first realized when working in Tokyo that Japanese and NS teachers, "live in separate worlds" (transcript 4, line 130), and that "both sides are not willing to cross borders in general" (transcript 4, line 151). Yoshie felt that NSs were not willing to give up their linguistic and cultural authority, while in a similar fashion the Japanese professors

were unwilling to do so with regard to their status as owners of the Japanese language and culture (transcript 4, lines 151-152). Unlike her Japanese colleagues who had studied abroad, yet still considered themselves Japanese, Yoshie felt "changed and I don't see myself that way. I am just a human being" (transcript 4, lines 46-47). Yet Yoshie felt she was forced to choose between being Japanese and being Other (transcript 4, lines 30-31). As a result, she made a conscious decision to "play being Japanese. People believe I am Japanese" (transcript 4, line 32). Yoshie describes playing being Japanese in the following manner: "Even though I think in a different way, I don't EVER reveal my perspective entirely. I have never done so to my Japanese colleagues; only to my research partner- a NS- who thinks as I do. It is stressful do so…" (transcript 4, lines 36-38). Yoshie notes that in order to play Japanese "in one sense, you have to follow societal expectations. If you don't follow those rules, you are not Japanese. So, maybe I am trying to follow the rules to survive in Japan" (transcript 4, lines 51-52), adding that she has, "learned how to play the game" (transcript 4, lines 52-53).

Following two years in Tokyo, Yoshie was invited to apply for a job in western Japan, which she eventually received. In her formal introduction to faculty, she half-jokingly told them, "I am half North American because of the experiences and education I had" (transcript 4, lines 26-27). After doing so, she was told that, "they had noticed that" (transcript 4, line 28), which Yoshie interpreted as a gentle reminder of her place in the department. New to the department, Yoshie was assigned duties that greatly limited her position and influence, including "the oratorical contest for students and the party planning committee" (transcript 4, line 114). This reinforced for Yoshie the necessity of playing being Japanese (transcript 4, line 38).

Part of playing being Japanese, according to Yoshie, involves "being patient" (transcript 4, line 38). The dominant worldview in her department is grounded in the NS construct (transcript 4, line 71). All of the professors in the department, in Yoshie's words, "are targeting the idealized NS" (transcript 4, line 71). This, according to Yoshie, completely contradicts her worldview (transcript 4, line 176): "The English students acquire does not have to be such. Students need the tools to be able to successfully communicate with others around the world" (transcript 4, lines 73-74). Yoshie places great stress on the role of context in ELT: "Practically, context is important. So first, my students are most likely going to use English with other Asians" (transcript 4, lines 79-80). She laments the fact that in academia "all the non-Japanese teachers are Native Speakers, as the dominant academic and social view-that English is the property of white North America and the U.K." (transcript 4, lines 80-82). As a result, Yoshie contends, "Japanese people believe English speakers are white…" (transcript 4, line 84). This leads to the outcome that, "even though many people from around the world speak English fluently, in Japan they cannot get a job" (transcript 4, lines 82-83).

As per the NS construct, according to Yoshie, there are clearly defined roles between who the Japanese and NS teachers are and what they are capable of doing academically and administratively in her department (transcript 4, lines 139-140). In Yoshie's opinion, however, "The best person for a job, Japanese or non-Japanese, would be trained, qualified, active learners about context, interested in contextualizing their language teaching" (transcript 4, lines 144-145). In other words: "Any teacher, whether NS-ing or NNS-ing can do the job as long as they possess and actively pursue knowledge related to the context where students are" (transcript 4, lines 196-197). Critically, therefore Yoshie is "challenging culture and identity, language

ownership and how English is taught" (transcript 4, lines 77-78). To share such a perspective, however, would endanger Yoshie's standing in the department: "Older professors would be threatened by me if I talked about what I see or about change- I would be challenging their authority as professionals and as Japanese" (transcript 4, lines 104-106). [35] Yoshie notes that if she threatened such authority, the consequences would likely manifest as follows: "I would probably not be promoted- I wouldn't be fired, but I would be marginalized and kept out of influence" (transcript 4, lines 112-113). Patience, again, is Yoshie's active tool for agency: "The only thing that saves me is that these people are old- they are thinking about retirement- that gives me space. Patience is the key. I have hope" (transcript 4, lines 189-190). Yoshie is "waiting for older people to exit so I will be able to participate in departmental change" (transcript 4, lines 38-39). Yoshie believes her patience has paid off recently: "I have been put in charge of our department's exchange program (with a university in the U.S.) and I have been given courses that I can shape and influence" (transcript 4, lines 115-116).

Though Yoshie "never attempt(s) to affect change with teachers directly" (transcript 4, line 103), in committees and meetings Yoshie has been "sussing out who people are, looking patiently for ways to connect with others" (transcript 4, lines 167-168). She has connected with a NS in her workplace, with whom she shares a similar vision and similar research interests (transcript 4, line 169). That, in her place of work "is rather unheard of and discouraged- for a Japanese and non-Japanese to work together in such a way" (transcript 4, lines 43-44). She is collaborating and publishing with this individual in research and writing on the subject of challenging

[35] When prompted, Yoshie stated firmly that she did not believe her status as female was a factor in the way she was perceived by her colleagues, nor a hindrance to her in terms of agency: "Being female is not a barrier, nor is it a barrier to agency for change" (transcript 4, line 192).

the NS construct (transcript 4, line 42). Doing so beyond her department is rather safe, as no one inquires into her research (transcript 4, line 170). She has also formed relationships with three younger Japanese colleagues, noting that their age allows her to approach them more easily (transcript 4, lines 103-104). In the interest of forming productive relationships, Yoshie "chats with people" in probing ways (transcript 4, lines 159-160) and "looks for things in common to build upon" (transcript 4, line 171). In Yoshie's opinion, "people who are tolerant- not necessarily sharing the same worldview as me" are people with whom she believes she can affect change; people who may not necessarily share her beliefs, but are open to them (transcript 4, lines 157-158).

The classroom is another locale in which Yoshie shares her perspective and asserts agency (transcript 4, line 55). At times, in her interaction with students, Yoshie explicitly tells them, "they are human beings and they can connect with each other without barriers. I do not tell them to be 'good' Japanese" (transcript 4, lines 57-58). She says this, as she believes, "there is a barrier between how Japanese people perceive themselves, and their relationship with other cultures and languages- people use 'ware-ware'[36]- I believe it is exclusive and I don't like or use it" (transcript 4, lines 59-61). Yoshie wants her students to challenge the nature of being Japanese and a Japanese learner of English. She works hard to instill in her students a sense of language ownership and to counter the notion of a NNS as deficient.

Though working within a system shaped by a worldview very different from her own (transcript 4, lines 118-119), Yoshie's enthusiasm is not dampened: "It is frustrating, but I still see opportunity for change. That is what keeps me going" (transcript 4, line 120). Though she feels she may be a "visible target" if her

[36] "Ware-Ware" can be translated as a collective 'we.'

colleagues placed her under more meticulous scrutiny (transcript 4, line 179), her worldview is, "what makes me happy" (transcript 4, line 180).

Hiroyuki's Narrative

Hiroyuki is a self-described "sixty-something professor teaching English" (transcript 5, line 2), "born and brought up in Japan" (transcript 6, line 58), and "a man of few words- I prefer things that way" (transcript 5, lines 2-3). Hiroyuki is "from a family of farmers" (transcript 5, lines 21-22) who have lived for countless generations in rural west-central Japan. Hiroyuki's language learning journey began in his high school days, when he was first exposed to English and immediately found he loved the subject (transcript 5, line 33). As only basic introductory English classes were offered at his school, however, Hiroyuki made the decision to travel to a city nearly two hours away to take classes in the evening (transcript 5, lines 33-35). According to Hiroyuki, his high school was not a typical school in Japan: "Actually, my high school was not a school to prepare me to go to college. It was a kind of technical high school. Maybe 90% of the grads would get a job and not go to uni" (transcript 5, lines 29-31). During the course of his evening studies, Hiroyuki grew ever fonder of English; time, money and effort to attend classes was well worth sacrificing (transcript 5, lines 35-38).

Upon graduating from high school, Hiroyuki decided to go to university, making him the first person in his family to ever do so (transcript 5, lines 23-24). Hiroyuki made the choice based largely on the advice of his older sister: "My sister, after graduating from high school, got a job at a bank. She saw many colleagues and she found out that a college degree was a must in Japan, so she strongly recommended that I go to college" (transcript 5, lines 26-28). As a result, Hiroyuki entered university in central Japan to study Economics, a field that he believed would

help him both find employment in the future and study English (transcript 5, lines 4-5). During this period, however, Hiroyuki's burgeoning interest in English prompted him to make the decision to study overseas and specifically, in England (transcript 5, lines 6-7). England was a place that he had always had an interest in visiting, and studying in an English institution would be a pragmatic way of getting himself there. Hiroyuki's journey from rural Japan to a world he had only visualized in his dreams, though surreal to his friends and family, "made me feel comfortable and peaceful"; like the natural next step forward (transcript 5, lines 44-45).

Hiroyuki therefore left his Economics program early and immediately enrolled in a university in central England and began a Bachelor's program in Linguistics. The course was four years long, and included one year abroad that he spent studying Japanese learners of English in Japan (transcript 5, lines 11-12). Hiroyuki greatly enjoyed studying linguistics. This was due, in part, to the opportunity Hiroyuki had to reflect on his identity and proficiency in his mother tongue, which he had always viewed as inferior (transcript 5, lines 45-46). After completing the program, Hiroyuki then entered a short program in an "international house" in London, where he briefly studied ELT (transcript 5, lines 16-17). Teaching was an avenue, Hiroyuki surmised, that would allow him to continue to connect his personal and academic pleasures with his need for employment. After six and a half years in England, he then made the decision to return to Japan to look for work (transcript 5, line 53).

Hiroyuki's time in England had a profound effect on his identity. He became, as he succinctly described, "a person who lives and thinks across contexts" (transcript 6, lines 58-59). One example was in his relationship with his wife, whom he had met while studying in England. After returning to Japan, his family was surprised to find him performing duties normally connected with females, such as cleaning, washing

the dishes and clothes (transcript 5, lines 53-56). Hiroyuki "felt it was a very natural thing to do, but I realized not many Japanese people would do that" (transcript 5, lines 55-56). These kinds of interactions with family and friends caused him to have "culture shock" (transcript 5, line 53). In England, Hiroyuki had "felt it would be alright to be me however I wanted to be me" (transcript 5, lines 57-58). This feeling endured after Hiroyuki's culture shock subsided. Before leaving for England, Hiroyuki "was very much influenced by what other people did or said to me. I did not have a backbone. But that changed" (transcript 5, lines 59-61).

Hiroyuki's experience in England greatly shaped his view of the place where he was born and had grown up. According to Hiroyuki, "When I lived in Japan (previously), I didn't like the countryside- the green- everything was surrounded by mountains and paddy fields- I really hated that. But now, that's the thing I really value" (transcript 6, lines 63-65). Hiroyuki attributed this shift in the way he viewed his hometown, to his ability to step outside and reflect upon his identity. Hiroyuki no longer felt bound by the social status connected to the place he was from, noting that he was "Japanese in my own way" (transcript 6, line 68). In his words, Hiroyuki notes, "I have found good things about where I am from. I feel I can see things with a little more perspective than before- more than someone who has not had such experiences" (transcript 6, lines 65-67). In addition, Hiroyuki came to value his "Japaneseness," though such was on his terms (transcript 6, line 60).

Finding a teaching job back in Japan proved difficult for Hiroyuki, as he did not have a graduate degree. He therefore entered a B.A. program in central Japan via "hennyuu" (transferring), doing so as he did not feel entirely prepared to enter a Japanese graduate school without experiencing upper-level undergraduate classes (transcript 5, lines 19-20). After completing the program, Hiroyuki entered graduate

school at the same institution to study ELT. Graduating with a Master's degree in ELT, Hiroyuki taught in central Japan for ten years, first in a part-time position for one year, followed by a three years in a full-time job at a junior college and nine years at a university (transcript 5, lines 81-84). Throughout this period Hiroyuki had desired to teach English to English majors, and held out hope that he might be able to teach ELT-related content courses (transcript 5, lines 85-86). A chance to teach such students manifested, when a former university classmate of Hiroyuki's gave him an introduction and recommendation for a position at a local university that would grant him tenure (transcript 5, lines 86-87). Hiroyuki was hired for the job, a position he has held for nearly twenty years.

Hiroyuki entered his new workplace eager to begin teaching. Finally, it seemed, he would be able to focus on content that intrigued him and that he desired to share his worldview with his students. This manifested for Hiroyuki in two ways: first, in his focus on intelligibility not on native-like knowledge or production- "My emphasis is on students' language production- not on the receptive. I am interested in students expressing themselves with intelligibility- not in terms of being understood by native speakers, but by people around the world" (transcript 5, lines 63-66), and second, on language ownership in a manner which challenges the notion of English as the exclusive property of the NS (transcript 5, lines 67-68). In addition, Hiroyuki hoped to challenge the roles Japanese and NSs played in the department. Writing and speaking courses were traditionally assigned to the NSs, while grammar and listening classes were assigned to Japanese professors. Hiroyuki desired to teach writing, at the very least.

Things began well for Hiroyuki, as he was surprisingly "assigned and able to teach writing for several years" (transcript 5, lines 90-91). This, he attributed in part

to his willingness to take on what other teachers perceived as a larger workload (transcript 5, lines 89-90). Suddenly, however multiple years of teaching writing, "someone decided to stop Japanese teachers from teaching writing. Every year I requested writing courses, but they refused to give me a chance to teach" (transcript 5, lines 91-93). Within the department "all the production-related courses were deemed the property of the NSs" (transcript 5, line 96). In Hiroyuki's opinion, the temporary ebb in the power of the NS construct had ended: "Many people had a hand in shaping the prevailing belief that Japanese couldn't or shouldn't teach such courses- they believed that production-related courses were not good for Japanese- they believed in a NS framework" (transcript 5, lines 97-99). The power of the NS construct "was an unsaid, unwritten thing" (transcript 5, lines 94-95) that Hiroyuki felt he could not formally challenge: "I know the people who decide who should be teaching are not prepare to hear… their minds are not open" (transcript 5, lines 104-106).

As the years passed by, Hiroyuki felt extremely isolated from his peers. This, however, was something that his colleagues not only acknowledged (transcript 6, line 13), but embraced (transcript 6, line 14). People exist in their "own worlds" (transcript 6, lines 14-15), contended Hiroyuki, wherein they are simultaneously isolated and actively isolating themselves to preserve their status in their academic setting (transcript 6, lines 15-16). Hiroyuki describes the reasons for this multi-faceted isolation as rooted in an intertwining of the NS construct (transcript 5, lines 99-100) and a Confucian sense of status and knowledge transfer in relationships (transcript 6, lines 49-55).

Hiroyuki believes the power of and perpetuation of the NS construct in Japan instills in his colleagues the desire to "put up barriers around us. We don't want other people to come into our garden and we don't want to go into other people's

gardens" (transcript 5, lines 69-71). The constant fear of appearing deficient in terms of linguistic and cultural knowledge, in Hiroyuki's opinion, keeps teachers from sharing with others (transcript 5, lines 78-79). The power of the NS construct is compounded, according to Hiroyuki, by the Confucian notion of knowledge transfer and seniority in relationships, that influences approaches to education in Japan (transcript 6, lines 49-55). For Hiroyuki, authority as a teacher "generally comes from the content you have studied and not teacher training" (transcript 6, lines 54-55). "People do literature and linguistics focusing on the NS, not teaching. They are not trained. We say (in Japan) that teachers teach without any license" (transcript 6, lines 50-52). As deficient language users, according the NS construct, the status of such professors is inherently threatened. As "having to show one's cards and identity-disclosing our weaknesses- is a threat" (transcript 5, lines 75-77), Hiroyuki therefore argues that isolation serves as a sort of protection from any challenging of his colleagues' personal and professional authority by their peers, whether Japanese or from elsewhere. In such a context, professors are drawing upon the authority they are afforded by the NS construct as owners of the Japanese language and Japanese culture, while they seek to minimize the power of the NS construct as related to English (transcript 6, lines 67-80).

Realizing that "my opinion is not popular" (transcript 5, line 103) with relation to challenging the NS construct, Hiroyuki has decided not to formally "talk about this kind of topic- this is the first time, really" with colleagues in his place of work (transcript 5, lines 103-104). Though he has built one relationship with a younger colleague wherein they exchange ideas (transcript 5, lines 71-74), Hiroyuki has chosen to focus his efforts in other venues. The setting wherein Hiroyuki feels he can most easily be himself and share his worldview, is the classroom (transcript 6, lines 1-

2). Hiroyuki's primary desire is to provide students with an alternative view of language ownership and use: "When I teach pronunciation, for instance, I tell students there are a number of ways to speak- being a NS is not necessary. I tell them my classes do not aim to make them NSs- it is not necessary. I tell them that even in they speak in a way that others think of (derogatorily) as Japanese, I tell them it is like their own 'spice" (transcript 6, lines 2-6). He also shaped his courses around the notion that, "The aim of learning language is to be prepared for contextual use of the language, and not to simply have abstract knowledge" (transcript 6, lines 27-28). Though Hiroyuki believes "It is not necessary to become native-like" (transcript 6, line 6), he recognizes that his students "may believe this is necessary and may therefore misinterpret my message, thinking the class is lower quality" (transcript 6, lines 7-8). As a result, Hiroyuki emphasizes that, "we have to be aware of what students expect- what the other teachers expect- even if it is not what the students need" (transcript 5, lines 108-109).

Hiroyuki is also actively participating in professional activities beyond his university. Though not presenting, "I am attending conferences related to my interests" (transcript 6, lines 31-32). In addition, he is a "member of a writing group- we are developing practical rubrics for writing classes that rethink what 'standards' are; that are meaningful to students" (transcript 6, lines 32-34). In this group Hiroyuki says he is "able to share my perspective on language ownership and language use" (transcript 6, lines 38-39). The group, comprised of professors from around the region where he works, is seeking to develop a handbook for university teachers of English; Hiroyuki dreams of using it in his school (transcript 6, lines 39-44).

Hiroyuki emphasizes the fact that despite living and working within a system dominated by the NS construct and the macro discourses that perpetuate it and give it shape, "I have found ways to create space- to be active and share. There are always ways to find your way- your place" (transcript 6, lines 45-46). As a member of his department, that place is the classroom. As a scholar, that place is beyond his place of work, as "there's always something outside the place you are in" (transcript 6, lines 46-47).

Mitsuyo's Narrative

Mitsuyo is a fifty-something "Japanese NNEST at the university level" (transcript 7, lines 2-3), who had been living and working in west-central Japan. She has just moved overseas as a result of a work assignment given to her husband. Mitsuyo's relationship with English began at the age of 12, when she was in junior high school in a town in rural western Japan (transcript 7, lines 7-8). Though feeling distant from the language, Mitsuyo quite enjoyed studying. Then, in her second year of junior high, "I had a unique teacher who could speak English quite well" (transcript 7, lines 9-10). This teacher, according to Mitsuyo, "used English as a tool of communication, even in class, though listen and repeat was dominant (at the time)" (transcript 7, lines 10-11). As a result of her time in this teacher's class, Mitsuyo felt that "I could express something in English as in Japanese" (transcript 7, lines 11-12).

Though she saw English as a foreign language, Mitsuyo began to envision the language as a tool to connect with other people and other worlds (transcript 7, lines 12-13). This was fuelled, in particular, by events that occurred beyond the classroom. One day, Mitsuyo's inspirational teacher invited her and a friend to visit some Mormon missionaries with whom the teacher had an ongoing social relationship (transcript 7, lines 15-17). This teacher often took students who liked studying

English to a local Mormon church, though she was not Mormon herself (transcript 7, lines 14-15). "That experience," according to Mitsuyo, "was my first encounter with native speakers of English. We could talk- we listened to one missionary's personal history. I think I could understand 20-30%. It was a very nice experience" (transcript 7, lines 17-20). Following that day, the teacher invited Mitsuyo to her house 3-4 times when the teacher hosted guests from abroad. These individuals visited the teacher's house as, "My teacher's husband was a civil servant, working for (our) prefecture. He was in the division of international relationships. He sometimes had guests from other countries. In the prefecture, his office's job was to internationalize people. International influences were rare in a place like (my prefecture)" (transcript 7, lines 25-29). As a result of these experiences, Mitsuyo gained confidence in speaking to and connecting with others, though such chances were few and far between. When in high school, Mitsuyo grew rather bold in approaching the limited number of internationals who passed through her town: "Every time on the street I saw a foreigner I spoke to them… I would ask them if I could speak to them for a while. Most of them were very happy to talk to me in English, because they were very isolated" (transcript 7, lines 33-35).

After graduating from high school, Mitsuyo decided to go to university in west-central Japan. Rather than choosing to study English, she opted for Burmese: "I liked English very much but somewhere in my mind, because Japan is so Americanized and everyone is looking to the West –'other countries' in Japan means 'America'- (*laughs*) globalization means America—I wanted to study something different. Japan is located in Asia. Even though Japan is in Asia, we don't know much about Asia. I thought that if Japan is going to be a leader amongst Asian nations, we should know more about Asian countries" (transcript 7, lines 36-42). Mitsuyo added that, "There is

good and bad about westernization, but Japan needs to pay more attention to Asia" (transcript 7, lines 48-49). Mitsuyo chose Burmese specifically due to the fact that to her knowledge, "Burmese is probably the least known Asian language- in Japan there is only one school with Burmese in the department" (transcript 7, lines 44-46). Nearly ready to graduate, Mitsuyo realized that during the era in which she was studying, finding employment related to her Burmese studies would prove difficult (transcript 7, lines 51-52). It was at that time that "English then came back into my life" (transcript 7, line 53). In Mitsuyo's Burmese program, four girls had decided to take English classes in order to get teaching licenses, believing that such would provide them with security, job-wise (transcript 7, lines 53-55). Mitsuyo "followed them. I didn't mean to become a teacher of English…" (transcript 7, lines 55-56).

Immediately after graduation, Mitsuyo took an employment exam in order to be hired as a teacher in her home prefecture. After passing the test, Mitsuyo headed to a small high school in a mountainous area. Mitsuyo completely lacked confidence, not as an English speaker, but with relation to her ability to teach: "I was not really prepared. Giving a teacher's license to someone like me was not good. I was not trained" (transcript 7, lines 58-59). As a teacher, Mitsuyo "really did not know what to do… I felt really isolated and I thought I needed to study how to teach." (transcript 7, lines 60-63). Following three years of teaching, Mitsuyo capitalized on an opportunity to go to graduate school through an in-service education program of which her prefecture was a participating member (transcript 7, lines 64-65). She was sent to a university in west-central Japan, where during her studies she met her future husband (transcript 7, lines 65-67). Mitsuyo subsequently returned to her prefecture to teach, as she owed a few years of service in exchange for her graduate scholarship. In love, however, she quit her position after one year (transcript 7, lines 73-75).

Mitsuyo and her new husband then moved to northern Japan, where her husband was both from and had found work. Her husband taught for a total of five years at the junior high and high school level, before securing a full-time position at a local university (transcript 7, lines 76-78). Throughout that period Mitsuyo, "taught English privately at my home. I taught junior and senior high school students" (transcript 7, line 79), while she gave birth to and raised two boys. This was her only connection to the language personally and professionally, as "My husband and me never speak English together… English is something we used when we needed to" (transcript 7, lines 79-80), and "I did not teach my two boys English" (transcript 7, line 90). English, for Mitsuyo, "was a profession- it was not part of my daily life" (transcript 7, line 90).

Mitsuyo formally returned to teaching a few years later, one year after her second son was born. At that time, part-time courses at a junior college were offered to her husband. Not wanting to take on any further classes, however, he offered Mitsuyo as an alternate. "That was the beginning of my second career" (transcript 7, line 88). It was at that time that Mitsuyo "started to think about the notion of 'nativeness' with relation to English" (transcript 7, lines 90-91). In particular, Mitsuyo became interested in the notion of her role as a NNEST: "In the junior college, there were many NSs. I was thinking about what I was supposed to/expected to do as a non-native speaker of English. And I thought that I would likely teach differently from those NSs. That's how I got interested in roles" (transcript 7, lines 91-94). Mitsuyo came to believe that "Japanese teachers could do 'this' and NSs can do 'this,' and that both have advantages and can compensate for each other in order to build community" (transcript 7, lines 95-96). The boundaries around NEST and

NNEST roles, however, Mitsuyo found very "difficult" to define both at that time and in the present (transcript 7, line 99).

A few years later, Mitsuyo and her family moved to south-central Japan, where her husband had received a full-professorship. Mitsuyo was "really lucky" (transcript 7, line 168) to find part-time work at the university level, as a teacher had recently left one of the two universities in the area. Mitsuyo taught and continued raising her boys for another 5 years, until she eventually made a major decision: to enter a doctoral program (transcript 7, lines 169-170). Entering a Ph.D. program was a large step, but Mitsuyo made an even bigger choice: to complete the degree in the U.K. This was driven by her discovery of Vivian Cook's idea of multicompetence (transcript 7, line 178), which she encountered in an article given to her by her husband (transcript 8, line 21).[37] Multicompetence interested Mitsuyo for a few different reasons. First, the worldview underpinning multicompetence was one that Mitsuyo interpreted to run counter to the Chomskyian universalism she had studied in her Master's program. Mitsuyo did not identify herself with the Chomsykian approach to language (transcript 7, line 172). In addition, multicompetence seemed to be in line with her thinking that, "people are different when they speak different languages" (transcript 7, lines 172-173). This interest in multicompetence was not one through a postmodern lens focusing on hybridized identity (transcript 7, line 199), but "rather in terms of how people change and can understand each other" (transcript 7, lines 182-183). Mitsuyo had a lived experience that highlighted her perspective: "walking around in the street with two British people, we noticed that their green and our (Japanese) green are a little different. We could understand by explaining it through language.

[37] See chapter two for a brief overview of multicompetence.

Even if we are different, still we have room to understand and change" (transcript 7, lines 183-186).

Inspired by multicompetence, Mitsuyo enrolled in a program in England wherein the topic was a popular focus of study. She hadn't been looking for a degree; rather, she "just wanted to continue learning and how to do research" (transcript 8, line 2). Mitsuyo did not choose to go to England because she thought she had to do so to be a good teacher of English (transcript 8, lines 5-6), but rather for two reasons: "I didn't think anyone could guide me here on the topic" (transcript 8, line 7), and "I thought it would give me benefits- to give me the chance to experience culture, living in an English-speaking environment, etc." (transcript 8, lines 11-12). Over the course of seven years Mitsuyo worked on her degree part-time, spending a few weeks a year in England (transcript 7, lines 226-232). Mitsuyo was still greatly interested in differences between NSs and NNSs, and found her perspective on the topic evolving (transcript 7, lines 217-219). Mitsuyo began to challenge elements of the NS construct she had never questioned before, such as referring to an idealized NS as the target for teaching pronunciation (transcript 7, lines 228-229). At her university in Britain, Mitsuyo studied under non-native English-speaking professors for the first time, and found it to be "interesting and very fun! I wish Japan would be like that someday…" (transcript 7, line 158). Mitsuyo concluded that, "non-Japanese non-native speakers of English, having overcome difficulty, can be good role models. And students can become more comfortable with different Englishes" (transcript 8, lines 76-77). In addition, Mitsuyo studied under NS teachers, with the likes of whom she had only experienced one class during her entire English language learning experience in Japan (transcript 8, lines 13-15).

Mitsuyo's worldview towards language acquisition, use and instruction took its present shape during this period. Her studies "made me feel comfortable about my English. Before that, I always used to think about my not perfect English- I only paid attention to my lack of proficiency. Now, that has changed. Being a multicompetent speaker of English makes me feel more comfortable" (transcript 8, lines 150-153). Multicompetence, Mitsuyo argues, "challenges the interlanguage perspective of a learner's language proficiency" viewing the second language learner's production as deficient (transcript 8, lines 236-237). Mitsuyo feels, "more confident saying I don't know something or how a NS would say something" (transcript 8, lines 159-160); that, "we don't have to be like Americans or British people" (transcript 8, lines 165-166). Intelligibility is now the concern for Mitsuyo: "As long as we can understand each other, that is what matters" (transcript 7, line 164). In terms of instruction, Mitsuyo believes teachers "should ask themselves who their students are going to interact with in the future and what kinds of jobs the students may get and how they are prepared for their future jobs. Teachers should think about that" (transcript 8, lines 183-185). Mitsuyo concluded, "It's not a question of Native or Non-Native, but rather of who is best prepared to teach English- that is the question" (transcript 7, lines 199-200).

Mitsuyo became greatly troubled by the expert status granted to NSs in Japan, as linguistic and cultural authorities (transcript 8, lines 111-113), and the effect of this privileging of an idealized NS upon curriculum development and choices related to classroom goals and materials (transcript 8, lines 41-44). In her opinion, the problem was not only related to the hiring of untrained NSs hired by virtue of their native-speaking status. Mitsuyo also included trained NESTs, asserting: "I think native teachers who are well-trained and experienced, but don't know about the Japanese

context, they are not professionals. If I don't know what my students' everyday life is like- their economic background, social status, etc.- without knowing about that- about context- how can I teach Japanese students?" (transcript 8, lines 119-122). Yet despite this perspective, Mitsuyo still saw a role for native speaker teachers (transcript 8, line 130). Mitsuyo believed students "can see different views- can widen their views" by studying with NSs (transcript 8, lines 132-133). Having NESTs and NNESTs from other countries, would offer students a chance to experience "international society" (transcript 8, lines 142-143). Mitsuyo also believed it necessary to move beyond the almost exclusive hiring of white westerners (and in particular white males) when hiring NSs, though she acknowledged that Japanese society generally placed the ownership of English in the hands of such individuals (transcript 8, lines 145-150).

Mitsuyo acknowledged an unresolved tension between her belief that, "It's not a question of Native or Non-Native, but rather of who is best prepared to teach English- that is the question" (transcript 7, lines 199-200), and her assertion that there are static roles for teachers- Japanese, non-Japanese NNSs and NSs, the borders of which should not and in many cases cannot be crossed (transcript 8, lines 213-217). On the one hand, Mitsuyo argues that contextualized teaching requires teachers to have a working sociocultural and linguistic knowledge of that context, and be able to connect with students both personally and academically (transcript 7, lines 122-125). Mitsuyo argues that being able to speak the students' native language allows teachers "to understand more" about their students' lives both within and beyond the classroom (transcript 7, lines 125-129). On the other hand, however, Mitsuyo asserts that NS, non-Japanese NNESTs and Japanese NNESTs "have their own roles- they can never replace or become each other- they are different" (transcript 8, lines 135-136).

According to Mitsuyo, the role of the NS involves serving as an example of someone who "uses English quite naturally" (transcript 8, lines 62-63) and does not fall back on Japanese as a tool to negotiate meaning (transcript 8, lines 63-64). NSs should "play their roles as NSs and not speak Japanese" (transcript 8, lines 105-106), or at the very least greatly limit its use (transcript 8, lines 110-111). This is due to the fact that, "if they speak too much, students will depend on the Japanese" (transcript 7, line 105). Mitsuyo argues that NSs should provide a classroom experience in which they "negotiate meaning with students in English" (transcript 8, lines 120-121). NSs, in Mitsuyo's opinion, should have a working knowledge of Japanese for "administration work" (transcript 8, line 199) and meetings (transcript 8, lines 243-244). Mitsuyo feels that as non-Japanese, these individuals must be careful in terms of how they participate in such activities, as they may be perceived as "threatening" (transcript 8, line 211), as they "may not understand the Japanese way of doing things" hypothetically or in fact (transcript 8, lines 208-209). As with NSs, non-Japanese NNESTs can contribute to students' exposure to different Englishes (transcript 8, lines 77-83). In addition, they "can be very clear role models for learners" (transcript 8, line 74), "having overcome difficulty" learning English (transcript 8, line 76). Mitsuyo notes, however, that the elements of the roles she envisions do not aid contextualized language teaching, other than providing "variety" (transcript 7, lines 139-140).

In contrast, Japanese teachers of English for Mitsuyo, "know and can understand" students (transcript 8, line 65). Teachers and students have a "shared Japaneseness" (transcript 8, line 72) that allows teachers to connect deeply with the learners in the classroom, and affords them great insight into what students need. Japanese teachers "can easily anticipate the major obstructions of learning English

and make meaning clear" (transcript 8, lines 85-86) by using Japanese. Mitsuyo feels that many Japanese teachers are "just being lazy and it's easier to use Japanese," (transcript 8, line 93) though she firmly believes that there are times that students cannot understand without the use of Japanese (transcript 8, lines 93-99). Code switching, from Mitsuyo's perspective, is a valuable tool for Japanese teachers to employ: "we can quickly say the meaning (of something) and go on to the next thing (transcript 8, lines 122-123). She struggles with the idea that non-Japanese teachers would be or should be capable of doing so (transcript 8, lines 100-105), however, arguing that such teachers can "complement" each other by playing their roles (transcript 8, line 136). Therefore, if a Japanese teacher uses Japanese in the classroom and students rely on Japanese, that is acceptable, as part of the Japanese teacher's role is that of Japanese speaker (transcript 7, line 107-109).

Mitsuyo notes that her perspective on the NS/NNS binary and on contextualized language teaching is extremely complex (transcript 8, line 37). She concedes that her worldview may be interpreted as a desire to deconstruct the NS/NNS binary, while simultaneously erecting a Japanese/non-Japanese binary in terms of who is theoretically capable of serving students in the Japanese context (transcript 8, lines 31-35). In doing so, she points to her doctoral advisor–an individual who has spent a lifetime challenging the NS construct- as an example of someone experiencing similar feelings: "He himself laughs at himself for tearing down the NS/NNS binary and then rebuilding it in little ways- for example commenting on and criticizing the English he sees and expects to see in the local newspaper" (transcript 8, lines 27-29). Yet Mitsuyo is adamant in her desire for community and common vision (transcript 7, lines 195-196), as professors are "teaching to the same goal" (transcript 7, line 109).

During her doctoral studies, Mitsuyo began to transition away from an explicit focus on the NS/NNS binary, grounded in her dissertation advisor's strong warning that, "the topic is dangerous" (transcript 8, line 260), especially in the context which she had come from. She did, however, write a paper on NNEST issues for a journal in Japan both to share the issue with the greater ELT community in Japan and to gauge responses to it (transcript 8, lines 176-177). The "taboo" (transcript 8, lines 219-222), nature of the NS/NNS binary is rooted, for Mitsuyo, in a number of issues. First, is the fact that many people in the Japanese context simply have not been exposed to literature challenging the NS construct, and are therefore intimidated by any attempts to challenge it (transcript 8, lines 171-173). For Japanese professors, in Mitsuyo's opinion, change is dangerous (transcript 8, line 172), as the majority of them are linguistics or literature people who "rarely pay attention to professional language teaching and feel they don't have to be fluent speakers of English" (transcript 8, lines 173-174). Challenging the authority the NS construct affords Japanese professors as owners of the Japanese language and culture, "might be kind of threatening" (transcript 8, line 211). The NS construct affords these individuals the ability to place the onus of teaching English on NSs to be the owners and users of English (transcript 8, lines 139-140). For NSs, change entails threatening their status and livelihood (transcript 8, lines 143-145). In addition, some Japanese professors Mitsuyo has come into contact with have expressed worry regarding the true intention underpinning a NNS's attempt to deconstruct the NS construct. When attempting to do research on the issue in Japan while still a doctoral student, for example, Mitsuyo asked a Japanese friend for help. Her friend's response was, "What are you doing this for? You mean we don't need any NSs in Japan? Are you going to eliminate all NSs because we don't need them?" (transcript 8, lines 264-266). The friend, as a result,

did not respond to any of her further e-mail inquiries, which shocked Mitsuyo: "She is not my friend anymore. I felt surprised. I had no intention of eliminating NSs… I think her fear was of what I was REALLY trying to say even if I wasn't trying to say it" (transcript 8, lines 271-274). This led Mitsuyo to believe that if her research was explicitly on the subject of the binary, "people will immediately get defensive about my motives" (transcript 8, lines 274-275)

As a result, Mitsuyo is now focusing her attention on the subject of multicompetence (transcript 8, line 221). For Mitsuyo, "It's too challenging to speak directly about NSs and NNSs- it is better to begin with multicompetence- that is somewhat related to NS/NNS issues" (transcript 8, lines 231-232). Multicompetence is "a way to connect with people on both sides –native and non-native" (transcript 8, lines 232-233). It is, for Mitsuyo, "a more safe way. It is too dangerous to speak directly about Nativeness/Non-nativeness" (transcript 8, lines 233-234); a danger that potentially leads to the following: "Fundamentally, you will find yourself without a job and without friends…" (transcript 8, line 224). Mitsuyo is writing and presenting regarding multicompetence in Japan, though she is faced with a similar problem related to that of the NS/NNS binary (transcript 8, lines 180-181): most people, Japanese or non-Japanese, are not familiar with the topic at all (transcript 8, lines 226-228). Due to the lack of awareness of the subject matter in Japan, Mitsuyo "feels professionally isolated" (transcript 8, line 239), finding solace only in sharing with her husband who is knowledgeable on the topic (transcript 8, lines 241-243) and has collaborated with her in research and writing (transcript 8, lines 19-21). Publishing and presenting have therefore served as platforms from which Mitsuyo can share her thoughts and ideas. One major challenge to doing so at present, however, is access to materials as, "I do not have access to my former school's database" (transcript 8, line

250). She is therefore seeking ways to access scholarly literature and a discourse community that will grow her professionally (transcript 8, lines 248-253).

The classroom is another location in which Mitsuyo creates space for sharing. Mitsuyo enjoys "telling students explicitly in class that they don't have to be ashamed of being a 'perfect' speaker- instead, trying their best to communicate is most important" (transcript 8, lines 155-156). Mitsuyo seeks to instill confidence in students related to their ability- to shape students' worldview in a way where they begin to view themselves as proficient rather than deficient speakers of English (transcript 8, lines 157-159). She wants her students to "feel the same way" she feels about her identity as a Japanese speaker of English (transcript 8, line 153). Mitsuyo perceives power in "spreading ideas through students" (transcript 8, line 284) and "talking to them explicitly about NS/NNS issues" which she does not view as threatening to her either personally or professionally (transcript 8, line 284).

Mitsuyo is actively challenging borders within her life, both personally and professionally and in doing so, is confronting tensions both from within and without related to language, culture and identity. Her narrative is one of concomitant push and pull; of marginalization and isolation, yet of agency as well.

Chapter 6: Negotiating Borders, Negotiating Identity

In the following chapter, through the lens of "post-structural storytelling," which "aims to excavate the power and knowledge that are used to construct versions of humanity" (Goodley, 2004, p. 101), I will approach the excavation of "resonant threads" (Clandinin, 2010) grounded in my participants' narrations of lived experiences negotiating transcultural and translinguistic identities. These threads are storylines of conceptualizing and negotiating borders both within university-level ELT and in the Japanese society in which it is situated. I then discuss some of the implications grounded in my participants' narratives related to theoretical conceptualizations of the NS construct, the purpose of and audience for critical scholarship in ELT, and contextualized language teaching. In addition, I discuss my self-reflexivity and ongoing negotiation of translinguistic and transcultural identity in light of the study. I conclude with future directions for research.

Conceptualizing and Reconceptualizing the Study

My original intention in undertaking this study was to examine how Japanese professors of English at the university level are actively challenging and seeking to move beyond the NS construct in ELT in the Japanese context. I had intended my study to focus on their narrative accounts of creating space for agency within a context in which, as described in the literature, the NS construct reigns supreme (e.g., Kubota, 1998). I had not allowed, however, conceptual space for the notion that perhaps the NS construct was not a fixed regime of truth, but rather a dynamic, contextualized confluence of dominant discourses within and beyond ELT my participants encounter and negotiate in and through their transcultural and translinguistic lived experiences.

As I listened to and interacted with Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo, I found myself attempting and failing to "contain" the contents of our co-constructed narratives within critical conceptualizations of the NS construct located in ELT-related literature. With the help of feedback from my participants, dissertation committee members and friends in my doctoral program, I took a hard look at the way I was conceptualizing my study and interacting with my participants' narratives.[38] This hearkened me back to Lather's (1993) words: "the "crisis of representation" is not the end of representation, but the end of pure presence… It is not a matter of looking harder or more closely, **but of seeing what frames our seeing**" (p. 675). My experiences greatly emphasized the incredible necessity of self-reflexivity (e.g., Hesse-Biber, 2006) and the pitfalls of treating such reflexivity casually. This journey of conceptualizing and reconceptualizing provided the answer to my fourth research question: 4) How am I, as the researcher, contributing to the co-construction and restorying of narratives, in light of my past experiences and experiences during the research, reflection and writing process.

In re-approaching critical scholarship examining the NS construct, I encountered scholars who are problematizing the over-simplification of the NS/NNS and NEST/NNEST dichotomies (e.g., Higgins, 2003; Motha, Jain and Tecle, 2012). Menard-Warwick (2008), in particular, addresses the quandary I had constructed and was facing. Focusing on the NS/NNS and NEST/NNEST binaries, I had fallen into the "trap" of "reproducing the dichotomizing and essentializing colonial storyline of Self and Other" (Lin et al., 2002, p. 298), neglecting my participants' lived

[38] Another example: Though I did not use the term with my participants, I had originally imposed (Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2001) the labels "marginalized" and "marginalization" upon my participants and their experiences, grounded in the way in which I had constructed the NS construct.

experiences constructing their translinguistic and transcultural identities. Menard-Warwick (2008) asserts the following:

> "the NNEST/NEST dichotomy remains the most prevalent way of theorizing teacher identity in TESOL. This scholarship represents a commendable attempt to get away from the "colonial legacy" of the "native speaker fallacy", but teachers' cultural, intercultural, national, and transnational identities remain undertheorized" (p. 620).

Drawing upon Menard-Warwick (2008), I shifted my focus from the NS/NNS and NEST/NNEST binaries, to my participants' ongoing negotiation of identity. In line with the spirit of work by scholars including Menard-Warwick (2008), Park (2008, 2012) and Simon-Maeda (2011), I assert that in and through their negotiations of transcultural and translinguistic identities, Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo are conceptualizing and negotiating borders of identity related to "Japaneseness," "Japan" and the "Other" preeminent in Japanese society and as a result, in ELT in the Japanese context. These larger societal discourses, inseparably intertwined with prevailing discourses within a globalized ELT, construct and perpetuate borders around who owns English, who Japanese learners, users and teachers of English might be or become, and the role non-Japanese NNSs and NSs might play in the Japanese context.

In reconceptualizing this study, as a result of my interaction with Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo, as well as correspondence with my dissertation committee and colleagues in my doctoral program, I found myself faced with the need to reconsider my research questions. Therefore, over the course of the study, I moved away from questions that attempted to reconcile my participants' experiences with the NS construct, including, "*How do participants in this study construct the NS construct; How and why have participants in this study arrived at challenging their*

construction of the NS construct; How do participants describe their lived experiences challenging this NS construct," to questions that oriented my research focus towards their ongoing negotiation of translinguistic and transcultural identity, and how via this negotiation, they arrived at challenging borders within ELT in the Japanese setting.

Findings: Borders, Borderlands and Border Crossing in ELT in the Japanese Context

In their ongoing construction of translinguistic and transcultural identities, Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo have conceptualized borders demarcating "Japaneseness," extending from dominant social discourses within the Japanese context. These discourses, fluidly and concomitantly shaping and shaped by pervading discourses within a globalized ELT, establish borders within English language teaching in the Japanese context. Together, such borders seek to govern who Japanese learners and users of English might aspire to be, and the roles Japanese teachers might and/or should play in English language education. In addition, constructed and perpetuated as such, these borders attempt to eliminate border crossing, rendering such crossing deviant (e.g., Bhabha, 1996, Fine et al., 2007).

Tomomi describes borders of "Japaneseness" in ELT related to femininity, seniority in terms of age and knowledge, professionalism. There are, according to Tomomi, borders defining what she might wear, how she might appear physically, and how she might interact with her colleagues and students. These borders, in concert with dominant discourses in ELT positing an idealized NS as the linguistic and cultural target for acquisition, in turn outline who she can and should be in the classroom. These borders govern what classes Japanese professors might teach, their pedagogical approach to the classroom, and the content of their instruction. For Tomomi, professors and policy makers in her workplace serve as border guards (Fine

et al., 2007) who protect and perpetuate preeminent discourses of "Japaneseness" within Japanese society and ELT in the Japanese context.

Yoshie conceptualizes borders within ELT seeking to demarcate the nature of "Japaneseness," and as a result, who Japanese learners, users and instructors of English might be and/or become. In line with the NS construct, there are borders that place ownership of English in the hands of NSs, and privilege the "language" and "culture" of this idealized NS. As with English, the linguistic and cultural authority pertaining to the Japanese language and Japanese culture rest in the hands of NSs of Japanese. This, according to Yoshie, establishes a gap between NESTs and Japanese teachers of English. On the one hand, NESTs are privileged as linguistic and cultural experts. Japanese professors of English are rendered deficient as English users and instructors in comparison with such individuals. On the other hand, these NESTs can never perform the role of the Japanese professor. According to Yoshie, Japanese and NS-ing professors of English serve as border patrols (Fine et al., 2007), seeking to preserve their power and authority in the ELT profession. This in turn, eliminates any conceptual space or need for non-Japanese NNESTs who are neither NSs of Japanese nor English. The maintenance of borders bleeds into the classroom, according to Yoshie, affecting student perceptions of who they are and who they might become as Japanese and as English users. Not able to become the NS, they are instead to learn from and juxtapose themselves against him or her. Studying with NSs and Japanese professors functions to reinforce who they are and who they are not. They are Japanese, acquiring a knowledge of the language and culture of the "other" so that they might imitate the other and gain a reinforced sense of being "Japanese" as dictated by social regimes of truth within Japanese society.

Hiroyuki conceptualizes borders within ELT that aim to define the nature of "being Japanese" and by proxy, who a Japanese professor of English can and should be. In line with the NS construct, Japanese NNESTs are to focus on teaching the linguistic and cultural knowledge of an idealized NS, though they themselves are deficient when compared to this NS. This, for Hiroyuki, presents a potential dilemma for Japanese professors of English, who derive their authority –in the spirit of Confucian discourses- from an expert knowledge of the content they are to teach. While isolated by their perceived lack deficiency in terms of linguistic and cultural knowledge, Japanese professors concomitantly harness their isolation according to Hiroyuki, acting as border guards perpetuating borders of being and becoming both relating to English and Japanese. In doing so, Hiroyuki posits, these professors preserve their status both personally and professionally.

Mitsuyo conceptualizes boundaries relating to what a "non-native" speaker, and by proxy, what a Japanese teacher and speaker of English can and cannot do; what they can be and what they cannot be. These boundaries, established and patrolled by Japanese and NS scholars and teachers alike, are linguistically and culturally imperialistic in nature. They create a need to focus on the linguistic and cultural knowledge of the NS, while instilling in Japanese teachers and students the belief that they are deficient rather than multicompetent users of English. In addition, they eliminate space for non-Japanese NNESTs. Mitsuyo also conceptualizes borders defining the challenging of the NS construct. Mitsuyo believes her approach to arguing for a move beyond the NS construct, which involves a belief in roles NSs and NNSs can and should play as teachers in the Japanese context (Japanese and non-Japanese), has brought her into contact with borders patrolled by Japanese colleagues who view the term "roles" as code for legitimized divisiveness.

Within their respective professional settings, there are varying manifestations of administrative policies and expectations, expected roles, and implicit and explicit social pressure to conform to established borders of identity. Yet in and through their lived experiences, Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo have each constructed ELT in the Japanese context as a borderland (Anzaldua, 1987); a location in which transition and transformation can and is occurring. Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo are all mindfully asserting agency engaging and crossing borders of "Japaneseness" inscribed in ELT and in Japanese society at large. In doing so, Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo are aware of the potential and real personal and professional cost of their border crossing. As a result, they are strategic in the way they assert agency. Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo are creating "in-between spaces" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 1) in which they are concomitantly asserting their transcultural and translinguistic identities and challenging pervading constructions of Japaneseness and notions of the ownership, learning, use and instruction of English.

The classroom is one site, for example, in which Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo do so. Tomomi incorporates her negotiation of identity and perspective on language ownership and use into the classroom. She shares her lived experiences and worldview with her students. In doing so, Tomomi is, in concert with her students, creating the potential for a reconceptualization of "Japaneseness," and as a result, who they are as English language users. Mitsuyo shares her worldview with her students and creates space for dialogue surrounding language ownership and use with them. Students, she believes, have the potential to affect great change in terms of shaping both the direction of ELT and broader discourses of who Japanese language learners are and what they are capable of. Hiroyuki has made his classroom the primary venue in which he creates space for agency. He creates an environment

that challenges students to reconceptualize language ownership and linguistic and cultural targets for acquisition. In doing so, he encourages students to view themselves as proficient owners and users of English. Yoshie approaches the classroom in a manner that allows her to share with her students, both implicitly and explicitly, her worldview and her desire to challenge borders relating to who she and her students can and might be.

Whether in the classroom, in their interaction with colleagues or in their professional activities, Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo are contributing to alternate discourses reconceptualizing who they and other members of Japanese society might be or become as English language learners, users and teachers. As discourses flow fluidly between the field of ELT and Japanese society, Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo are also contributing to a postmodern transformation of Japan and Japaneseness (Willis & Murphy-Shigematsu, 2008)

Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo, and their ongoing negotiation of translinguistic and transcultural identity, are situated within a Japan in which discourses of identity continue to vie for the opportunity to construct Japaneseness and Japan's relationship with and location in an ever-globalizing world (Willis & Murphy-Shigematsu, 2008). They are therefore concomitantly negotiating borders of being and becoming within Japanese society as well as within ELT in the Japanese context. Their negotiation of identity is indeed much more than that of confronting discourses of privilege or power within ELT. They are choosing to conceptualize border crossing as possible, potentially valuable, and on the whole as proficiency rather than deficiency. Such choices place them center stage in the ongoing socio-historical struggle over the construction of language, culture and identity in Japan that continues to rage on.

Implications for Theory, Research and Teacher Education in the field of ELT

I believe the lived experiences of Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo have the potential to inform theory, research and teacher education in ELT both within Japan and beyond. In this section, I focus on four topics: 1) theoretical conceptualizations of the NS construct, 2) the purpose of and audience for critical scholarship, 3) contextualized language teaching, and finally, 4) my journey of self-reflexivity and negotiation of translinguistic and transcultural identity.

I contend that the first implication of this study, is the necessity of challenging theoretical conceptualizations of the NS construct in ELT scholarship, informing research and teacher education, that oversimplify the NS/NNS and NEST/NNEST binaries inscribed within. I believe my participants' narratives describe how dominant social discourses in Japanese society shaping constructions of "Us," "Being Us," and "Them" fluidly and concomitantly shape and are shaped by pervading discourses within a globalized ELT, establishing borders within English language teaching in the Japanese context. The confluence of these discourses constructs an ELT wherein borders attempt to define who Japanese learners, users and teachers of English can be and/or are becoming. Thus ELT is embedded in and inseparably intertwined with the sociohistorical context in which it is situated.

As with Menard-Warwick (2008), I assert that viewing the lived experiences of English language learners, users and teachers through the lens of the NS construct and the dichotomies embedded within –NS/NNS and NEST/NNEST- reduces the complexity of their negotiation of transcultural and translinguistic identity, and may therefore serve to strip away their agency. With specific relation to teachers, conceptualizing their identities through the lens of the NS construct may serve to essentialize their lived experiences negotiating identity, therefore over-simplifying

how their transcultural and translinguistic identities are implicated in pedagogy (e.g., Menard-Warwick, 2008; Morgan, 2004; Motha, Jain and Tecle, 2012; Park, 2012). In their narratives, for example, Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo describe, with rich detail, lived experiences negotiating personal and professional identities that cannot be wholly contained within or explained by binaries. In addition, all four, in idiosyncratic ways, describe the fluid negotiation of the "personal" and the "professional." In other words, their ongoing negotiation of "Japaneseness" in Japanese society is concomitant with their negotiation of their identity as ELT professionals.

I contend there is a second implication for ELT research and teacher education, relating to the purpose of and audience for critical scholarship. Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo, in negotiating their transcultural and linguistic identities, are confronting dominant constructions of national, geographical, ethnic and cultural identity inscribed in Japanese society. I would argue, as with Menard-Warwick (2008) that the NS/NNS and NEST/NNEST dichotomies have served as a vehicle to approach critical conceptualizations of inequity and marginalization in globalized ELT. Yet, as Menard-Warwick (2008) mentions, such binaries neglect the interstices of the local and the global at which teachers are negotiating their transcultural and translinguistic identities. In approaching the localizing of ELT in contexts around the globe, Kumaravadivelu (2001, 2006) argues for a postmethod approach. One of the "parameters" guiding this approach is that of "particularity" which, "seeks to facilitate the advancement of a context-sensitive, location-specific pedagogy that is based on a true understanding of local linguistic, sociocultural and political particularities" (Kumaravadivelu, 2001, p. 537). This, Kumaravadivelu (2001, 2006) argues, is a way to decentralize ELT in favor of connecting ELT with context, with teacher preparation

and student needs in mind. I assert that in the interest of further orienting critical scholarship and teacher education towards serving communities in context, critical approaches to issues of language ownership, assessment, instruction and use must also be decentralized and contextualized. This entails paying attention to the interplay of the global and the local (Appadurai, 2000), sociohistorically situated in context. Doing so will be a step towards addressing localized needs, while contributing to an ever-increasing body of global ELT scholarship (Block and Cameron, 2002). As Yoshie and Mitsuyo both mention in their narratives, they left Japan to pursue their studies, something yet common at this juncture in globalized ELT (Braine, 1999, Canagarajah, 1999). Yoshie noted, upon returning to Japan, that she would not have had access to critical approaches to linguistics and ELT if she had stayed in Japan, while Mitsuyo had consciously made the decision to study in Britain, as she would not have had access to theory and research examining multicompetence and NNEST issues. Thus, I argue there is a need to address the local in the global (Block & Cameron, 2002).

I believe a third implication for critically-oriented theory and research informing teacher training and practice, grounded in my participants' narratives, relates to conceptualizations of contextualized language teaching and more specifically, the roles of teachers within such contexts. Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo have all touched upon an issue that is far from resolved in the ELT literature. Scholars have discussed the necessity for language teaching that connects with the local (e.g., Alptekin, 2002; Block & Cameron, 2002; Canagarajah, 2006a; Leung, 2005; Kumaravadivelu, 2003, 2006; McKay, 2003) while acknowledging the connection between the local and global in terms of language use (e.g., Alptekin, 2002; Canagarajah, 2007; Kramsch and Sullivan, 1996; Kramsch, 2008). Scholars

including Medgyes (1994, 2001) and Mahboob (2005, 2010) have argued that both NESTs and NNESTs have different strengths that allow them to fulfill different roles as ELT professionals. Medgyes (2001) argues, "Who's worth more, the native or the non-native? Is pointless" (p. 440).

I contend there is a gap in the literature- even an elephant in the room- however, related to how critically constructing contextualized language teaching in contexts around the world might create or eliminate space for teachers from different linguistic, sociocultural, ethnic and national backgrounds. As Tomomi, Yoshie, Hiroyuki and Mitsuyo articulate, ELT in the Japanese context has traditionally assigned space to Japanese NNESTs and NESTs, while both implicitly and explicitly alluding to an elimination of space for non-Japanese NNESTs. Tomomi, Yoshie and Hiroyuki, challenge the validity of boundaries placed around the roles of NESTs, Japanese NNESTs and non-Japanese NNESTs. Yoshie specifically argues: "The best person for a job, Japanese or non-Japanese, would be trained, qualified, active learners about context, interested in contextualizing their language teaching" (transcript 4, lines 144-145), and: "Any teacher, whether NS-ing or NNS-ing can do the job as long as they possess and actively pursue knowledge related to the context where students are" (transcript 4, lines 196-197). In other words, Yoshie contends that teachers, regardless of their status as NSs or NNSs, might fill ELT positions at the university level in Japan if they "possess and pursue" contextualized linguistic and sociocultural knowledge. Mitsuyo also asserted, "It's not a question of Native or Non-Native, but rather of who is best prepared to teach English- that is the question" (transcript 7, lines 199-200). Mitsuyo also argues a point she acknowledges is contentious when juxtaposed against her first statement (transcript 8, lines 31-35): there are roles in teaching for NSs and NNSs whether Japanese or non-Japanese;

linguistic and cultural roles they cannot fulfill in place of each other. In light of both Yoshie's and Mitsuyo's comments, the question arises: how would a non-Japanese instructor gain the linguistic and socio-cultural knowledge necessary to compete and then function as an English professor in Japan, and how would such linguistic and socio-cultural knowledge be assessed? Mitsuyo's perspective on teacher roles also raises the issue of how roles might be defined and spaces distributed within a given teaching context. I believe there is an additional unanswered question as well: if contextualized language teaching is tailored to the local setting and prepares learners to interact with individuals in that given setting (e.g., in Japan and in Asia with Asians as Yoshie notes), then might certain NESTs and in particular, NNESTs be excluded from hiring? These questions pose difficult challenges for the ELT community that I believe critical scholarship must eventually address.

I believe there is a fourth set of implications for ELT research, that relate to my positionality and subjectivities as a participant in critically-oriented ELT scholarship and dialogue. As a white, male native speaker of English, I have been privileged within my teaching community and Japanese society. I have, for example taken both part-time and full-time teaching positions that I knew were available exclusively to native speakers based on such status. I viewed these positions both as a way to support my family, as well as a means to promote critically-oriented transformative change in ELT research and in my workplace and classroom in Japan.

At the same time, however, I have experienced disempowerment, as Baxter (2003) describes: "It is possible for a speaker to be positioned as relatively powerful within one discourse but as relatively powerless within another, perhaps competing discourse" (Baxter, 2003, p. 9). Drawing from my professional life and providing excessive detail at this juncture would endanger my professional standing and by

proxy my personal life.[39] What I believe I can share, however, is that the social discourses defining "Japaneseness," "Us" and "Them" flowing from Japanese society and intertwining with dominant discourses within globalized ELT, construct who I might and/or should be or become as a "native" English speaker, non-Japanese and "outsider." As a result, I have experienced privilege in concert with marginalization and even outright discrimination. I have been told that Japanese culture is impenetrably mysterious, that I am incapable of hoping to fulfill any of the duties ascribed to "Japanese" teachers, and that my translingusitic and transcultural experiences and knowledge related to Japan are a font from which I need or should not draw. I have been admonished very directly to play my role as a NS, and told that border crossing is not only not valued, but is downright a dangerous professional affair. In and through these lived experiences, I have wrestled with approaching my positionality and my negotiation of the borderlands of ELT in Japan and the society in which it is situated (Sultana, 2007). Yet while negotiating these lived experiences, I had neglected my own storyline in my research and other professional activities, as I struggled to account for it within critical conceptualizations of the NS construct located in ELT-related literature.

During a presentation in Tokyo in 2011 on the subject of NNESTs and the NS construct, a native speaker in attendance asked to comment. While expressing the fact that he agreed that the NS construct affected ELT in Japan, he believed the contents of my presentation neither allowed space for people like him who were approaching ELT through a critical lens nor valued their work. This individual argued that he too, felt marginalized both as a NS in Japan and as a critically-oriented ELT teacher and scholar (field notes, lines 104-106). The first reaction in my mind to his words, was

[39] I was strongly admonished by Yoshie to edit out any self reflections that discussed my professional life.

to casually write them off with the thought, "yes, but you chose to come here." I realized later on, however, that I saw myself reflected in his words. I was forced to confront the fact that I was oversimplifying the NS construct and in doing so, stripping the agency away from "native speakers" like this individual who had attended my presentation, as well as from myself.

In my pilot study (2011) my participant, Halil, asserted that native speakers were very necessary potential members of a critically-oriented ELT desiring to reconceptualize language theory, research, ownership, assessment, instruction and use. This, according to Halil, was due to the fact that all shades of native speakers – from those who are very comfortable reaping the rewards of native speakerdom to those who seek to critically reorient the field- yet play a role in globalized ELT. In this study, Tomomi and Yoshie both speak of collaborating in Japan with native speakers in their critical-oriented professional activities. I assert that the inclusion of the narrative voices of these individuals –stories of their ongoing negotiation of translinguistic and transcultural identity- would serve both to deconstruct the catch-all category of "native speaker," as well as to counter the perception that attempts at moving beyond the NS construct are purely defensive in nature on the part of non-native speakers, as Halil laments in my pilot study (2011). Doing so, I contend, would be one step toward moving the focus of critical scholarship away from binaries of NS/NNS and NEST/NNEST, and towards that of the negotiation of borders of linguistic and cultural identity, which I believe would contribute to a more inclusive and transformational critical presence in the field.

In the process of completing this study, I have regularly been crossing linguistic, cultural, educational and national borders. This brings me to another issue of positionality and subjectivity: the difficulties of constructing and negotiating

translinguistic and transcultural spaces in academia. Throughout the study, I have posed and wrestled with many questions including the following: How can I articulate my positionality and my lived experiences to my advisor and committee? How can I construct a study that avoids essentializing my participants' lived experiences and the context in which they live and work? How can I simultaneously function as a professor of English in Japan and doctoral candidate in a research-oriented university in the U.S.? I have been blessed both with a wife, a close Japanese co-worker and two friends/colleagues in the U.S. who have negotiated academia across borders and have supported me personally and professionally. I cannot overemphasize the importance of maintaining dialogue to inspire, challenge and keep a researcher fresh.

Potential Contributions to the ELT Literature

Drawing from the above implications, I believe this study contributes to the ELT literature in a number of ways. First, the study contributes to an understanding of how dominant societal discourses, inseparably intertwined with prevailing discourses within a globalized ELT, shape borders regarding who owns English, who learners, users and teachers of English might be or become, and the role NNSs from other locales and NSs might play in the context. The study serves as a sociohistorically-situated account of NNEST negotiations of translingual and transcultural identity portraying this negotiation of identity as the conceptualization and negotiation of borders of being and becoming. In doing so, I contend this study, in line with Menard-Warwick (2008), offers an alternative to critically-oriented constructions of NS/NNS and NEST/NNEST that scholars including Higgins (2003), Menard-Warwick (2008) and Motha, Jain and Tecle (2012) argue do not account for the intricacies of the contextualized negotiation of translinguistic and transcultural identity. I assert that approaching ELT in a manner that explores the construction and

perpetuation of borders of being and becoming, and how individuals –in and through their lived experiences- negotiate these borders, allows for flexibility in describing the interplay of the local and the global. In their narratives, for instance, Yoshie and Mitsuyo assert that within ELT in Japan, theoretical and practical space for NNSs from other countries has been virtually eliminated as a result of the interplay of social and philosophical discourses both in Japanese society and in globalized ELT. I contend that conceptualizing this issue as one of linguistic and cultural border crossing might equip scholars to paint a more sociohistorically descriptive picture of what is occurring in context.

In a similar vein, I believe this study contributes to discussion of the question of how constructing contextualized language teaching might create or eliminate space for teachers from different linguistic, sociocultural, ethnic and national backgrounds. In this study, Yoshie and Mitsuyo have very different worldviews regarding border crossing in language teaching. Yoshie posits that English language users, native or non-native- can cross linguistic, cultural and academic borders. As such, they are ideally capable of fulfilling any roles as teachers. Mitsuyo, however, takes a different view, arguing that there are borders that teachers cannot and/or should not cross in context. I believe this study brings the tension, yet largely unaddressed, related to contextual border crossing in language teaching, to the forefront. Grounded in this study, I contend there are unresolved tensions within critically-oriented scholarship relating to who learners, instructors and users might and/or should be and become.

In addition, I believe this study contributes to the ELT literature in and through my negotiation of reflexivity and positionality as a "Native Speaker" and advocate for challenging borders within the field of ELT. There is little research on the subject of "Native Speakers" participating in critical attempts at reorienting ELT-

related scholarship and practice. I contend the inclusion of their voices will further enrich descriptions of the construction and maintenance, challenging and crossing of borders in ELT contexts around the world.

Finally, I assert that this study makes a meaningful contribution to descriptions of ELT in Japan. Murahata (2008) argues that scholarly discussion of the NS/NNS and NEST/NNEST dichotomies in the ELT literature most often emanates from scholarship originating in Western, native English-speaking countries. This study, however, situates its discussion of borders and border crossing –of the negotiation of translinguistic and transcultural identity- in the Japanese context. I contend that such an account, while contributing to global knowledge of what is transpiring in ELT contexts around the world, serves to contribute towards a localized, critical understanding of ELT to which readers in the Japanese context might connect.

Future Directions for Research

In an increasingly globalizing, postmodernistic world (Canagarajah, 2007), facilitated by national and international flows of people, technology, ideologies, information and finances, (Appadurai, 2000), the construction, perpetuation, problematization and negotiation of borders will continue. As such occurs within societies around the world, so it will occur within the borderlands of ELT. I believe that contextualized accounts of conceptualizing, challenging and crossing borders will connect the local with the global and diversify ELT scholarship. In addition, such accounts can better equip teachers and teacher trainers to support students negotiating translinguistic and transcultural identities (e.g., Park, 2012).

In addition, I believe that unpacking the implications of Mitsuyo's two statements -"It's not a question of Native or Non-Native, but rather of who is best

prepared to teach English- that is the question" (transcript 7, lines 199-200) and her assertion that there are roles in teaching for NSs and NNSs whether Japanese or non-Japanese; linguistic and cultural roles they cannot fulfill in place of each other-[40] will generate important dialogue relating to who might teach, what might be taught and how teachers might be prepared, and who might prepare such teachers, all with contextualized language teaching in mind.

[40] See also: Mahboob (2005) and Medgyes (2001).

Appendices

Appendix A: Semi-structured Interview Protocol

Questions Guiding Our Interview(s)
The following questions will provide direction for our interview(s). Please feel free to discuss (or to refrain from discussing) anything.
1) How would you describe yourself, professionally?
2) Please describe the journey that has led to your status as an ELT professional at the university level in Japan.
3) What has inspired you to challenge prevailing discourses related to language ownership, learning, use and instruction?
4) Please describe your lived experiences challenging such discourses.

Appendix B: Consent Form

Project Title	**Negotiating the Borderlands of Advocacy and Marginalization: "Non-native" English-Speaking Japanese Scholars/Teachers and the Native Speaker Construct**
Purpose of the Study	This research is being conducted by Nathanael Rudolph under the supervision of Dr. Melinda Martin-Beltran at the University of Maryland, College Park. We are inviting you to participate in this research project because you are a teacher and scholar interested in challenging the Native Speaker construct, and advocating for Non-Native English Speaker Teachers. The purpose of this study is to explore the experiences Japanese teachers of English who are both challenging the Native Speaker construct and dealing with its effects, personally and professionally.
	In this study, you will be interviewed individually, at an agreed upon time and date. Interviews will last approximately 60-90 minutes. This research project proposes making digital audio recordings of your interviews. Only the Principal and Student Investigators will have access to the recordings, which will be securely stored on the Student Investigator's laptop in a locked drawer in a locked office. ___ I agree to digital audio recording of my

Procedures	participation in this study. ___ I do not agree digital audio recording of my participation in this study. Up to five interviews may be necessary depending upon what transpires in our interactions. You may either decline further interviews, or withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty. During the interview, you will be free to use both English and Japanese. In this study you will also be asked to participate in focus groups related both to challenging the Native Speaker construct and Non-Native English Speaker Teacher advocacy. These focus groups discussion will occur monthly for 90 minutes. You may decline to participate in the focus groups, as well as withdraw from the study at any time, without penalty. This research project proposes making digital audio recordings of the focus groups. Only the Principal and Student Investigators will have access to the recordings, which will be securely stored on the Student Investigator's laptop in a locked drawer in a locked office. ___ I agree to digital audio recording of my participation in focus groups. ___ I do not agree digital audio recording of my participation in focus groups. In this study you will also be asked to write a narrative and submit it electronically to Nathanael Rudolph, related to your language learning experiences, professional experiences, and how you learned to care about language.
Potential Risks and Discomforts	Although there are no known risks associated with this study, you may find yourself feeling apprehensive either during the interviews or during your participation in the focus group events. Writing about your language learning experiences, professional experiences, and how you learned to care about language may cause you to feel apprehensive. In the interest of alleviating anxiety, all participants are welcome to review, edit, and delete any comments you make before the interview transcripts are used for data analysis. You are encouraged to ask the researcher questions throughout the duration of the study. You may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

Potential Benefits	There are no direct benefits to participation. However, possible benefits include participation in the creation of a Non-Native English Speaker Teacher advocacy group, and the opportunity for you to voice your experiences as a Japanese teacher of English in the interest of working towards a more equitable field**.** We hope that, in the future, other people might benefit from this study through improved understanding of Non-Native English Speaker issues and challenging the Native Speaker construct.
Confidentiality	The Researchers will maintain confidentiality of all data by storing electronic information in a password-protected laptop locked in the office of Nathanael Rudolph. Transcripts and any other written materials will be kept in a locked drawer in the locked office of Nathanael Rudolph. If the researchers write a report or article about their research project, your identity will be protected to the maximum extent possible, including the use of pseudonyms, when reporting research. Your information may be shared with representatives of the University of Maryland, College Park or governmental authorities only if you or someone else is in danger or if we are required to do so by law.
Right to Withdraw and Questions	Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. If you decide to participate in this research, you may stop participating at any time. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you stop participating at any time, you will not be penalized or lose any benefits to which you otherwise qualify. If you decide to stop taking part in the study, if you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or if you need to report an injury related to the research, please contact the student investigator, Nathanael Rudolph: Address: Mukogawa Women's University, 6-46 Ikebiraki-cho, Nishinomiya, Japan, 663-8558 E-mail: nrudolph@umd.edu or Primary Investigator, Dr. Melinda Martin-Beltran: Address: 2311 Benjamin Building, University of Maryland, College Park, College Park, Maryland, 20742 E-mail: memb@umd.edu
	If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or wish to report a research-related injury, please contact: **University of Maryland College Park**

<table>
<tr><td>Participant Rights</td><td colspan="2">Institutional Review Board Office
1204 Marie Mount
College Park, Maryland, 20742
E-mail: irb@umd.edu
Telephone: 301-405-0678

This research has been reviewed according to the University of Maryland, College Park IRB procedures for research involving human subjects.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Statement of Consent</td><td colspan="2">Your signature indicates that you are at least 18 years of age; you have read this consent form or have had it read to you; your questions have been answered to your satisfaction and you voluntarily agree to participate in this research study. You will receive a copy of this signed consent form.

If you agree to participate, please sign your name below.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Signature and Date</td><td>PARTICIPANT NAME
[Please Print]</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>PARTICIPANT SIGNATURE</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>DATE</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

References

Agger, B. (1991). Critical theory, poststructuralism, postmodernism: Their sociological relevance. *Annual review of sociology*, *17,* 105–131.

Aldwinckle, D. (1999). Ten+ questions for your next university employer. *The Language Teacher*, *23*(7). Retrieved October 1, 2011 from http://www.jalt-publications.org/old_tlt/articles/1999/07/aldwinckle

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal*, *56*(1), 57-64.

Alvermann, D.E. (2000). Narrative approaches. *Reading Online, 4*(5). Retrieved August 15, 2011 from http://www.readingonline.org/articles/art_index.asp?HREF=/articles/handbook/alvermann/index.html

Alvesson, M. & Skoldberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive methodology: new vistas for qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Amin, N. (1997). Race and the identity of the nonnative ESL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 580-583.

Amin, N. (1999). Minority women teachers of ESL: Negotiating white English. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching*, 93–104. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Amin, N. (2000). Negotiating nativism, minority immigrant women ESL teachers and the native speaker construct. Retrieved from https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/handle/1807/14099

Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/la frontera: The new mestiza*. Spinsters/Aunt Lute.

Appadurai, A. (2000). *Modernity at large*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Arudou, D. (2007, August 28). The blame game. *The Japan Times*. Retrieved September 7, 2012, from http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/fl20070828zg.html

Atkinson, P., & Silverman, D. (1997). Kundera's immortality: The interview society and the invention of self. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *3*(3), 304-325.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do Things with Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: OUP.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: OUP.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. (C. Emerson, trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Befu, H. (1993). Nationalism and nihonjinron. *Cultural Nationalism in East Asia: Representation and Identity. Research Papers and Policy Studies*, *39*, 107–135. University of California.

Befu, H. (2001). *Hegemony of homogeneity: an anthropological analysis of "Nihonjinron"* (Vol. 5). Trans Pacific Press.

Bell, J. S. (2002). Narrative inquiry: More than just telling stories. *TESOL Quarterly*, *36*(2), 207–213.

Berns, M. (2008). World Englishes, English as a lingua franca, and intelligibility. *World Englishes*, *27*(3/4), 327–334.

Bhabha, H. K. (1990). Bhabha on Multiculturalism, cultural diversity and cultural difference. In J. Rutherford (Ed.) *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Bhabha, H. (1992). The World and the Home. *Social Text*, (31/32), 141-153.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *Bhabha, The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. K. (1996). Culture's in-between. *Questions of cultural identity*, 53–60.

Bhabha, H. K., & Appignanesi, L. (1987). *Identity: the real me*. Institute of Contemporary Arts.

Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2001). Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *5*(3), 243.

Block, D. (2002) 'McCommunication': A problem in the frame for SLA. In D. Block and D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 117–132). London: Routledge.

Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Edinburgh University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social science information*, *16*(6), 645.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. *Readings in economic sociology*, 280–291.

Bourdieu, P., & Thompson, J. B. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard U. Press.

Bouthier, A. (2012, August 18.). Japanese nationalists land on disputed island, tensions with China intensify. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved September 12, 2012, from: http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/japanese-nationalists-land-on-disputed-island-tensions-with-china-intensify/article4488134/

Braine, G. (1999). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Braine, G. (2010). *Nonnative Speaker English Teachers: Research, Pedagogy, and Professional Growth*. Taylor & Francis Group.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101.

Bredo, E. (2006). Philosophies of educational research. *Handbook of complementary methods in education research*, 3–32.

Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). White Plains, N.Y.: Pearson Education (Longman).

Bruthiaux, P. (2003). Squaring the circles: issues in modeling English worldwide. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *13*(2), 159–178.

Bruton, A. (2005). World English: the medium or the learning? A reply to Kanavillil Rajagopolan. *ELT Journal 59*(3), 255–7.

Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002) *World English. A study of its development.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Brutt-Griffler, J., & Samimy, K. K. (1999). Revisiting the colonial in the postcolonial: Critical praxis for nonnative-English-speaking teachers in a TESOL program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 413–431.

Bucholtz, M. (2000). The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *32*(2), 1439–1465.

Burgess, C., Gibson, I., Klaphake, J., & Selzer, M. (2010). The "Global 30" Project and Japanese higher education reform: an example of a "closing in" or an "opening up"? *Globalisation, Societies & Education*, *8*(4), 461–475.

Butler, Y. G. (2007). Foreign language education at elementary schools in Japan: Searching for solutions amidst growing diversification. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *8*(2), 129–147.

Butler, Y. G., & Iino, M. (2005). Current Japanese reforms in English language education: The 2003 “action plan”. *Language Policy*, *4*(1), 25–45.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1996). From critical research practice to critical research reporting. *TESOL Quarterly*, *30*(2), 321–331.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). Interrogating the “native speaker fallacy”: Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. *Non-native educators in English language teaching*, 77–92.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006a). Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *26*, 197–218.

Canagarajah, S. (2006b). Changing communicative needs, revised assessment objectives: Testing English as an international language. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *3*(3), 229–242.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006c). TESOL at forty: What are the issues? *TESOL Quarterly*, 9–34.

Canagarajah, S. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*(5), 923–939.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. *Language and communication*, 1.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied linguistics*, *1*(1), 1.

Celce-Murcia M. (l995). The elaboration of sociolinguistic competence: Implications for teacher education. In Alatis JE, Straehle CA, Ronkin M (Eds.), *Linguistics and the Education of Language Teachers: Ethnolinguistic, Psycholinguistic, and Sociolinguistic Aspects*. Proceedings of the Georgetown University, Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, 2005. Georgetown University

Press, Washington DC, 699–710.

Celce-Murcia M, Dörnyei Z, Thurrell S. (1995). A pedagogical framework for communicative competence: A Pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 6(2), 5–35

Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. *Intercultural language use and language learning*, 41–57.

Charles, M. (2007). Language matters in global communication. *Journal of Business Communication*, *44*(3), 260–282.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Boston: MIT Press.

Clandinin, D. J. (2010). Narrative Understandings of Lives Lived in and out of Schools. In L. Butler-Kisler (Ed.), *Perspectives on education: Voices of eminent Canadians, 3*(2), 15-20.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research* (Vol. 2). Jossey-Bass.

Clandinin, D. J., Murphy, M. S., Huber, J., & Orr, A. M. (2009). Negotiating Narrative Inquiries: Living in a Tension-Filled Midst. *Journal of Educational Research*, *103*(2), 81–90.

Clandinin, D. J., & Rosiek, J. (2007). Mapping a landscape of narrative inquiry: Borderland spaces and tensions. *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology*, (pp. 35–75).

Coleman, J. S. (1958). Relational analysis: the study of social organizations with survey methods. *Human Organization*, *17*(4), 28–36.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(2), 185–209.

Cook, V. J., Iarossi, E., Stellakis, N. & Tokumaru, Y. (2003). Effects of the second language on the syntactic processing of the first language. In V. J. Cook (Ed.), *Effects of the second language on the first* (pp.214-233). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cook, V. J. (2006). Interlanguage, multi-competence and the problem of the "second" language. *Rivista di Psicolinguistica Applicata, VI,* 3, 39-52.

Cook, V. J. (2007a). Multi-competence: Black-hole or worm-hole for second language acquisition research. In Z. Han (Ed.), *Understanding second language process* (pp. 16-26). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cook, V. J. (2007b). The goals of ELT: Reproducing native-speakers or promoting multi-competence among second language users? In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *Handbook on English language teaching,* (pp. 237-248). Kluwer.

Craig, E. (1998). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Volume 7*. Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). Narrative research designs. In *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 511-550). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: CUP.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: CUP.

Curtis, G. L. (1999). *The Logic of Japanese Politics: Leaders, Institutions, and the Limits of Change*. Columbia U. Press.

Daily Yomiuri. (2005, Oct. 18). Aso Describes Japan as 'One Race Nation'. *Daily Yomiuri,* p. 2.

Davidson, A. I. (1997). *Foucault and his interlocutors*. University of Chicago Press.

Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Davies, A. (2009). Assessing World Englishes. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *29*, 80–89.

Davies, A., Hamp-Lyons, L., & Kemp, C. (2003). Whose norms? International proficiency tests in English. *World Englishes*, *22*(4), 571-584.

Davies, B. (1991). The concept of agency: A poststructuralist analysis. *Postmodern Critical Theorising, 30,* 42-53.

Davies, B. & Harre, R. (1994) Positioning: the discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, *20*(1), 43-64.

De Saussure, F., Bally, C., Sechehaye, A., Riedlinger, A., & Baskin, W. (1966). *Course in General linguistics*. McGraw-Hill, New York.

De Saussure, F., & Riedlinger, A. (1983). *Course in general linguistics*. Open Court Publishing Company.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (Vol. 3). McGraw-Hill.

Denzin, N. K. (1997). *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology* (G. C. Spivak, trans.). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dillard, C. (2000). The substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen: Examining an endarkened feminist epistemology in educational research and leadership. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 13*(6), 661–681.

Dobson, D. (2008). The symbol as teacher: Reflective practices and methodology in transformative education. In R. Jones, A. Clarkson, S. Congram & N. Stratton (Eds.), *Education and Imagination: Post-Jungian Perspectives,* (pp. 142-159). Taylor & Francis.

Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33–56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Educational Testing Service (2009) *TOEIC.* Retrieved December 10, 2009 from http://www.ets.org/portal/site/ets/menuitem.fab2360b1645a1de9b3a0779f1751509/?vgnextoid=06cfd898c84f4010VgnVCM10000022f95190RCRD

Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography.* Walnut Creek, CA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Ellis, C. & Berger, L. (2003). Their story/my story/our story: Including the researcher's experience in interview research. In J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Postmodern interviewing* (pp. 157-186). Thousand Oaks, CA:Sage.

Educational Testing Service (2009) *TOEIC.* Retrieved December 10, 2009 from http://www.ets.org/portal/site/ets/menuitem.fab2360b1645a1de9b3a0779f171509/?vgnextoid=06cfd898c84f4010VgnVCM10000022f95190RCRD

Fackler, M. (2012, July 15). Japan Recalls Ambassador in Island Dispute With China. *The New York Times*. Retrieved September 12, 2012 from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/16/world/asia/japan-recalls-ambassador-to-china.html

Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). On identifying communication strategies in interlanguage production. *Strategies in interlanguage communication*, 210–238.

Fennelly, M., & Luxton, R. (2011). Are they ready? On the verge of compulsory English, elementary school teachers lack confidence. The *Language Teacher*, (*35)*4, 19-24.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: Reinventing self and other in qualitative research. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research,* (pp. 70-82). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Fine, M., & Jaffe-Walter, R. Pedraza, P., Futch, V. & Stoudt, B. (2007). Swimming: On oxygen, resistance, and possibility for immigrant youth under siege. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *38*(1), 76–96.

Firth, A. (1990). 'Lingua franca' negotiations: Towards an interactional approach. *World Englishes 9*, 69–80.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On `lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *26*(2), 237-259.

Firth, A. (2009). The lingua franca factor. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *6*(2), 147–170.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal, 81*, 285–300.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1998). SLA property: No trespassing! *Modern Language Journal, 82*, 91–94.

Fischer, M., & Marcus, G. (1986). *Anthropology as cultural critique: an experimental moment in the human sciences*. Chicago: U of Chicago Press.

Fish, S. (1989). *Doing What Comes Naturally*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. *Handbook of qualitative research*, *2*, 645–672.

Foucault, M. (1978). La Philosophie analytique de la politique. In D Defert & F. Ewart, (Eds.), *Dits et écrits 1954–1988* (pp. 540– 541). Paris: Gallimard.

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), Beyond structuralism (pp. 208-226). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1984). *The Foucault Reader.* Paul Rabinow, (Ed.). New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M., & Gordon, C. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. Vintage.

Fujimoto-Adamson, N. (2006). Globalization and history of English education in Japan. *Asian EFL Journal*, *8*(3). Retrieved September 12, 2012 from http://70.40.196.162/September_2006_EBook_editions.pdf#page=259

Fukada, T. (2008, September 27). Tourism minister apologizes for gaffes. *The Japan Times.* Retrieved September 7, 2012, from http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/nn20080927a2.html

Fukuzawa, Y. (1885). Datsu-A Ron (脱亜論). In Junji Banno (Ed.), *Fukuzawa Yukichi Sensyu* (福沢諭吉選集, "Selected works of Yukichi Fukuzawa") (1981, volume 7). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Furukawa, S. (2002). Decentralization in Japan. *Japan's Road to Pluralism: Transforming Local Communities in the Global Era. Tokyo: Japan Center for International Exchange*, 21–47.

Gale, K., & Wyatt, J. (2006). Inquiring Into Writing. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *12*(6), 1117-1134.

Gauthier, J. D. (1988). The ethics of the care of the self as a practice of freedom: an Interview. In J Bernauer & D Rasmussen (Eds.), *The final Foucault* (pp. 1-20). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ge, S. (2007). How does Asia mean? Translated by Hui-Shu Lun & Lau Kinchi. In Chen, K. H., & Chua, C.B. (eds.), *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies Reader* (pp. 9-65). London: Routledge.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.

Giroux, H. (1992). Border crossing. *Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. Routledge.

Goodley, D. (2004). *Researching Life Stories: Method, Theory and Analyses in a Biographical Age*. Routledge.

Gorsuch, G. J. (2000). EFL Educational Policies and Educational Cultures: Influences on Teachers' Approval of Communicative Activities. *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(4), 675-710.

Government of Japan (2011). 1993 Personal Information Privacy Act. Retrieved September 1, 2011 from http://law.e-gov.go.jp/htmldata/H15/H15HO057.html

Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English? A guide to forecasting the popularity of the English language in the 21st century.* London: British Council.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, 41–58.

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln,Y. S. (1994). Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research,* (pp. 105–17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guba, E. G. and Lincoln,Y. S. (1989) *Fourth Generation Evaluation.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: CUP.

Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1992). Beyond "culture": Space, identity, and the politics of difference. *Cultural Anthropology*, *7*(1), 6–23.

Hall, I. (1994). *Working Paper #3: Academic apartheid at Japan's National Universities*. Tokyo: Japan Policy Research Institute. Retrieved August 19, 2011 from http://www.debito.org/JPRIacadapart1.html

Hall, I. (1995). *Working Paper #9: Academic apartheid revisited*. Tokyo: Japan Policy Research Institute. Retrieved August 19, 2011 from http://www.debito.org/JPRIacadapart2.html

Hall, I. (1997). *Cartels of the Mind*. New York: W W Norton & Co.

Hall, S. (1997). The local and the global: Globalization and ethnicity. In A. D. King (Ed.), *Culture, globalization, and the world system* (pp. 19–40). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). Explorations in the functions of language (London, Edward Arnold). *Links*.

Haraway, D. J. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. Routledge.

Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. *Second language acquisition: A book of readings*, 401-435.

Hatch, E., & Long, M. (1980). Discourse analysis, what's that. *Discourse analysis in second language research*, 1–40.

Hartsock, N. (1987). Rethinking Modernism: Minority vs. Majority Theories. *Cultural Critique*, (7), 187-206.

Hawkins, J. (1998). Education. In R. Maidment (Ed.), *Culture and Society in the Asia-Pacific* (pp. 141–162). Routledge.

Heinrich, P. (2012). The making of monolingual Japan: Language ideology and Japanese modernity. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Hesse-Biber, S. N. (2007). The practice of feminist in-depth interviewing. *Feminist research practice: A primer*, 111–148.

Higgins, C. (2003). "Ownership" of English in the Outer Circle: An Alternative to the NS-NNS Dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(4), 615–644.

Hobbs, M. (2008). On Discourse and Representation: Reflections on Michel Foucault's Contribution to the Study of the Mass Media. *Annual Conference of the Australian Sociological Association,* University of Melbourne. U of Melbourne Press.

Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford: OUP.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1995). *The active interview*. Sage Publications.

hooks, b. (1990). Choosing the margin as a space for radical openness. In *Yearning: Race, gender and cultural politics* (pp. 145–54). Boston: South End.

House, J. (2003). English as a lingua franca: a threat to multilingualism? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *7*(4), 556–578.

House, J. (1999). Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: Interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility. In C. Gnutzmann (Ed.), *Teaching and Learning English as a Global Language*. Tubingen: Stauffenburg, 73-89.

Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. London: OUP.

Huber, J, Murphy, M. S., & Clandinin, D. J. (2011). *Places of Curriculum Making: Narrative Inquiries Into Children's Lives in Motion*. Emerald Group Publishing.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). London: Penguin.

Hymes, D. (1977). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: an ethnographic approach*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Iino, M. (2002). English language education in Japan. In R. E. Silver, G. Hu & M. Iino (Eds.), *English language education in China, Japan, and Singapore* (pp. 81-97). Nanyang, Singapore: Nanyang Technological University National Institute of Education.

Imura, M. (2003). 日本の英語教育*200*年 *(English education in Japan for the past 200 years)*. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.

Institute of International Education (2009a). Record numbers of international students in U.S. higher education. Retrieved March 18, 2010 from: http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=150649

Ishihara, S. (2004). Policy Speech at the 2nd Regular Session of the Metropolitan Assembly, 2004. Retrieved online from http://www.metro.tokyo.jp/ENGLISH/GOVERNOR/SPEECH/2004/fge6g102.htm

Ivic, S. (2009). European Udine Declaration: A Poststructuralist Reading. *Review of European Studies*, *1*(2), 110-116.

Japan Exchange and Teaching Program (2009). *Participant numbers*. Retrieved December 11, 2009 from http://www.jetprogramme.org/e/introduction/statistics.html#detail

Japan External Trade Organization (2008). *Japan's international trade in goods (yearly)*. Retrieved March 15, 2010 from http://www.jetro.go.jp/en/reports/statistics/

Japan Tourism Marketing Co. (2009) *Tourism statistics*. Retrieved December 11,

2009 from http://www.tourism.jp/english/statistics/

Jarvis, S. & Pavlenko, A. (2009). *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. (2002). Pronunciation goals for EAL: by default or by design? In C. Leung (Ed.), *Language and additional/second language issues for school education* (pp. 59-68). Watford: National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum.

Jenkins, J. (2005). *English as a lingua franca: Past empirical, present controversial, future uncertain*. Paper presented at RELC International Seminar, Singapore.

Jenkins, J. (2006a). Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 157–181.

Jenkins, J. (2006b). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *16*(2), 137–162.

Jenkins, J. (2006c). Global intelligibility and local diversity: possibility or paradox? *English in the world: Global rules, global roles*, 32–39.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: attitude and identity*. Oxford Applied Linguistics (Vol. 34). Oxford: OUP.

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, *28*(2), 200–207.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*, 11–30.

Kachru, B. B. (1991). Liberation linguistics and the Quirk concern. *English Today*, *7*(1), 3–13.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). Teaching world Englishes. *The other tongue: English across cultures*, *2*, 355-365.

Kachru, B. B. (1998). English as an Asian language. *Links & Letters*, *5*, 89–108.

Kachru, Y. (2005). Teaching and learning of world Englishes. *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, 155–173.

Kramsch, C. (1995). The cultural component of language teaching. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *8*(2), 83–92.

Kato, M. (2009, March 5). Elementary school English: ready or not. *Japan Times.* Retrieved November 1, 2010 from http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/nn20090305f1.html

Khan, Y. (1997). *Japanese Moral Education Past and Present*. Fairleigh Dickinson Univ Press.

Kitao, K., & Kitao, S. K. (1995). *English teaching: Theory, research, practice* (pp. 3-20). Tokyo: Eichosha.

Koch, T., & Harrington, A. (1998). Reconceptualizing rigour: the case for reflexivity. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *28*(4), 882–890.

Koike, I., & Tanaka, H. (1995). English in foreign language education policy in Japan: Toward the twenty−first century. *World Englishes, 14* (1), 13−25.

Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. New York: OUP.

Kramsch, C. (2006). From communicative competence to symbolic competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, *90*(2), 249-252.

Kramsch, C. (2008). Ecological perspectives on foreign language education. *Language Teaching*, *41*(3), 389–408.

Kramsch, C., & Sullivan, P. (1996). Appropriate pedagogy. *ELT Journal*, *50*(3), 199-212.

Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2008). Language Ecology in Multilingual Settings. Towards a Theory of Symbolic Competence. *Applied Linguistics*, *29*(4), 645-671.

Kubota, R. (1998). Ideologies of English in Japan. *World Englishes*, *17*(3), 295–306.

Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese Culture Constructed by Discourses: Implications for Applied Linguistics Research and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(1), 9–35.

Kubota, R. (2001). Teaching world Englishes to native speakers of English in the USA. *World Englishes*, *20*(1), 47-64.

Kubota, R. (2002). The impact of globalization on language teaching in Japan. In D. Block & Deborah Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching*, (pp. 13-28). London: Routledge.

Kubota, R. (2011). Learning a foreign language as leisure and consumption: enjoyment, desire, and the business of Eikaiwa. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *14*(4), 473–488.

Kubota, R. & L., Angel. (2009). *Race, Culture, and Identities in Second Language Education: Exploring Critically Engaged Practice*. Taylor & Francis.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, *35*(4), 537–560.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 59–81.

Kusch, J., & McVittie, J. (2002). Just clowning around: Classroom perspectives on children's humour. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'education*, 195–210.

Lacan, J. (1977). The function and field of speech and language in psychoanalysis. *Écrits: A selection*, 30–113.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: OUP.

Lapadat, J. C. (2000). Problematizing transcription: Purpose, paradigm and quality. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *3*(3), 203–219.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. Psychology Press.

Lather, P. (1992). Critical frames in educational research: Feminist and post-structural perspectives. *Theory into practice*, *31*(2), 87–99.

Lather, P. (1993). Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *Sociological Quarterly*, *34*(4), 673–693.

Lather, P. (2008). Getting lost: Critiquing across difference as methodological practice. In K. Gallagher (Ed.), *The methodological dilemma: creative, critical, and collaborative approaches to qualitative research* (pp. 219-231). Cornwall, England: Routledge.

Law, G. (1995). Ideologies of English language education in Japan. *JALT Journal*, *17*(2), 213−224.

Lee, E., & Simon-Maeda, A. (2006). Racialized research identities in ESL/EFL research. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(3), 573–594.

Lenzo, K. (1995). Validity and self-reflexivity meet poststructuralism: Scientific ethos and the transgressive self. *Educational Researcher*, *24*(4), 17–45.

Leung, C. (2005). Convivial communication: Recontextualizing communicative competence. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *15*(2), 119–144.

Leung, C., Harris, R. & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly 31(*3), 543–60.

Leung, C., & Lewkowicz, J. (2006). Expanding Horizons and Unresolved Conundrums: Language Testing and Assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 211-234.

Lin, A., Wang, W., Akamatsu, N., & Riazi, A. M. (2002). Appropriating English, Expanding Identities, and Re-Visioning the Field: From TESOL to Teaching English for Glocalized Communication (TEGCOM). *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *1*(4), 295.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Llurda, E. (2005). *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession*. Springer Verlag.

Lowenberg, P. H. (1993). Issues of validity in tests of English as a world language: Whose standards? *World Englishes*, *12*(1), 95–106.

Lowenberg, P. (2000). Non-native varieties and issues of fairness in testing English as a world language. In Antony John Kunnan (Ed.), *Fairness and validation in language assessment: selected papers from the 19th Language Testing Research Colloquium, Orlando, Florida* (pp. 43-60). Cambridge: CUP.

Lowenberg, P. H. (2002). Assessing English proficiency in the expanding circle. *World Englishes*, *21*(3), 431–435.

Lu, Y. H. (2005). Stories of teacher identity: A narrative inquiry into East Asian ESL teachers' lives. Unpublished Disseration retrieved September 1, 2011 from: http://hdl.handle.net/1903/3127

MacKinnon, M. (2012, August 14). Tokyo's hawkish governor stirs the pot. *Foreign Policy*. Retrieved online at: http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/08/14/tokyo_s_hawkish_governor_stirs_the_pot

Mahboob, A. (2005). Beyond the native speaker in TESOL. *Culture, Context, & Communication* (60–93). Abu Dhabi: Center of Excellence for Applied Research and Training & The Military Language Institute.

Mahboob, A. (2010). *The NNEST lens: Non native English speakers in TESOL*. Cambridge Scholars.

Martin-Beltrán, M. (2010a). Positioning proficiency: How students and teachers (de)construct language proficiency at school. *Linguistics and Education, 21*(4), 257-281.

Martin-Beltrán, M. (2010b). The two-way language bridge: Co-constructing bilingual language learning opportunities. *Modern Language Journal, 94*(2), 254-277.

Masso, A., & Tender, T. (2008). About the linguistic constitution of social space: The case of Estonia. *Trames: Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, *12*, 151.

Matsuda, A. (2003a). The ownership of English in Japanese secondary schools. *World Englishes*, *22*(4), 483–496.

Matsuda, A. (2003b). Incorporating World Englishes in teaching English as an International Language. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(4), 719-729.

Matthews, E. A. (2003, November 1). Japan's New Nationalism. *Foreign Affairs*, (November/December 2003). Retrieved September 12, 2012 from: http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/59369/eugene-a-matthews/japans-new-nationalism

Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Sage Publications, Inc.

McArthur, T. (1998). *The English Languages.* Cambridge, UK: CUP.

McCrostie, J., & Spiri, J. (2008, December 30). Foreign university faculty face annual round of "musical jobs." *The Japan Times.* Retrieved September 7, 2012, from http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/fl20081230zg.html

McKay, S. (2003). Teaching English as an international language: The Chilean context. *ELT Journal*, *57*(2), 139.

Mcneill, D. (2010, September 8). Japan's Globalization Project Stalls as Some Criticize Focus on Elite Universities. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/A-Slow-Start-for-Japans/124346/

McKay, S. L., & Wong, S. L. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, *66*(3), 577–609.

Medgyes, P. (1983). The schizophrenic teacher. *ELT Journal*, *37*(1), 2.

Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, *46*(4), 340.

Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. Macmillan London.

Medgyes, P. (2001). When the teacher is a non-native speaker. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 429-442). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Meierkord, C. (1996). *Englisch als Medium der interkulturellen Kommunikation*. *Untersuchungen zum non-native-/ non-native-speaker Diskurs.* Frankfurt.

Meierkord, C. (1998). Lingua franca English: Characteristics of successful nonnative-non-native discourse. *Erfurt Electronic Studies (EESE*). Retrieved August 1, 2011 from: http://webdoc.sub.gwdg.de/edoc/ia/eese/eese.html

Meierkord, C. (2000). Interpreting successful lingua franca interaction. An analysis of non-native/non-native small talk conversations in English. *Linguistik online*, *5*(1). Retrieved August 1, 2011 from http://www.linguistikonline.com/1_00/MEIERKOR.HTM

Meierkord, C. (2002). "Language stripped bare" or "linguistic masala"? Culture in lingua franca communication. In K. Knapp & C. Meierkord (Eds.), *Lingua franca communication* (pp.109-134). Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang.

Melchers, G., & Shaw, P. (2003). *World Englishes: An introduction*. Arnold.

Menard-Warwick, J. (2008). The cultural and intercultural identities of transnational English teachers: Two case studies from the Americas. *TESOL Quarterly*, *42*(4), 617–640.

MEXT (2002). Developing a strategic plan to cultivate 'Japanese with English abilities. Retrieved October 4, 2009 from http://www.mext.go.jp/english/news/2002/07/020901.htm

MEXT (2003a). Action Plan to Cultivate ''Japanese with English Abilities.'' Retrieved December 10, 2009 from http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/03072801.htm

MEXT (2003b). About the Future Promotion of International Cultural Exchange (Report 24). Retrieved December 9, 2009 from http://www.mext.go.jp/english/bunka/index.htm

MEXT (2007). Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. Handbook retrieved December 15, 2009 from www.mext.go.jp/list_001/list_016/__.../03/.../mext_2007_e.pdf

Meyer, C. (2011, December 22). Fukushima Refugees Trapped By Uncertainty.

Spiegel Online. Retrieved October 1, 2012 from http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/scattered-across-japan-fukushima-refugees-trapped-by-uncertainty-a-805337.html

Mikitani, H. (2012). *Englishnization.* Kobo Publishers.

Miller, J. (2004). Identity and language use: The politics of speaking ESL in schools. *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*, 290–315.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2008). School Basic Survey, 2008. Retrieved September 1, 2012 from www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/toukei/001/08072901/002.pdf

Ministry of Finance (2008). *Trade statistics for Japan*. Retrieved December 11, 2009 from http://www.mof.go.jp/english/index.htm

Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (2010) Saikin kohyo no toukei shiryou (Statistical documentation recently made public). Retrieved September 7, 2012 from http://www.mhlw.go.jp/toukei/saikin/hw/jinkou/suii09/marr2.html

Mishler E. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mizuta, A. (2009). The Unchanged Images of English in Changing Japan: From Modernization to Globalization. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, *18*(2), 38-53.

Modiano, M. (1999). International English in the global village. *English Today*, 15(2), 22-27.

Morgan, B. (2004). Teacher identity as pedagogy: Towards a field-internal conceptualisation in bilingual and second language education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *7*(2-3), 172–188.

Morgan, B. (2007). Poststructuralism and applied linguistics. *International handbook of English language teaching*, 1033–1052.

Mori, J. (2011). < Survey Report> G30 and its Implications for Japan. *京都大学国際交流センター論攷, 1*, 63–71.

Motha, S. (2006). Racializing ESOL Teacher Identities in US K-2 Public Schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(3), 495–518.

Motha, S., Jain, R. & Tecle, T. (2012). Translinguistic identity-as-pedagogy: Implications for language teacher education. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language Teaching, 1*(1), 13-27. Nova Science Publishers.

Murahata, Y. (2008). What do we learn from NNEST-related issues? Some implications for TEFL in Japan. *The Language Teacher, 30*(6), 3-7. Tokyo: JALT Press.

Murahata, G., Murahata, Y. (2008). V. Cook's Multicompetence and Its Consequences for SLA Research and L2 Pedagogy. Retrieved September 1, 2012 from https://ir.kochi-u.ac.jp/dspace/handle/10126/2998

Murphey, T. (2004). Participation, (Dis-) identification, and Japanese university entrance exams. *TESOL Quarterly*, *38*(4), 700–710.

Nation, P., & Meara, P. (2002). Vocabulary. In N. Schmitt, (Ed.), *An introduction to applied linguistics,* (pp. 35-54). New York, NY: Hodder Arnold.

Nattinger, J. R. (1980). A lexical phrase grammar for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, *14*(3), 337–344.

Nayar, P. B. (1997). ESL/EFL dichotomy today: Language politics or pragmatics? *TESOL Quarterly*, 9–37.

Neeley, T. (2011). Language and Globalization: "Englishnization" at Rakuten. *SSRN eLibrary*. Retrieved September 20, 2012 from: http://pagpers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1993062

Nelson, C. L. (1985). My language, your culture: whose communicative competence? *World Englishes*, *4*(2), 243-250.

Nemoto, Y. (1999). *The Japanese Education System*. Universal-Publishers.

Newman, S. (2001). Derrida's deconstruction of authority. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, *27*(3), 1 -20.

Nguyen, P. M., Terlouw, C., & Pilot, A. (2006). Culturally appropriate pedagogy: the case of group learning in a Confucian Heritage Culture context. *Intercultural Education*, *17*(1), 1–19.

Niikawa, T. (2006). Decentralization and local governance: Reinforcing democracy and effectiveness of local government. *Regional Forum on Reinventing Government in Asia-Building Trust in Government: Innovations to Improve Governance*. Retrieved September 15, 2012 from http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/UN/UNPAN024473.pdf

Noriguchi, S. (2006). English education leaves much to be desired. *Asahi Shimbun*, Sep. 15, 2006. Retrieved January 20, 2012 from http://www.asahi.com/english/Heraldasahi/TKY200609150129.html

Nguyen, P. M., Terlouw, C., & Pilot, A. (2006). Culturally appropriate pedagogy: the case of group learning in a Confucian Heritage Culture context. *Intercultural Education*, *17*(1), 1–19.

Norton Pierce, B. (1995). Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(1), 9–31.

Norton, B. (1997). Language, Identity, and the Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*(3), 409-430.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.

Norton, B. (2006). Identity as a sociocultural construct in second language education. In K. Cadman & K. O'Regan (Eds.), *TESOL in Context* [Special Issue], 22-33.

Norton, B. (2010). Language and Identity. In N. Hornberger and S. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (349–369). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2001). Changing perspectives on good language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, *35*(2), 307–322.

Oda, M. (1999). English only or English plus? The language (s) of EFL organizations. *Non-native educators in English language teaching*, 105–121.

Oda, M. (2007). Globalization or the World in English: Is Japan Ready to Face the Waves? *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *1*(2), 119–126.

Oliver, C. (2009). Kokusaika, revisited: Reinventing "Internationalization" in late 1960s Japan. *Sophia Junior College Faculty Journal, 29*, 47-54.

Oliver, D. G., Serovich, J. M., & Mason, T. L. (2005). Constraints and opportunities with interview transcription: Towards reflection in qualitative research. *Social Forces*, *84*(2), 1273–1289.

Parmenter, L., & Tomita, Y. (2001). Virtual intercultural competence: A programme for Japanese elementary school students. In M. Byram, A. Nichols, & D. Stevens (Eds.), *Developing intercultural competence in practice* (pp. 133-145). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Paikeday, T. M. (1985). *The native speaker is dead!* Paikeday Pub. Inc.

Pakir, A. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Analyzing research frameworks in international English, world Englishes, and ELF. *World Englishes*, *28*(2), 224–235.

Park, G. (2008). Lived pedagogies: Becoming a multicompetent ESOL teacher. In J.A. Carmona (Ed.), *Perspectives on community college ESL, Volume 3: Faculty, administration, and the working environment* (pp. 17-30). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Park, G. (2012). "I Am Never Afraid of Being Recognized as an NNES": One Teacher's Journey in Claiming and Embracing Her Nonnative-Speaker Identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, *46*(1), 127–151.

Pawley, A., & Syder, F. H. (1983). Two Puzzles for Linguistic Theory: Nativelike Selection and Nativelike Fluency. In J. C. Richards & R W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication,* (pp. 191-225). London: Longman.

Pavlenko, A. (2002). Poststructuralist approaches to the study of social factors in second language learning and use. *Portraits of the L2 Learner*, *2*, 277–302.

Pennycook, A. (1990). Towards a Critical Applied Linguistics for the 1990s. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 8–28.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Longman.

Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction: Critical Approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(3), 329-348.

Pennycook, A. (2003). Global Englishes, rip slyme, and performativity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *7*(4), 513–533.

Peters, M. (2004). Educational research: "Games of truth" and the ethics of subjectivity. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, *5*(2), 50–63.

Peters, M. & Humes, W. (2003). The reception of post-structuralism in educational research and policy. *Journal of Education Policy, 18*(2), 109-113.

Peters, M. & Lankshear, C. (1996). Postmodern counternarratives. In H. A. Giroux, C. Lankshear, P. McLaren, & M. Peters (Eds.), *Counternarratives: Cultural studies and critical pedagogies in postmodern spaces* (pp. 1-40). New York: Routledge.

Pettersen, L. (1993). Japan's cram schools. *Educational Leadership*, *50*(5), 56-58.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: OUP.

Phillipson, R. (2003). *English-only Europe?: Challenging language policy*. Routledge.

Poetter, T. S., & Bird, J. L. (2004). *Critical Perspectives On The Curriculum Of Teacher Education*. University Press of America.

Pulvers, R. (2012, July 22). Osaka Mayor Toru Hashimoto: "What Japan needs now is dictatorship" *The Japan Times*. Retrieved September 6, 2012, from http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/fl20120722rp.html

Quirk, R. (1988). The question of standards in the international use of English. In Peter H. Lowenberg (Ed.), *Georgetown University Roundtable in Languages and Linguistics 1987* (pp. 278–341). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Quirk, R. (1989). Language varieties and standard language. JALT Journal *11*, 14–25.

Quirk, R. (1990). Language varieties and standard language. *English Today*, *6*(1), 3–10.

Rajadurai, J. (2005). Revisiting the concentric circles: conceptual and sociolinguistic considerations. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 7*(4), 111-130.

Rajagopalan, K. (1999). *Of EFL teachers, conscience, and cowardice* (Vol. 53). Oxford Univ Press.

Rajagopalan, K. (2005). Non-native speaker teachers of English and their anxieties: Ingredients for an experiment in action research. *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 283-303). New York: Springer.

Rampton, B. (1987) Stylistic variability and not speaking 'normal' English: some post-Labovian approaches and their implications for the study of interlanguage. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in context* (pp. 47-58). London: Prentice Hall.

Rampton, M. B. (1990). Displacing the" Native Speaker": Expertise, Affiliation, and Inheritance. *ELT Journal*, *44*(2), 97–101.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (1983). *Language and Communication.* New York: Longman.

Richardson, L. (1997). *Fields of play: Constructing an academic life*. Rutgers Univ Press.

Riessman, C. K., & Quinney, L. (2005). Narrative in social work. *Qualitative Social Work*, *4*(4), 391-412.

Riley, P. A. (2008). Reform in English language teaching in Japan. *人間環境学会* (紀要), *9*, 105-11.

Rolfe, G. (2006). Validity, trustworthiness and rigour: quality and the idea of qualitative research. *Journal of advanced nursing*, *53*(3), 304–310.

Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. (1998). *Learning in the Field*. SAGE Publications.

Rugen, B. (2010). When non-traditional meets traditional: Understanding nontraditional students through classroom discourse analysis. *The Language Teacher*, *24*(6), 14-21. JALT Press.

Rudolph, N. (2011). *Negotiating Halil: Concomitant agency as a "non-native" English speaker teacher, scholar and teacher trainer.* Unpublished pilot study. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Rudolph, N. & Igarashi, Y. (2012). Conceptualizing the Role of the Language Teacher Within and Beyond the Native Speaker Construct: A Focus on Japan. *2012 Proceedings of the IAFOR Asian Conference on Language Learning*. Aichi, Japan, 342-357.

Sandelowski, M. (1993). Rigor or rigor mortis: the problem of rigor in qualitative research revisited. *Advances in Nursing Science*, *16*(2), 1-8.

Saraceni, M. (2008). English as a lingua franca: between form and function. *English Today*, *24*(2), 20–26.

Sawada, J. A. (1993). *Confucian Values and Popular Zen: Sekimon Shingaku in Eighteenth-Century Japan*. University of Hawaii Press.

Scheurich, J. (1991). *The Paradigmatic Transgressions of Validity*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, Dayton, Ohio.

Seale, C. (2002). Quality issues in qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Social Work*, *1*(1), 97.

Seargeant, P. (2011). *English in Japan in the Era of Globalization*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Searle, J. A. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: CUP.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca.

Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24, 209-239.

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, *59*(4), 339-341.

Seidlhofer, B. (2006). English as a lingua franca in the Expanding Circle: what it isn't. *English in the world: Global rules, global roles*, 40–50.

Seidlhofer, B. (2009). Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes*, *28*(2), 236–245.

Selinker, L. (1992). *Rediscovering interlanguage: Applied linguistics and language study*. London: Longman.

Siegal, M. (1996). *Creation of the other: The case of White women learning Japanese and the implications of discursive practices*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Chicago, IL.

Simon-Maeda, A. (2004). The complex construction of professional identities: Female EFL educators in Japan speak out. *TESOL Quarterly*, *38*(3), 405–436.

Simon-Maeda, A. (2011). *Being and becoming a speaker of Japanese: An autoethnographic account*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: OUP.

Smith, L. E. (1981). English as an international language. Gaikokugo (Kyoikukiyo, Japan). In Larry E. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in English as an International Language* (pp. 7–12). Oxford: Pergamon.

Smith, L. E. (1992). Spread of English and issues of intelligibility. In B.B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures, second edition* (pp. 75-90). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Spector-Mersel, G. (2010). Narrative research: Time for a paradigm. *Narrative Inquiry*, *20*(1), 204–224.

Sugimoto, Y. (1999). Making sense of nihonjinron. *Thesis Eleven*, *57*(1), 81–96.

Sultana, F. (2007). Reflexivity, positionality and participatory ethics: Negotiating fieldwork dilemmas in international research. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, *6*(3), 374–385.

Swain, M., & Deters, P. (2007). "New" Mainstream SLA Theory: Expanded and Enriched. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*(5), 820–836.

Sylvester, J. (2007). Japan's territorial disputes. *American diplomacy: Foreign service dispatches and reports on U.S. foreign policy.* Retrieved from: http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/item/2007/0709/sylv/sylvester_japan.html

Takahara, K. (2008, January 5). Assistant language teachers in trying times. *The Japan Times*. Retrieved September 12, 2012 from: http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/nn20080105f1.html

Taylor-Mendes, C. (2009). Construction of racial stereotypes in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) textbooks: Images as discourse. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 64-80). London: Routledge.

Taylor, I., & Taylor, M. M. (1995). *Writing and literacy in Chinese, Korean and Japanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and international English: A classroom view. *ELT Journal*, *56*(3), 240.

Trahar, S. (2009). Beyond the Story Itself: Narrative Inquiry and Autoethnography in Intercultural Research in Higher Education. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *10*(1). Retrieved from http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1218

Trahar, S. (2011). *Learning and Teaching Narrative Inquiry: Travelling in the Borderlands*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Trend, D. (1994). Nationalities, Pedagogies, and Media. In H. A. Giroux & P. McLaren (Eds.)*, Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies* (pp. 25-241). New York: Routledge.

Tsui, A. B. M. (2007). Complexities of identity formation: A narrative inquiry of an EFL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*, 657–680.

Tsui, A., & Tollefson, J. W. (2007). *Language policy, culture, and identity in Asian contexts*. New York: Routledge.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2011). *International Compilation of Human Research Protections*. Washington, D.C.: Office for Human Research Protections. Retrieved August 20, 2011 from http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/international/

University of Maryland Institutional Review Board (2011). *IRB Policies and Procedures*. Retrieved October 1, 2011 from http://www.umresearch.umd.edu/IRB/PoliciesandProcedures.htm

Varley, H. P. (2000). *Japanese Culture*. University of Hawaii Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wagner, A. (2012). Policy Change in a Post-Crisis Japan: An Interview with Richard J. Samuels. National Bureau of Asian Research. Retrieved online September 21, 2012 from *http://www.nbr.org/research/activity.aspx?id=218*

Wagner, J. and Firth, A. (1997). Communication strategies at work. In E. Kellerman and G. Kasper (Eds.), *Advances in research on communication strategies* (pp. 323–344). Oxford: OUP.

Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Weiss, R. S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies.* New York: Free Press.

Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*(2), 377-389.

Widdowson, H. G. (1998). Context, community, and authentic language. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*(4), 705–716.

Widdowson, H. G. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching*. New York: OUP.

Widdowson, H.G. (2004). A perspective on recent trends. In A.P.R. Howatt & H.G. Widdowson (Eds.), *A history of English language teaching* (pp. 353-72). Oxford: OUP.

Willis, J. (2008). *Qualitative Research Methods in Education and Educational Technology*. IAP.

Willis, D. B. & Murphy-Shigematsu, S. (2008). *Transcultural Japan: At the borderlands of race, gender and identity.* New York: Routledge.

Wray, H. (2008). *Japanese and American Education: Attitudes and Practices*. IAP.

Wright, H. (2003). An endarkened feminist epistemology? Identity, difference and the politics of representation in educational research. *Qualitative Studies in Education,16*(2), 197–214.

Yamanaka, N. (2006). An evaluation of English textbooks in Japan from the viewpoint of nations in the Inner, Outer, and Expanding Circles. *JALT Journal*, *28*(1), 57-76.

Yano, Y. (2011). English as an International Language and 'Japanese English'. In P.

Seargeant, (Ed.), *English in Japan in the Era of Globalization* (pp. 125-142). Palgrave Macmillan.

Yokomichi, K. (2008). The Debate on the Introduction of a regional System in Japan. *Up-to-date Documents on Local Autonomy in Japan No*, *3*. Retrieved September 10, 2012 from http://www3.grips.ac.jp/~coslog/test/activity/01/03/file/up-to-date- 3_en.pdf

Yoshida, K. (2003a). Language Education Policy in Japan: The Problem of Espoused Objectives versus Practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, *87*(2), 290-292.

Yoshida, K. (2003b). Implications of research on the state of English education in Japan. *Sophia Linguistica 50*, 53-65.

Zuengler, J., & Miller, E. R. (2006). Cognitive and sociocultural perspectives: Two parallel SLA worlds? *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 35–58.