

Collaborative Deconstruction of Native-Speakerism

Sunao Fukunaga

Kyushu Institute of Technology

Natasha Hashimoto

Tokyo Woman's Christian University

Robert J. Lowe

Tokyo Kasei University

Giancarla Unser-Schutz

Rissho University

Laura Kusaka

Aichi University

Reference Data:

Fukunaga, S., Hashimoto, N., Lowe, R. J., Unser-Schutz, G., & Kusaka, L. (2018). Collaborative deconstruction of native-speakerism. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & P. Bennett (Eds.), *Language teaching in a global age: Shaping the classroom, shaping the world*. Tokyo: JALT.

Teacher/researchers of diverse backgrounds worked collaboratively to deconstruct native-speakerism. Native-speakerist ideology has been recognized as an important issue since the

'nonnative speaker' English teachers' movement in the 1990s. However, change has been slow, as illustrated by the studies presented here. The first section focuses on teachers in the commercial sector in Japan. Discriminatory hiring practices are rampant, and what is equally disturbing is how teachers are dispatched by such companies to public or private educational institutions. Duoethnography is used in the second study to deconstruct the ways in which native-speakerism affects perceptions of instructors, based on the superficial labeling of 'native' and 'nonnative speaker' teachers. The paper concludes with a pilot study on student experiences and attitudes toward 'native' and 'nonnative speaker' teachers that revealed that students do not necessarily believe in the superiority of 'native speaker' teachers. In the appendix, a checklist is provided for readers to deconstruct the influences of native-speakerism on their respective workplaces.

多様な経歴の教師/研究者が協働しネイティブスピーカー信仰(中心主義)を脱構築することを試みる。本論では、90年代のノンネイティブスピーカー英語教師運動以来、ネイティブスピーカー信仰イデオロギーが、いかに可視化され問題視されてきたかを概観し、異なる脱構築の手法を用いた3つの研究を紹介する。第1の研究は、日本の民間英会話学校の差別的な採用実態と、そこで採用された英会話教師の正規教育機関への派遣の実態を明らかにした。第2のデュオエスノグラフィー研究は、対照的な経歴を持つ研究者が、其々が置かれた状況からネイティブスピーカーイデオロギーと自らの実践を対照し内省的に分析した。第3の予備研究は「ネイティブ」と「ノンネイティブ」教師に対する学生の経験と態度を調査し、学生が必ずしも「ネイティブ」教師に優位性があると考えているわけではないことを明らかにしている。ネイティブスピーカー信仰の影響を脱構築するチェックリストを付録とした。

The five contributors of this paper bring racially, linguistically, and culturally diverse backgrounds to three different studies, working in collaboration to challenge the ideology of native-speakerism and its effects on ELT in Japan. Each works toward professional equity within ELT and each uses various perspectives to “deconstruct” the multifaceted nature of native-speakerism and demystify the construct and perception of native-speakerism. Throughout this paper, the term deconstruction will refer to a critical analysis of native-speakerism, its ideology, and practices. Also, based on discussions with various professionals and through our own experiences, we provide a checklist in Appendix C that can aid readers in deconstructing native-speakerism at their own institutions and combat its influences in their own situations.

Native-Speakerism in English Language Teaching

Holliday (2006) defined native-speakerism as “a pervasive ideology within ELT, characterized by the belief that ‘native speaker’ teachers represent ‘Western culture’ from which spring the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology” (p. 386). Native-speakerism validates the idealization of ‘native speakers’ as optimal language instructors while undermining the professionalism of ‘nonnative speakers’ as teachers. This relegates these teachers to a second-rate category when they are, in fact, as valid and as professional as ‘native speaker’ teachers. Houghton and Rivers (2013) extended Holliday’s conceptualization (2005) and articulated native-speakerism as “prejudice, stereotyping and/or discrimination, typically by or against foreign language teachers, on the basis of either being or not being perceived and categorized as a native speaker of a particular language” (p. 14). Native-speakerism is, thus, a mutually reinforcing ideology and set of practices in terms of their operationalization within ELT.

Since the establishment of the Caucus for Nonnative Speakers in TESOL in 1998 and the groundbreaking colloquium *In Their Own Voices: Non-native Speaker Professionals in TESOL* (Braine, 2004), much research has examined and problematized the ‘native’ and ‘nonnative speaker’ dichotomy (Amin, 1999; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). Findings, however, have tended to reify this dichotomy by generalizing skill sets and individual strengths as signified within the ‘native’ and ‘nonnative’ labeling system (Holliday, 2018). Recent studies have employed a more critical approach, examining native-speakerism in ways that reveal its tacit discriminatory parameters and discussing how race, ethnicity, and gender come into play in the construction of native-speakerism and its ideology (Bailey & Pasternak, 2004; Holliday & Aboshiha, 2009; Houghton & Rivers, 2013; Kubota, 2001, 2002b, 2009). These studies have examined how native-speakerism has led to the normalization of unjust hiring practices, workplace conflict, and unequally distributed professional responsibilities, as well as adversely influencing the career paths of all ELT professionals—normalizations which Holliday (2018) warned create a domestication of native-speakerist ideology. Kachru (1992) believed the terms ‘native speaker’ and ‘nonnative speaker’ connote favoritism toward teachers from inner-circle English speaking countries. This longstanding unchallenged favoritism has been taken for granted because too often ‘native speaker’ and ‘nonnative speaker’ are treated like objectively measurable constructs existing within established categories (Holliday, 2015). Kumaravadivelu (2016) also argued that continual use of these phrases reifies and makes them appear neutral and objective, resulting in dividing teachers into two arbitrary groups, which allows discrimination to take place. Thus, following Holliday (2005), we chose to contest the normalization of these terms by using inverted commas throughout

the paper to highlight the problematic nature of these terms: ‘native speaker’ and ‘nonnative speaker.’ The point of using inverted commas is to highlight how these terms are used and that they are social constructs with a host of ideological baggage attached to them and are highly contested.

Three Studies That Deconstruct Native-Speakerism

The purpose of these three studies is to deconstruct the ways in which native-speakerism works as an ideology and how it is operationalized in the ELT industry in Japan. Each author deconstructs a different actor in native-speakerism, namely institutions, teachers, and students, through interview analysis, duoethnography, and a student survey.

First, Natasha Hashimoto reports a study involving “minority” Inner Circle teachers and ‘nonnative’ English speaker teachers (NNESTs) in the *eikaiwa*, or English conversation industry, in Japan. Little research has been conducted of such *eikaiwa* instructors, many of whom are neither Japanese nor ‘native’ English speakers (NESs). She also deconstructs how *eikaiwa* instructors as dispensable labor have become institutionalized and streamlined from primary to secondary and higher education.

Next, Robert J. Lowe draws on an emergent research method, duoethnography, to create an autobiographical narrative of his experiences and professional trajectories as a ‘native’ English speaker teacher, critically contrasting his experiences with those of his ‘nonnative’ English speaker teacher coauthor, Marek Kiczowski (Lowe & Kiczowski, 2016). He uses duoethnography to deconstruct how native-speakerism affects perceptions of instructors, based on the superficial labeling of ‘native’ and ‘nonnative speaker’ teachers.

Finally, Giancarla Unser-Schutz reports on a student survey conducted to deconstruct the fallacy that all students want ‘native’ English speaker teachers in their English classes. Her examination of the complex perspectives regarding ‘native’ and ‘nonnative’ English speaker teachers among nonteaching staff, administrators, and students reveals the need for a paradigm shift in pedagogy from liberal to more critical practices.

The Commercial ELT Sector

Natasha Hashimoto

In this section, I focus on a study of the recruiting practices and dispatch of teachers from the commercial sector to formal educational institutions, which is one part of a multiple case study of 23 teachers employed in the Japanese *eikaiwa* industry. Whereas most previous studies on *eikaiwa* schools (e.g., Appleby, 2014; Bailey, 2007; Seargeant, 2009) have not included NNESTs and ethnic minorities as key participants, primary participants in this study are non-Japanese NNESTs (e.g., Germans and Peruvians whose L1 is not English) and native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) of Asian descent from English-speaking countries (e.g., Chinese-Australians and Korean-Canadians whose L1 is English).

Scholars have argued that ‘native speaker’ is “an imaginary construct” (Kramsch, 1997, p. 255) or “a fiction” (Appleby, 2014, p. 13). However, many people still conflate the NES status with race and nationality (Holliday, 2008; Pederson, 2012; Phillipson, 2016). As some employers only recruit (white) NESTs (Ruecker & Ives, 2015), my research participants’ self-ascribed identities—as NNESTs or NESTs of Asian descent—are not in line with such employers’ preferences. These NNESTs experiences are different from experiences of NESTs perceived as white and point to many irregularities in the industry, which was a compelling reason to share their voices. This is also important because the commercial sector and traditional educational institutions are increasingly interconnected, as explained in the sections below.

Study Design

Since 2013 I have collected various data for triangulation purposes—to have “the picture” of the sector “as clear and suitably meaningful” as possible (Stake, 2006, p. 77) as it relates to minority teachers. There were over 90 hours of interviews with teachers, managers, and learners. Other data include emails, job postings, *eikaiwa* schools’ advertisements, and video-recorded *eikaiwa* sessions. They are “[pieces] of the ‘puzzle’” that help understand “the whole phenomenon” (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 554) of native-speakerism in Japanese commercial ELT.

Through snowball (chain referral) sampling, eight NESs of non-Japanese Asian descent from Australia, North America, and the United Kingdom, and 11 NNESTs from Africa, Asia, Europe, and South America were recruited for this study. Most work on annual contracts without benefits. Secondary participants are two white NESs, 10 school managers (mainly from Inner Circle countries), two Japanese teachers of English, and

two Japanese English-language learners. Between two and six sessions of semistructured interviews were conducted with each participant and qualitative thematic analyses of the data were performed (see Braun & Clarke, 2006). This study is a report on a set of questions focusing on recruiting practices (see Appendix A).

Findings and Analysis

The results show that participants found being NNESTs (particularly for people of color) and being NESTs of Asian descent was disadvantageous. For some, this resulted in economic discrimination due to inability to find (enough) work or being less paid than NESTs.

When participants were asked what factors made it easy or difficult to find employment, frequently mentioned issues included there being an unfair advantage, passport (nationality), experience, race, and hiring based on one’s likeability rather than qualifications. Recruiters also reported being a ‘native speaker’ as an important factor in recruiting, with one noting that “[learners] feel they aren’t getting what they paid for [because] NNESTs would make mistakes or have a different accent.” This finding is reflected in many job postings, which present only particular types of teachers as desirable: “must be a passport holder from a native English-speaking country,” “ideal candidates [are] from a native British, Australian, New Zealand or Commonwealth English-speaking background” (Gaijinpot, n.d.). Such discriminatory practices discourage NNESTs. Chris (Croatia) mentioned he never applies for “natives’ jobs” because “there’s no point in preparing applications. Nonnatives won’t be accepted anyway. Recruiters check my CV and don’t see why they should even interview me.” Even when postings do not specify NESTs only, Catherine (Philippines) “checks schools’ websites to see if *any* other Filipinos work there” before applying.

Furthermore, the participants reported that NESTs of Asian descent were often perceived as inauthentic and, for example, “not real Australian” (Steven, Australia). A recruiter said that learners want “teachers who fit their perception of ‘NESs’—white, fun, smart, and good-looking. Unfortunately, this usually means Caucasians from the United States, United Kingdom, or Australia.” Kureha (Canada) agreed: “Race is important. With a visibly foreign teacher, when parents visit the class they see, ‘Oh, an ‘authentic’ foreigner is teaching!’” A recruiter mentioned, “A student’s mother complained that a Chinese-American teacher’s accent sounded differently. He was born and raised in the United States, had an American accent, but she had a preconceived notion that he wouldn’t be able to speak English perfectly because of his appearance.” Some teachers of Asian descent also reported difficulty finding work.

Participants often found that being pushed into jobs only for NNESTs resulted in economic discrimination. Lucy, a NEST, reported that “a [European] NNEST, completely qualified, with much more experience than me and other [NESTs], got only 2/3 of our pay,” adding also that “my [English-speaking country’s] passport gives me an unfair advantage compared to just as qualified and experienced teachers coming from China, Russia . . .” Similarly, Hannah (Germany) said, “American friend works with a NNEST Filipina. They both do the exactly same job, [but my friend is perceived as] an asset and paid more than the Filipina.” Japanese NNESTs also reported being paid less than their NEST coworkers.

Outsourced ELT

The issues discussed above might become more important as the division between the for-profit sector and regular education is becoming less distinct, a topic which also emerged in the interviews. Participants were dispatched from *eikaiwa* schools to elementary schools, junior high schools, and universities. This finding is similar to Breden’s (2016), who reported on university English courses being outsourced to the commercial sector. This trend might be growing and might also be affected by native-speakerism. Two managers said that only NESTs from their schools were sent to teach university courses. John (USA) and his colleagues, mostly BA degree holders, were regularly dispatched to universities and graduate schools and “sometimes taught for-credit courses,” using “our in-house teaching materials,” which were made by his *eikaiwa*.

This further indicates that irregularities present in the commercial sector could potentially affect universities because teachers, materials, and teaching philosophies increasingly transfer from purely commercial contexts to academia. This is a serious issue also because some employers’ practices could be interpreted as legal violations (e.g., the Japanese Labor Standards Act, Article 3, prohibits discrimination in terms of salaries and work conditions due to workers’ nationality).

The findings indicated that discriminatory hiring practices—refusing to hire minority teachers or paying them less—lead to economic disadvantages for NNESTs and teachers of Asian descent. An important implication is that this deprives learners from contact with a diverse range of English speakers. As discriminatory hiring practices from a part of the commercial ELT sector now affect universities, even if they do not deliberately discriminate against certain groups of teachers, it is important to investigate this issue and its further implications and raise awareness of them.

Duoethnography as a Tool for Collaboratively Deconstructing Native-Speakerism

Robert J. Lowe

At the heart of native-speakerism is a focus on difference: between ‘native’ and ‘nonnative speaker’ teachers, between the “unproblematic” Western teacher and the “problematic” non-Western student, and between “good” Western pedagogy and “bad” non-Western pedagogy (Holliday, 2005; 2006). These are distinctions and assumptions that are taken for granted by many in the field of ELT, and yet critical scrutiny of these distinctions might reveal that they are not as clear-cut as previously considered. The following description of the dialogic research method of duoethnography includes an example based on a previously published study (Lowe & Kiczowski, 2016) of how it may be used to investigate and question some of these binary assumptions and thereby collaboratively deconstruct native-speakerism.

Duoethnography is a qualitative research method that developed from the more established genre of autoethnography (Sawyer & Norris, 2013), which itself derived from ethnography (Adams, Jones, & Ellis, 2015). Traditionally, ethnographers have engaged in empirical investigations and descriptions of peoples and cultures. In autoethnography, researchers “draw together features of autobiography and ethnography” (Paltridge, 2014, p. 100), using their own personal experiences to explore social phenomena and settings. Duoethnography was first conceptualised by Norris and Sawyer (2004) as a method in which two researchers from different backgrounds juxtapose their life histories to provide contrasting understandings of a topic. Duoethnographers engage in multiple recorded written or spoken discussions related to a particular social phenomenon, using their life histories as the basis for discussion. They then code this data by theme and, most commonly, write up their findings as a series of fictionalized dialogues, each dialogue representing one theme that emerged from their data. This helps to retain the voices of the researchers as well as make the findings accessible for readers (for a more detailed description see Norris & Sawyer, 2012; Sawyer & Norris, 2013). Until recently, duoethnography had made little impact on the fields of applied linguistics or language education. In a search of the Web of Science and SCOPUS databases, Rose and Montakantiwong (2018) were only able to identify two duoethnographies in applied linguistics, one of which was my own coauthored paper, *Native-speakerism and the complexity of personal experience: A duoethnographic study* (Lowe & Kiczowski, 2016).

I met Marek Kiczowski in 2016 and through discussions of native-speakerism in our own careers, we realised that it might be beneficial to contrast our experiences of

being positioned as a ‘native’ and a ‘nonnative speaker’ teacher respectively, in order to challenge aspects of native-speakerism. We decided that duoethnography would be the best method for such a study because it allowed for the principled and rigorous examination of our own personal histories and was also highly accessible, due to its dialogic format. Making the study accessible to a general audience was important to us because despite the high level of research and commentary on native-speakerism in academia, very little has filtered down to the profession itself. As Kumaravadivelu (2016) stated, “Seldom in the annals of an academic discipline have so many people toiled so hard, for so long, and achieved so little” (p. 17). Data collection took place through online discussions in a messenger application, eventually totaling around 20,000 words. Through a process of thematic coding, we began to identify threads emerging from our discussions, which challenged some of the binary distinctions often drawn between ‘native’ and ‘nonnative speaker’ teachers. The three main challenges found are summarized below.

Opposing Forms of Discrimination

Native-speakerist ideology is often assumed to exclusively benefit ‘native speakers’ in terms of employment. However, we found a more complex relationship between assigned speakerhood and employment opportunities. Marek experienced discrimination by being deemed ineligible for certain positions but was respected within the workplace. Robert experienced positive discrimination (being offered jobs despite being underqualified) but was often not taken seriously as an educator and was forced into roles in which he did not feel comfortable. In other words, native-speakerism can affect both groups of teachers negatively in terms of employment, although in opposing ways.

Essentialized Strengths and Weaknesses of Teachers

Researchers such as Medgyes (1992) often draw up lists of essentialized strengths and weaknesses of ‘native’ and ‘nonnative speaker’ teachers and suggest that classroom roles and duties should be assigned on this basis. For example, Marek, as a ‘nonnative speaker’ teacher, is assumed to be empathetic with his students as he has gone through the process of learning English himself. However, we found that as a naturally skilled language learner he is actually less understanding of his students than Robert, who is a poor language learner and can thus relate to his students’ struggles. This suggests that these essentialized characteristics do not always hold true.

Self-Confidence, Authenticity, and Authority

Finally, native-speakerism is often depicted as causing issues of self-confidence among ‘nonnative speaker’ teachers. Yet, we found that both of us were affected due to native-speakerism. Marek felt a lack of trust from students and colleagues regarding his expertise and proficiency and a perception that he was not an authentic voice, whereas Robert was perceived as an authentic, but not authoritative voice whose skills were considered to depend entirely on his ‘native speaker’ intuition. This again showed that native-speakerist ideology had a more complex influence than is generally believed.

Exploring native-speakerism through duoethnography allowed us to highlight the intricate and complex ways in which this ideology impacted us as teachers. By revealing this complexity, we were able to deconstruct certain narratives on which the ideology is based, such as notions of binary strengths and weaknesses of ‘native’ and ‘nonnative speaker’ teachers and the ways in which it can engender self-doubt and discrimination.

We found duoethnography to be a powerful tool for the collaborative deconstruction of native-speakerism. This indicates that further studies could be done using this method to deconstruct other aspects of the ideology and to investigate other elements of language teacher identity such as gender and geographical difference. Duoethnography is a research method that has the potential to explore the complexity of native-speakerism in the lives of teachers, students, and other members of the ELT profession.

What Students (Think They) Want and the ‘Native Speaker’ Issue

Giancarla Unser-Schutz

Following Hashimoto’s analysis of *eikaiwa* institutions and Lowe’s focus on instructors, I examine the final major topic in native-speakerism: students. ‘Native speakers’ are often presented as desirable and superior instructors (Kubota, 1998), but it is not always clear what students want from instructors, and their desires do not always match their needs, especially with lower level students who are not yet confident speakers. A wide variety of factors are involved including students’ previous interactions with ‘native’ and ‘nonnative speaker’ instructors, perceptions of the roles of different instructors, and classroom use of the local language. These issues can impact how programs are developed, as they have at my institution, a small urban university.

To explore these issues, a questionnaire was designed to explore students’ perceptions of ‘native’ and ‘nonnative speaker’ EFL instructors. The questionnaire was composed of 10 questions in Japanese (two on course materials, eight on ‘native speaker’ issues; see Appendix B). The questionnaire was given in a pilot study to 67 second-year students on the first day of classes in April 2017, as they transitioned from 1st-year classes taught by ‘nonnative speakers’ to my class. All students were non-English majors and were generally at the pre-intermediate level. Questions focused on their experiences with ‘native’ and ‘nonnative speaker’ instructors and differences they perceived between them. Due to space limitations, the discussion is framed around core themes concerning students and their perceptions of and attitudes towards ‘native speaker’ instructors.

What Are Students’ Expectations for ‘Native Speaker’ Instructors?

Although 69% of the students had previously studied with ‘native speaker’ instructors, for a significant minority their 2nd-year speaking courses were their first interactions with non-Japanese instructors. Contrary to ‘nonnative speaker’ instructors’ own frequent assessments of ‘native speakers’ as the best instructors (Butler, 2007), the majority reported no preference (54%) or preferred ‘nonnative speaker’ instructors (33%). Most students studied English because it was required, and matriculation surveys reported motivation to be low within the faculty compared to subject courses in their major. Only approximately 20% looked forward to studying with ‘native speaker’ instructors, whereas 59% reported feeling nervous. The negative feelings reported related to beliefs that they would not be able to speak accurately or make themselves understood. It suggests they

might have foreign language classroom anxiety (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1991), which is common amongst Japanese students (Woodrow, 2006).

How Are the Roles of ‘Native Speaker’ Instructors Perceived by Students?

Although the learning goals of the faculty’s speaking classes are clearly stated as the development of speaking and listening skills, students’ anxiety about being able to communicate suggests that they believe that already being able to speak is a prerequisite for communicating with ‘native speakers.’ Rather than seeing such skills as something needing to be learnt, current weaknesses in ability become a perceived barrier, suggesting that students do not understand the learning process well. The results suggest that it is not apparent to students what ‘native speaker’ instructors *do*, with a misperception that they are not *instructors* but *trainers* or *models*. In comparison, ‘nonnative speakers’ are seen as sources of real instruction, despite the ‘native speaker’ myth common in Japan, resulting in their lower ratings (Kubota, 2002a).

How Do Students Perceive Use of the Local Language by ‘Native Speaker’ Instructors?

Given that many students reported anxiety about studying with ‘native speaker’ instructors, it might seem like a good strategy for ‘native speaker’ instructors to use some Japanese to decrease barriers in participation. However, most students (76%) reported that they did not think they would continue talking in English if Japanese became an option. Although this may seem encouraging to proponents of English-only classrooms, nonuse of the local language may contribute to the perception of ‘native speaker’ instructors as being models rather than instructors, as it may become difficult for students to seek guidance about topics that can be difficult to understand, such as nuanced grammar explanations.

Discussion: Removing Barriers and Improving Student–Instructor Relationships

The results of this pilot survey suggest that students do not necessarily prefer ‘native speaker’ instructors over ‘nonnative speaker’ instructors but view them as having different roles. This perception might be due to the courses ‘native’ and ‘nonnative speakers’ tend to be assigned to. At my institution there is a tendency to have ‘native

speakers' teach speaking classes, which tend to be more active and student oriented; this might contribute to 'native speaker' instructors seeming less "instructorly." At the same time, because 'nonnative speaker' instructors teach primarily writing and reading classes, this can minimize opportunities to model themselves as competent English speakers. The content of such courses might make them more instructor centered, contributing to the perception of 'nonnative speaker' Japanese instructors as being more engaged in active instruction.

One solution to this might be to move away from the one-skill set, one-class model to comprehensive courses where all instructors are offered opportunities to engage with all skills, thus creating opportunities to both be models and instructors for students. In addition, given that many students feel anxiety about not being able to speak English, it might be necessary to reevaluate how and what kind of support can be given in the local language. One option that I have been trying is to use a flipped-classroom style, with Japanese used in auxiliary course materials to explain learning points outside of class.

Conclusion

We have explored native-speakerism from the perspective of institutions and their policies, instructors, and learners. Although the methods used in each study varied considerably, the authors have illuminated the complex ways in which native-speakerism is manifested and how it impacts institutional integrity, teachers' career trajectories, and students' experiences in the classroom. Native-speakerism is an ideology that should be challenged by conscientious teachers and academics, and this paper has explored ways in which the underlying assumptions that support native-speakerism can be deconstructed. Hiring practices in educational institutions continue to exhibit a strong bias in favor of 'native speaker' teachers, with the troubling trend of the commercial sector's discriminatory practices impacting language teaching in tertiary academic spheres. Teachers' complex linguistic and professional experiences complicate definitions of who a 'native speaker' is and the advantages and disadvantages such teachers have on the quality of the instruction in the classroom. A more in-depth inquiry into students' views on how native-speakerism affects their classroom experience is needed. Deconstruction of native-speakerism by teachers and researchers using duoethnography as a tool has great potential for expanding collaboration within the ELT profession, hopefully leading to further equity.

Bio Data

Sunao Fukunaga is an associate professor at Kyushu Institute of Technology. Her research interests include language education policy and its issues. <fukunaga@lai.kyutech.ac.jp>

Natasha Hashimoto teaches at Tokyo Woman's Christian University. Her research interests include language assessment and transnational migration. <englishteachertky@gmail.com>

Robert J. Lowe is a lecturer at Tokyo Kasei University. His research interests include native-speakerism and the use of duoethnography as a research tool. <robert-l@tokyo-kasei.ac.jp>

Giancarla Unser-Schutz is an associate professor at Rissho University. She is interested in how to improve motivation and interest amongst students in non-EFL-specialist faculties. <giancarlaunerschutz@ris.ac.jp>

Laura Kusaka is a professor at Aichi University. Her research interests include teacher and student narratives and English as a lingua franca. <kusaka@aichi-u.ac.jp>

References

- Adams, T., Jones, S., & Ellis, C. (2015). *Autoethnography*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Amin, N. (1999). Minority women teachers of ESL: Negotiating white English. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 93-104). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Appleby, R. (2014). *Men and masculinities in global English language teaching*. Houndmills, England: Palgrave, Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137331809>
- Bailey, K. (2007). Akogare, ideology, and 'charisma man' mythology: Reflections on ethnographic research in English language schools in Japan. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 14(5), 585-608. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09663690701562438>
- Bailey K. M., & Pasternak, M. (2004). Preparing nonnative and native English-speaking teachers: Issues of professionalism and proficiency. In L. D. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English speaking professionals* (pp. 155-175). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559.

Fukunaga, Hashimoto, Lowe, Unser-Schutz, & Kusaka: *Collaborative Deconstruction of Native-Speakerism*

- Braine, G. (2004). The nonnative English-speaking professionals' movement and its research foundations. In L. D. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English speaking professionals* (pp. 9-24). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Breaden, J. (2016). Education and training for the intercultural competence of Japanese university graduates: Policy, practice, and markets in informal education. In K. Okano (Ed.), *Nonformal education and civil society in Japan* (Routledge critical studies in Asian education; pp. 133-154). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Butler, Y. (2007). Factors associated with the notion that native speakers are the ideal language teachers: An examination of elementary school teachers in Japan. *JALT Journal, 29*(1), 7-39.
- GaijinPot (n.d.). *Gaijinpot jobs*. Retrieved from <https://jobs.gaijinpot.com>
- Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal, 60*(4), 385-387. <http://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl030>
- Holliday, A. (2008). Standards of English and politics of inclusion. *Language Teaching, 41*(1), 119-130. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004776>
- Holliday, A. (2015). Native-speakerism: Taking the concept forward and achieving cultural belief. In A. Swan, P. Aboshiha, & A. Holliday (Eds.), *(En)countering native-speakerism* (pp. 11-25). London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Holliday, A. (2018). Native-speakerism. In J. I. Lontos (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0027>
- Holliday, A., & Aboshiha, P. (2009). The denial of ideology in 'nonnative speaker' teachers. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(4), 669-689. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00191.x>
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., Cope, J. A. (1991). Foreign language classroom anxiety. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 27-39). Englewood Cliffs, NH: Prentice Hall.
- Houghton, S. A., & Rivers, D. J. (Eds.). (2013). *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Kachru, B. (1992). *The other tongue* (2nd ed.). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kramsch, C. (1997). Guest column: The privilege of the nonnative speaker. *PMLA, 112*(3), 359-369.
- Kubota, R. (1998). Ideologies of English in Japan. *World Englishes, 17*(3), 295-306. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00105>
- Kubota, R. (2001). Discursive construction of the images of U.S. classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(1), 9-38. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587858>
- Kubota, R. (2002a). The impact of globalization on language teaching in Japan. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp.12-28). London, England: Routledge.
- Kubota, R. (2002b). The author responds: (Un)raveling racism in a nice field like TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(1), 84-92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3588363>
- Kubota, R. (2009). Rethinking the superiority of the native speaker: Toward a relational understanding of power. In N. M. Doerr (Ed.), *The native speaker concept: Ethnographic investigations of native speaker effects* (pp. 233-247). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2016). The decolonial option in English teaching: Can the subaltern act? *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(1), 66-85. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.202>
- Lowe, R., & Kiczkowiak, M. (2016). Native-speakerism and the complexity of personal experience: A duoethnography study. *Cogent Education, 3*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1264171>
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more? *ELT Journal, 46*(4), 340-349. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/46.4.340>
- Norris, J., & Sawyer, R. (2004). Null and hidden curricula of sexual orientation: A dialogue on the curreres of the absent presence and the present absence. In L. Coia, M. Birch, N. Brooks, E. Heilman, S. Mayer, A. Mountain, & P. Pritchard (Eds.), *Democratic responses in an era of standardization* (pp. 139-159). Troy, NY: Educators' International Press.
- Norris, J., & Sawyer, R. (2012). Toward a dialogic methodology. In J. Norris, R. Sawyer, & D. E. Lund (Eds.), *Duoethnography: Dialogic methods for social, health, and educational research* (pp. 9-40). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Paltridge, B. (2014). What motivates applied linguistics research? *AILA Review, 27*(1), 98-104. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.27.05pal>
- Pederson, R. (2012). Representation, globalization, and the native speaker: Dialectics of language, ideology, and power. In K. Sung & R. Pederson (Eds.), *Critical ELT practices in Asia* (pp. 1-22). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-797-4_1
- Phillipson, R. (2016). Native speakers in linguistic imperialism. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 14*(3), 80-96.
- Rose, H., & Montakantiwong, A. (2018). A tale of two teachers: A duoethnography of the realistic and idealistic successes and failures of teaching English as an international language. *RELC Journal, 49*(1), 88-101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217746206>
- Ruecker, T., & Ives, L. (2015). White native English speakers needed: The rhetorical construction of privilege in online teacher recruitment spaces. *TESOL Quarterly, 49*(4), 733-756. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.195>
- Samimy, K. K., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). Revisiting the colonial in the postcolonial: Critical praxis for nonnative-English-speaking teachers in a TESOL Program. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*, 413-431. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587672>
- Sawyer, R. D., & Norris, J. (2013). *Duoethnography*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Sargeant, P. (2009). *Idea of English in Japan: Ideology and the evolution of a global language*. Clevedon, England: Channel View Publications.

Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and speaking English as a second language. *RELC Journal*, 37(3), 308-328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206071315>

Appendix A

Interview Questions

Questions About *Eikaiwa* Job Search (for *Eikaiwa* Teachers)

1. How did you decide to teach English in the *eikaiwa* sector in Japan?
2. How did you find your first English teaching job in Japan?
3. And how did you find your current *eikaiwa* job?

Follow-up (if needed): Could you tell me more about how the job searching process went for you?

4. What factors do you think have made it easy for you to get *eikaiwa* jobs?
5. What factors have made it difficult at times for you to find ELT work?

Questions About *Eikaiwa* Hiring Practices (for *Eikaiwa* School Owners, Managers, Recruiters, and Supervisors)

1. When your institution needs a new teacher, what kind of person does the school/you look for?
2. Regardless of what you think a good teacher is, from your experience, what kind of teachers do you believe your clients/students would like to have?
3. Some say that English language teachers need to be marketable for schools to stay in business. What is something that you think would make a teacher easier to “sell” and attract more students? Please, name/describe *several* things that you think are important.

Appendix B

Translation of Survey on ‘Native-Speaker’ Instructors

1. Is this your first time studying with a native speaker instructor? (Yes / No)
2. If no: Where did you study with a native speaker instructor previously? (Studied with a native speaker at an English conversation school. / Studied with a native speaker ALT in elementary/junior high/high school. / Other)
3. How do you feel about studying with a native speaker instructor? (Nothing in particular / Excited / Anxious / Annoyed / Other)
4. Why do you feel that way? (Short answer format)
5. Do you expect any cultural differences in how native speakers teach? (Yes: Details / No)
6. Do you think that you would still use English if your native speaker instructor used Japanese? (Not at all / Not much / Neither / Somewhat / Very much)
7. Which would you prefer? (Native speaker instructors / Nonnative speaker instructors / No preference)
8. If you have anything else you would like to express, please write it here. (Short answer format)

Appendix C

Checklist for Troubleshooting Native-Speakerism at One’s Workplace

Pedagogical Concerns

1. How do I accommodate the students’ L1?
2. English only in the classroom: Do students understand why? How strictly do I enforce such a policy?

Curricular and Classroom Materials

1. Division of labor based on teachers’ L1
 - Who is assigned to teach what and why?
 - Is there room for negotiation?
2. Classroom materials
 - If I can choose my own materials, to which English(es) are the students exposed?

- How is English used/portrayed in the materials I use? (DVD, readers, news articles, etc.)

Personnel Issues

1. What are the hiring policies for foreign language teachers?
2. Are tenured positions available to all faculty?
3. How does the institution advertise for foreign language teachers, English in particular?

Extracurricular Activities

1. Open campus, global lounge, and other PR matters
 - Who is chosen to do what?
 - How do I feel about what I am assigned to do? (posing for pamphlets, staging mock lessons)
 - Is there room for negotiation?
2. Administrative duties (for full-time faculty)
 - What are the responsibilities/expectations for faculty meeting attendance, committee work, entrance examination duties? Am I treated differently?