

Robert J. Lowe and Richard Pinner*

Finding the connections between native-speakerism and authenticity

DOI 10.1515/applirev-2016-0002

Abstract: Native-speakerism and authenticity are two subjects that have been written on extensively in the field of English language teaching, but the links between the two have yet to be explored in any great depth. This paper extensively reviews the literature on native-speakerism and authenticity and outlines where the connections between these two concepts, both practical and theoretical, may lie. Native-speakerism and authenticity are first briefly introduced and contextualised separately, and a theoretical framework is then presented to explain the connections between them based on the key foundational topics of authority, culturism, and cultural capital. Following this, the paper moves on to explain how these connections manifest in the ELT industry to influence the lives of ‘non-native speaker’ teachers in terms of student perceptions, self-perceptions, and professional discrimination, and how these are both influential on, and propagated by, the sales rhetoric of the ELT industry. Finally some suggestions are given for possible avenues of future research.

Keywords: native-speakerism, authenticity, native speaker, non-native speaker, discrimination

1 Introduction

In the field of English language teaching (ELT), native-speakerism and authenticity are two issues that remain contentious, and individually the subject of much debate and theoretical discussion. Both have been explored at length in the work of numerous writers and scholars, however very few studies have attempted to make clear the connections between these two concepts, and tie them together in any kind of principled, explicit manner. We believe that such a discussion is necessary as the two concepts are deeply interrelated, to the extent that one may not be able to fully understand the effect of either without a clear knowledge of both. Although issues of bias and discrimination in our profession have been discussed for decades,

*Corresponding author: Richard Pinner, Sophia University, Tokyo, Japan,

E-mail: rpinner@sophia.ac.jp

Robert J. Lowe, Tokyo Kasei University, Tokyo, Japan, E-mail: robert-l@tokyo-kasei.ac.jp

these issues have not gone away, and appear still to be very deeply engrained in the structure of the ELT industry. It is tempting to look at the literature that has been produced on the subject and declare that the problem has been solved. However, as Kumaravadivelu (2014) has recently noted, discrimination continues to affect the lives of student-teachers and professionals deemed to be from ‘non-native speaker’ backgrounds, and consistently undercuts their efforts at professional recognition and advancement. The examples of this discrimination given by Kumaravadivelu demonstrate that ELT remains a field dominated by Western ‘native-speaker’ voices, in spite of the many years of discussion that have been had on the topic. In other words, there is “an abundance of politically correct words, and an avoidance of professionally correct deeds” (Kumaravadivelu 2014: 3), that make it appear as if the issues of discrimination and bias have been resolved when in fact very little has changed in the actual practices of the profession. We believe that a new perspective on this debate is necessary to begin to force change in the ELT industry, and that an understanding of the deep connections between native-speakerism and authenticity is essential if we are to understand and effectively tackle these issues of bias that have taken root in our profession. In this paper we will attempt to identify some of the broad connections between the two issues, and provide some possible directions for future research. We will first provide a brief overview of the concepts of native-speakerism and authenticity, before moving on to identify where we feel it is possible that the connections, both conceptual and practical, between the two may lie. We provide an initial starting point for further discussion by explaining the connections between authority, culturism and the notion of cultural capital in relation to authenticity and native-speakerism, and then look at how these three issues play out in the discourse of native-speakerism and in the lives of teachers. The ideas presented in this paper are intended as a starting point for the exploration of these two interrelated concepts.

2 Native-speakerism and authenticity: conceptual backgrounds

Before attempting to tease out the connections between native-speakerism and authenticity, it is important for us to explain what each concept refers to individually, and discuss some of the defining traits of each. These brief definitions are not intended to be comprehensive, but rather they are presented here in a way which frames the concepts in preparation for an examination of the connections between the two.

2.1 Native-speakerism

Native-speakerism, as outlined by Holliday, is defined as “a pervasive ideology within ELT, characterized by the belief that ‘native-speaker’ teachers represent a ‘Western culture’ from which spring the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology” (2006: 385). This bias is based on the spurious, poorly-defined, and ideologically constructed concepts of ‘native speaker’ and ‘non-native speaker’ (Davies 1995, 2003), and has been seen to produce numerous negative consequences for English language teachers who are defined as ‘non-native speaker teachers’, which we will address later in this paper. The fact that such an ideology is at play, based on spurious and ill-defined terms, is particularly problematic when we consider the fact that such individuals make up the majority of English language teachers worldwide, with conservative estimates at around 80% (Braine 2010; Canagarajah 2005).

Native-speakerism is a development of, and remains deeply connected to, other long-established concerns in the critical study of language learning and teaching. One of the most influential critiques of the political dimensions of language teaching is Phillipson’s (1992) concept of linguistic imperialism, which, borrowing from Galtung’s *Structural Theory of Imperialism* (1971), put forward the Centre/Periphery dichotomy of power relations in ELT. Phillipson (1992) detailed the ways in which the power centres of the West exercise control over the language learning and language use of developing nations, and particularly noted a number of fallacies which have been responsible for bolstering this neoimperialist agenda. These include the ‘native speaker fallacy’, or the idea that so-called ‘native speakers’ are the ideal teachers of a language, and the ‘monolingual fallacy’, by which we are to believe that English is best taught monolingually.

Phillipson’s (1992) ideas are important for understanding macro level power relations in ELT, but as Pennycook (1994) has argued:

[Phillipson’s] adherence to a version of structural imperialism leaves us at a problematic impasse. The unfortunate conjunction between structuralism and neo-marxism in world order theory has tended to reduce human relations to a reflection of the political economy (...) Phillipson amply demonstrates how and why various governments and organisations have promoted the spread of English, but rarely explores what the effects of that promotion may be apart from maintaining global capitalism (Pennycook 1994: 54).

While this statement dates from twenty years ago, and while the global situation may not be the same as it was at that time, as a criticism of the reductionist nature of Phillipson’s (1992) theory it still has weight, especially considering the continued promotion of the idea (Phillipson 2009).

Indeed, this is a criticism that has been repeated by other scholars in recent years such as Hyland (2015), who notes that “Philipson’s [sic] account is overdeterministic, underplaying the role of agency and how users exercise choice” (p. 48). Holliday’s (1994) BANA (Britain, Australia, and North America) and TESEP (tertiary, secondary, and primary) dichotomy of educational systems sought to address this gap by exploring some of the issues connected with ‘technology transfer’ from one domain to the other. However, this too was problematic. As Canagarajah (1996) argued, Holliday’s framework was essentially about finding the best ways of importing educational technology into developing nations, almost without the consultation of those to whom the technology is being transferred. This conception, while taking more account of local educational settings and introducing the concept of a ‘market place’ of teaching methods and approaches, still does not capture the full complexity of the situation.

In response to Canagarajah’s critique, Holliday (2003, 2005) coined the term ‘native-speakerism’ which seeks to deal with the issues of culture and politics in ELT in a more overarching way by including discussions of culturism and Orientalism. Said (1978: 3) described Orientalism as “the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient – dealing with it by making statements about it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient.” Of course, the descriptor of the ‘Orient’ is simplistic and overgeneralised, but this is perhaps intentionally so. Said (1978) described orientalism as reductive in the sense that it essentializes complex systems, cultures, and groups and explains them in simplistic ways, lacking in nuance. The ‘Orient’ as a construct reflects this, with the simplicity of the terminology highlighting the reductive nature of the discourse. Susser (1998) provides a clear example of Orientalism at work in ELT through an examination of materials offering advice to foreign teachers entering Japan, and research into cross-cultural learning styles. Susser found that the texts were “grounded in assumptions, stereotypes, platitudes, and errors” (1998: 63), which seemed intended to legitimize the authority of Western teachers over local teachers, students, and educational institutions by ‘othering’ them and attempting to solve problems that have been constructed by the writers from stereotypical images of the Japanese. A clear example of this given by Susser is a statement by Dadour and Robbins (1996) concerning Japanese students, in which they claim that student preferences is “to passively absorb information provided by teachers” (p. 166). This is a common stereotypical depiction of students in Japan, China, and other East Asian nations, and one which has not only been questioned on theoretical grounds (Holliday 2005), but has also been shown to be incorrect in research

on student attitudes (Littlewood 2000). The ways in which structures and systems with western-centric biases have used discourses in ELT to dominate the profession has led to a number of undesirable consequences for ‘non-native speaker’ professionals. Examples of these include employment discrimination (Clark and Paran 2007; Kim 2011; Mahboob and Golden 2013; Mahboob et al. 2004; Selvi 2010), student preferences for Western models of English (Matsuda 2003b; Saito 2012; Sasayama 2013), ‘non-native speaker’ teachers having negative self-images (Bernat 2008; Brutt-Griffler and Samimy 1999; Kim 2011) and students having a positive orientation towards ‘native speaker’ over ‘non-native speaker’ teachers (Alseweed 2012; Lasagabaster and Sierra 2002; Wu and Ke 2009). In some cases, this discrimination is coming from ‘native speakers’ and in some cases from ‘non-native speakers’, but the ideological root is the same, and is perpetuated and internalised by both practitioners and students due to the fact that it is a “hegemonic discourse” the “prejudices and politics [of which] are deeply embedded in every aspect of practice” (Holliday 2005: 10). Indeed, Houghton and Rivers have made a persuasive attempt to redefine the term ‘native-speakerism’ to mean “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” (2013: 14). Here we see the definition being broadened to include discrimination against ‘native speakers’, and while a convincing case for this is made in the book, we will focus in this article for the most part on the earlier definition of the term as we believe that this is still where the vast majority of the discrimination and prejudice can still be found (see the recent volume by Swan et al. 2015 for more examples of the ways and the extent to which native-speakerism influences the profession).

Native-speakerism is, in short, an important theoretical and descriptive concept which unites many of the different areas of critical thought on the political and cultural dimensions of ELT, and is a key way of examining how and why problematic ‘othering’ in the profession occurs. In other words, whilst the ‘native speaker’ is a spurious social and political construct, the harmful effects of many people’s belief in its existence are very real and we both feel that they have a lot to do with the equally thorny issue of authenticity in language teaching and learning.

2.2 Authenticity

In existential philosophy, authenticity roughly equates to the amount an individual is able to be their true self. Existential philosophers of the twentieth

century struggled with the way this true self fits into accepted forms of societal interaction (Golomb 1995; Lindholm 2008). Authenticity, as it relates to the present paper, is conceptualised as the way an individual sees themselves in relation to the various contexts in which they exist and are required to use language for the social production of meaning. We view authenticity as something which has both social and contextual dimensions, and is therefore dynamic in terms of space and time; unique to each individual and as such rather difficult to define (Badger and MacDonald 2010; Pinner 2016). Conversely, authenticity in language teaching often carries either implicit or direct reference to the culture(s) in which the target language is used as a first language, which generally gravitates towards ‘native-speakers’ (Holliday 2005; Pinner 2014). This is evident from the so-called ‘classic’ definition of authenticity, which usually explains that authentic language is ‘real’ language, primarily created for the purpose of communicating some intention or message. For instance, the ‘classic’ example of an authentic material is a newspaper from the target-speaking culture or some other piece of realia “not originally developed for pedagogical purposes” (Richards and Schmidt 2013: 43). Although defining authenticity specifically in relation to ‘native speakers’ is both undesirable and out-dated in English language materials-design, it is nevertheless pervasive, although it now manifests itself more subtly. The ‘classic’ definition of authentic materials does not directly mention ‘native-speakers’, and indeed, some versions of it argue that it is therefore more inclusive (Gilmore 2011; Harmer 2008). However, the ‘native-speaker’ is still very heavily implied in the definition and as such authenticity is implicit in the discourse on native-speakerism. Authenticity is still all too often defined as something absolute, as something which can inherently belong to a text or piece of material by virtue of its origin. This is despite the long-standing conceptual arguments against such an inflexible definition, as proposed by scholars such as Widdowson (1978), Breen (1985) and van Lier (1996). In ELT in particular, the concept of authenticity is extremely problematic because English is the world’s second language in the sense of it being the most taught and learned language globally, and therefore the future of the language will “be determined less by the number and economic power of its native speakers than by the trends in the use of English as a second language” (Graddol 2003: 157). As such, teaching the English language as a Western-centric model which comes pre-loaded with the ideals and beliefs of the West is undesirable to say the least, since the status of English as an international language relies on its flexibility and diversity (Blommaert 2010; Blommaert and Rampton 2012; Holliday 2005). Teaching a variety of English which has at its centre a culturist notion of what English should be will inevitably spell disaster for the future of English as a global language, not only because this

seems to contradict the idea of English being a language of empowerment and opportunity, but also because it aligns English education within a predominantly monolingual framework. As languages and cultures come into increasing contact with each other, many large urban areas are now experiencing what Vertovec (2007, 2010) has labelled ‘super-diversity’. Within this climate of cultural amalgamation, languages also get redefined according to the way multilingual people communicate, a phenomena known as translanguaging. Creese and Blackledge (2010), Canagarajah (2011, 2013) and Blommaert and Rampton (2012) among others, have argued that this phenomenon requires a restructuring of approaches to Second Language Acquisition as it does not align well with the idea that there is a ‘standard’ variety of English which is ‘best’ or ‘most desirable’ in terms of learning. Therefore, approaches to English language teaching need to move past culturist perceptions that tend to gravitate towards what is perceived as the centre of the English language. And yet, language and culture are generally seen as inseparable. How is it possible to teach an ‘authentic’ variety of English without having it convey some form of culture? To ostracise the English language from the cultures where it is spoken seems if anything to endanger its future even more, producing what might well be labelled as a ‘disembodied language’, meaning a language that is primarily experienced as a subject to be learned in order to pass exams or as a status marker which either grants or denies access to social mobility. Of course, this only applies to scenarios where the English language is learned as a school subject or purely for transactional purposes, such as to pass an exam or gain a certificate, and not to situations involving immigrants or those who have a genuine ‘investment’ (Norton 2013) in the language. In scenarios where English is learned purely as a subject, what is ‘authentic’ English and how can authenticity be incorporated into language teaching and learning without implicating the problematic notions of native-speakerism?

Pinner (2014, 2016) argues that authenticity should be conceptualised as a continuum, with both social and contextual axes. In this way, authenticity is defined as a dynamic concept which will need to be assessed and evaluated on an individual basis, and is therefore much more concerned with the personalisation of the teaching and learning process. This concept is further derived from Ushioda’s (2009, 2011) *persons-in-context relational* view of motivation, in which she argues that learners should speak as themselves in order to find a truly sustainable way of engaging with the language acquisition process. In conceptualising authenticity as a personally and socially constructed concept, something inherently linked to context and identity, authenticity becomes a much more sustainable concept and something very central to language learning and teaching. However, this more contextualised and individual view of authenticity

could, in some ways, actually exacerbate the embedded dangers of native-speakerism. Rather than being a poorly disguised implicit reference to ‘native-speakers’, as with the pervasive ‘classic’ definition, the issue of the ‘native-speaker’ in authenticity is pushed down into symbolic relationships of power and authority, as we will examine in the next section.

3 Where the connections may lie

In the previous sections we have outlined the two main concepts discussed in this paper, defining them specifically in terms of their relationship with English language teaching and learning. Where possible, we have attempted to highlight the initial links between authenticity and native-speakerism. In the following section, we will attempt to foreground these connections and explain how and why the two concepts are very deeply entwined.

3.1 Connections in theory

Holliday (2005) has examined the way that authenticity is implicit in the discourse around native-speakerism, drawing specifically on the notions of social autonomy and social authenticity. Holliday argues that the way practitioners conceptualise both autonomy and authenticity will need to be reconsidered in order to move away from native-speakerist approaches to pedagogy. He briefly outlined the way that autonomy will need to be reconceptualised as something which pre-exists in the learners, and which they already bring with them as part of their identity and motivation for learning, as opposed to the general conception that autonomy needs to be fostered by the teacher. Similarly, for Holliday, authenticity does not ‘pre-exist’ within a text or sample of language, as it does within the ‘classic’ definition of authenticity that is pervasive throughout the ELT industry. Rather, authenticity is created through a process of interaction and interpretation. This draws on the work of Widdowson (1979) and others (see for example Breen 1985; Hung and Victor Chen 2007; van Lier 1996) who have argued against the view that authenticity is something inherent in a text or piece of language purely by nature of its origin. Clearly native-speakerism and authenticity overlap conceptually in this way, because the pervasive idea held by many practicing English language teachers is that authentic language is an absolute trait rather than a relative construct. Although there are many possible ways that these two important ideas in language learning may relate to one

another, we will focus on three conceptual connections which we feel most powerfully represent the argument that we are attempting to put forward: authority, culturism, and cultural capital.

3.1.1 Authority

Widdowson (1994) explains that in the field of English language teaching ‘native speakers’ are inappropriately invested with both authority and authenticity and Creese, Blackledge, and Takhi (2014) have also examined the notion of legitimacy as part of the authenticity of the ‘native-speaker’. The word ‘authenticity’ has the same etymological root as ‘authority’, and the word ‘authentic’ is understood to mean “acting on one’s own authority” (Harper 2013). Cobb (2014: 2–3), in an interesting volume entitled *The Paradox of Authenticity in a Globalized World* goes on to say that “both words conjure up the idea of a single authority who imposes a master narrative of meaning.” In this way, talking about authenticity means that we are also talking about power, particularly, for our purposes, the way in which power is unequally distributed across speakers of English and possession maintained by a rather select minority of so-called ‘native-speakers’. If conceptualised in this way, it is clear to see how there could be a potentially very rich and yet very complex network of connections between authenticity and native-speakerism, particularly in relation to notions of identity, self-image and of course power-relations inherent in discourse. These links will be further alluded to when we discuss suggestions for further research, however it is clear that assumed authority based on notions of authenticity is heavily implicated in the production of attitudes which lead to native-speakerism in ELT. The notion of authority leads us on to the second conceptual connection between authenticity and native-speakerism we will discuss, culturism.

3.1.2 Culturism

One aspect of the concept of native-speakerism is that it is a “chauvinistic professional discourse” (Holliday and Aboshiha 2009: 671), that uses ‘othering’ to marginalise non-Western cultures, and also Western cultures where English is not spoken widely as a first language, through processes which are both part of, and reproduced through, English language education. Within the ELT industry, representation of non-Western cultures has been noted as being problematic for the very fact that it defines these cultures in monolithic ways which fail to represent their diversity, development, and internal tensions and negotiations.

As Holliday puts it, the students are taught about culture in a way which allows or encourages them to think that “they are travelling from one enclosed cultural block to another” (2005: 107). Canagarajah (1999: 31) argues that “dominant groups are always involved in building consent to their power by influencing the culture and knowledge of subordinate groups”, and while we may hesitate to use such dichotomous terminology as ‘dominant’ and ‘subordinate’, it is certainly true that in terms of teaching materials, teacher training courses, and teacher reference works, the ELT industry has tended to create “a taxonomy of differences between familiar and exotic cultures” (Guest 2002: 154) based on essentialized and static cultural ‘essences’ (Kubota 1999), as in the materials examined by Susser (1998). Such ‘othering’ by the industry is possible in large part due to the authority invested in ‘native speakers’ and their institutions, and the power that is granted to them because of this. This authority is legitimised through a discourse in which authenticity plays a substantial role, in which English is identified with the political West - those countries with a high level of historical, political, and economic power, including the United States, The United Kingdom, and Australia - and its authentic bearers considered to be Western, Anglo ‘native speakers’. Here again, we see conceptual connections between authenticity and native-speakerism begin to emerge.

3.1.3 Cultural capital

A final way, strongly related to the previous discussion, in which the concepts of authenticity and native-speakerism are connected is in terms of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1991), which can be defined as a body of non-financial social assets which can help an individual to gain social mobility. This is perhaps most vividly appreciable when we consider the practice of students going to universities in countries where English is the official language (or *de facto* official language), such as the USA or UK. In learning from what Altbach (1981) terms a Centre nation at a Centre university, learners hope to gain cultural capital by acquiring the pronunciation and discourse features of the empowered language variety. A recent study by Lowe (2015) provided evidence of this, showing data on the qualifications held by a mix of ‘native speaker’ and ‘non-native speaker’ instructors on three large-scale English programs at Japanese universities. Despite a mix of national backgrounds among the teachers, and despite the wide availability of ELT-related postgraduate courses in universities around the world, the vast majority of these teachers held TESOL or applied linguistics degrees from Centre universities. Students who seek to gain their credentials from Centre universities likely believe, either consciously or unconsciously, that

this cultural capital will allow (or perhaps even entitle) them to access even greater social capital in the form of connections to, and relationships with, people and institutions through which they may be able to socially and materially benefit. In this way, the issue of power is a central tenet to the conceptualisation of native-speakerism, just as it is with authenticity. English is an especially empowering language as it occupies the top position in the hierarchy of languages, since it is the world's only hyper-centralised global language (de Swaan 2001). Canagarajah (2012) illustrates this with an anecdote from his own professional life:

I approached my senior colleagues and asked them how I could obtain the knowledge that would make me more authoritative in my teaching. Where did the experts get their superior knowledge that gave them the power to treat my teaching as laughable? My colleagues divulged the secret that orthodox knowledge is embodied in the scholarship and research that came to us from the United States. (Canagarajah 2012: 259)

Given this situation, he decided to travel to the USA to gain the academic experience that would legitimise him as an ELT instructor:

I resolved to travel to what appeared to me then as the center of TESOL expertise—a U.S. university—to become professionalized. I decided that undergoing an institutionalized form of training, with a certificate to show at the end, would establish my credentials in my profession. After such training, I told myself, no TESOL expert would laugh at my methods and I wouldn't be lost for an answer the next time they challenged me to give an account of my teaching practice. (Canagarajah 2012: 266)

We can see here a clear example of an educator under the impression that Western approaches to language education are more authoritative, more authentic, and that gaining access to them and to their institutions will also signify an upgrade in professional status. This example clearly ties together the concepts of authority, culturism, and cultural capital, demonstrating the influence of ideas of authenticity on the attitudes which underlie the pernicious professional discourse of native-speakerism. This point becomes even more serious when we take into account the fact that many teachers do not have access to the opportunities for advancement available to Canagarajah, and for whom such professional development is not a realistic possibility.

A further issue that may be raised here concerns notions of authenticity attached to knowledge production and educational traditions. Hyland (2015) notes that Western scholarship and modes of knowledge production are often treated as synonymous with 'global' knowledge and standards. In effect this creates an unusual discourse in which Western (particularly American) knowledge is considered to be 'global' and the rest of the world's knowledge is 'local'.

Under this system, ‘local’ knowledge is constructed through the lens of ‘global’ (Western) knowledge. As Hyland notes, “local scholars are often trained in Western universities and follow western intellectual traditions which means they go on to interpret the local through the global” (p. 35). Here again we see the interplay of the authority of the Western academy, the culturism that constructs ‘local’ knowledge in opposition to that of the West, and the cultural capital that can be attained by gaining access to Western knowledge.

We have, in this section, outlined some of the ways in which authenticity and native-speakerism are connected on a conceptual level with particular reference to notions of authority, culturism, and cultural capital. In the following section we will discuss and exemplify some of the connections that occur in the ELT profession as a consequence of authenticity and native-speakerism.

3.2 Connections in practice

There are a number of ways that native-speakerism and authenticity interact and influence each other which have real effects on the lives of teachers, students, and others connected to English language teaching. Here, we will examine the problematic nature of this relationship, specifically as it affects student perceptions of their teachers, issues of professional discrimination, and the resultant negative self-perceptions of ‘non-native speaker’ teachers. We will also examine in detail the way these problems are not only manifested, but also disseminated by the sales-rhetoric of the multi-billion dollar English language teaching and learning industry.

3.2.1 Perceptions and discrimination from students

In order to illustrate some of the ways in which notions of authenticity can lead to native-speakerist practices, we will begin this section with a story. Several years ago, one of our colleagues at a conversation school in Japan was assigned a new student. Our colleague is a British-born Indian woman who speaks English as her first language, grew up in the UK, and considers herself culturally British. However, when she walked into the classroom to greet her new student, he walked straight out, went to the reception desk and requested a ‘real’ English speaker. This was very upsetting for the teacher in question, who despite numerous cultural tensions between herself and others in her hometown about whether or not she was a ‘real’ British person, had never up until this point been exposed to the idea that she was not a ‘real’ English speaker. What did this

student mean by a ‘real’ English speaker? On what basis had the student made the assumption that this teacher was not one? It was certainly not on the basis of the teacher’s accent, which was shaped by a childhood on the outskirts of Manchester, and mannered by years of teacher talk, nor was it on the basis of her proficiency, which was clearly no different to any of her co-workers. We must assume that this student had an image of a ‘real’ speaker in his head - someone who was, perhaps ‘visibly’ Western in appearance. This is perhaps because race “gets constructed as a visible attribute of individuals” (Kubota and Lin 2009: 13). In other words, authenticity was not only directly associated in this student’s mind with an ‘native speaker’, it was also a racial distinction, presumably tied up with an image of a Western white person for whom English was their first language (see also Haque and Morgan 2009). In an insightful paper that deals directly with this issue, Amin (1999) talks about research she conducted in Canada in which minority women teachers reported that their students had made it clear that “a non-White teacher could not teach them Canadian English” (p. 94). Amin also details her own experience in which her students “have voiced their assumptions that I am not a native speaker of English and therefore not a ‘real’ ESL teacher” (p. 95). In the same volume, Braine (1999: 23) describes a hurtful incident which occurred when he was teaching in the United States: he learned that some of his students had complained about his (non-standard) accent and had changed class. It seems, from these examples, that assumptions can be made about the authenticity and ‘nativeness’ of pronunciation whether the pronunciation in question is of a standard, inner circle variety or not.

This can be demonstrated with reference to research into student attitudes. Moussu (2002 cited in Braine 2010) conducted research on the attitudes of students studying at a university in the US towards ‘non-native speaker’ teachers over a semester, and found that their views changed substantially over the course of their studies. While the majority of the students held generally positive attitudes towards their ‘non-native speaker’ teachers, at the beginning of the course, only 56% of the students said they would encourage a friend to study with a ‘non-native speaker’. However, by the end of the course, this number had increased to 76%. Clearly, although students held positive attitudes towards their teachers, before experiencing the classes there was something which prevented these students from feeling able to recommend these teachers. This pattern of data can be seen repeatedly in research on this issue, as Braine (2010) notes in his review of several studies into student attitudes. Some of these studies showed that students have generally positive attitudes towards ‘non-native speaker’ teachers (see Ling 2002; Ling and Braine 2007), but many found that students had inbuilt preferences and biases towards ‘native speaker’

teachers. Goto Butler (2007) conducted a study into student perceptions of Korean elementary school teachers, finding that students showed no significant difference in comprehension level between Korean-accented and American-accented English, but still rated the American-accented speaker as having better pronunciation and a higher level of confidence in using the language, and generally expressed a preference for the American-accented teacher. This result is reflected in the work of Kelch and Santana-Williamson (2002), who found that students could not reliably tell whether an accent was 'native' or 'non-native', with Portuguese English accents being rated as 'native' more often than South American accents (40% to 39%), and Japanese English accents being rated as 'native' more often than British accents (30% to 27%). However, when the attitudes of these students were surveyed, they found that teachers considered to be 'native speakers' were rated as more educated and better trained, and the students showed an overall preference for these teachers. In other words, student preferences in this study bear no relation to the actual intelligibility, or 'native' status of their teachers, but rather to something implicit in the idea of 'nativeness' itself.

The incidents described in studies of this kind serve to illustrate our point, and demonstrate the extent to which notions of 'authentic speakers' can lead to students having negative perceptions of teachers who do not fit into this pre-determined mould. These incidents are recorded as being hurtful and upsetting to the teachers concerned, and may lead to the formation of negative self-images by 'non-native speaker' teachers.

3.2.2 Professional discrimination

As we already touched upon in the introduction to this paper, native-speakerism has been shown to affect employment practices, tipping the scale in favour of 'native-speakers', particularly, though not limited to settings where English is a foreign language. For example, Clark & Paran (2007) found that 72.3% of respondents to a questionnaire-based study of employers in the United Kingdom believed that it was important for their teachers to be 'native speakers', and this trend can be seen in other research. Mahboob et al. (2004) found that 59.8% of intensive program administrators preferred to hire 'native speakers', and this was evident from the fact that 'non-native speakers' made up only 7.9% of the staff on these courses. Other studies, such as Flynn and Gulikers (2001), and Al-Shahrani (2013), make the same point. This discrimination is even more explicit when job advertisements are investigated. Song and Zhang (2010) examined ten teacher recruitment websites and found that 78.5% of the

advertisements contained one or more discriminatory criterion, one of the most prominent of which was ‘native speaker’ status. The authors noted that “71.6% of job advertisements for teaching positions in Korea demanded NS status, while 79.3% of the advertisements for positions in China required being a NS” (p. 1), which reflects other research showing that countries in the Far East may have a stronger preference for ‘native speaker’ teachers (Braine 2010). Similar studies into recruitment websites have shown results which closely match Song and Zhang’s (2010) study (see Selvi 2010, Mahboob 2013). While it is true that discrimination can affect ‘native speakers’ in certain settings, particularly when applying for or working within state-run secondary and tertiary institutions (see Hashimoto 2013; Hayes 2013; Heimlich 2013; Rivers 2013; Tsuneyoshi 2013 for some examples from teachers based in Japan), it seems clear that the majority of the data and literature available on the subject points towards this discrimination working particularly against the interests of ‘non-native speakers’.

We believe that such discrimination is intrinsically linked to notions of authenticity, and to beliefs around what constitutes an ‘authentic’ teacher and speaker of English. Thus, if students have an idea of an ‘authentic’ English speaker or teacher (as we argued in the previous section that they do), they are likely to be less positive towards a person who does not fit that ideal. From the point of view of schools, this may translate into bad business, as students leave to find a more ‘authentic’ language learning experience elsewhere. This possibility is supported by the research cited in the preceding section, but it is not the only reason why employment discrimination may exist. School administrators and business owners may share the same bias against those they deem to be ‘non-native speakers’, and would thus be less likely to employ them. Here again, we see how notions of authenticity influence a native-speakerist discriminatory orientation, leading to the professional disadvantaging of ‘non-native speaker’ teachers.

3.2.3 Negative self-images of ‘non-native speaker’ teachers

Discrimination against ‘non-native speaker’ teachers can have knock-on effects, in particular, it may lead to teachers considered to be ‘non-native’ having negative self-images. In language teaching contexts the ‘native-speaker’ model is usually implicitly venerated through examples of ‘authentic’ material which present only standard varieties of English, such as newspaper articles or videos of people like Barak Obama, Queen Elizabeth and celebrities like Tom Cruise and Lady Gaga. From these models there also flows an element of culture, and

although this is usually intended to be depicted as a type of globalised culture, it is generally an Anglo-American version of globalisation. Mishan, for example, attacks the ‘neutralised’ or ‘Anglo-centric’ focus of commercial ELT textbooks (2005: 53). L2 speakers of English are also culpable in the veneration of the native-speaker, usually through what Reves and Medgyes (1994) label ‘self-discrimination’, in other words being overly self-conscious towards language usage errors. This negative and self-critical view of language use can seriously impair L2 teacher’s self-image which then could damage actual language performance, resulting in self-efficacy issues and demotivation. Furthermore, this is compounded by student behaviour towards ‘non-native speaker’ teachers. For example, when a ‘non-native speaker’ teacher cannot answer a question about grammar or makes an error it does not usually damage their self-image, but when a ‘non-native speaker’ makes a mistake or reveals that they “do not know everything about the English language, their teaching abilities are often immediately questioned” (Moussu and Llorca 2008: 323). Amin (1999: 100) also notes that her students constantly challenge her and seem to be waiting for her to make a mistake. It is little surprise then, that Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005a, 2005b) found through learner questionnaires that Spanish EFL students exhibit a preference for native speaker varieties, and Suzuki (2011), who conducted research with a group of trainee teachers in Japan, found that despite training which specifically tried to raise awareness of other non-standard varieties of English, the teachers remarked that they would not use such models in their teaching because they were perceived as confusing or being ‘incorrect’. In ELT classrooms around the world, the notion of ‘authentic language’ remains culture-bound (Matsuda 2003a; Pinner 2014; Suzuki 2011; Tan 2005), and therefore the ‘native speaker’ ‘still has a privileged position in English language teaching, representing both the ‘model speaker’ and the ‘ideal teacher’ (Clark and Paran 2007: 407). Native-speakerism, both influencing and influenced by ideas of authenticity, can lead to negative self-perceptions of ‘non-native speaker’ teachers, which is clearly a damaging issue for these teachers, and is only exacerbated by the advertising practices of the industry, which helps to crystallise the notion of the ‘authentic native English’ speaker and presents it as the face of what the industry wants.

3.2.4 Sales rhetoric and representation

Finally, we turn to an area where the connections between notions of authenticity and native-speakerism are both produced and played out - the rhetoric and representation of advertising and sales in the English language teaching

industry. The racially and culturally embedded notion of authenticity as something that emerges and flows from the ‘native speaker’, although ethically and morally hurtful, is perhaps not surprising, especially in countries which could be said to belong to the minor arc of Kachru’s (1985) expanding circle. In some EFL countries that belong to the expanding circle (i.e. where English has no official status) the relevance of the English language is quite apparent, and contact with international speakers of English and other varieties is relatively commonplace. For example, Henry (2013) discusses the teaching of English in Sweden, where learners are generally already highly proficient, not just because of their education system but also from exposure to English television (broadcast nationally in Sweden) and particularly from contact with other international speakers through the web, in many cases online gaming. Henry describes a situation in the classroom where learners tend to just ‘coast’ along because for them the subject is easy compared to the far more advanced usages which the students take part in outside of the classroom, something he labels the ‘authenticity gap’. However, in other countries, such as Japan, the English language is much more likely to be experienced *only* as a school subject, rather than a living and breathing language. This could still be labelled as an authenticity gap; however, in this context the gap relates to the student’s real life and the difficulty of finding a genuine reason for communicating in English beyond the work done in classrooms, with English becoming a ‘disembodied language’. The consequence of this is that, in such minor arc contexts, English becomes something of a fantasy. This also serves as an indication of the direction taken by the sales rhetoric of the ELT industry in many EFL countries, the implication being that the English language is part of the globalised culture of capitalism (Block et al. 2012).

There are numerous examples which can be found of the ways in which sales rhetoric and advertising images draw on the idea of the ‘native speaker’ in order for companies, schools, and organisations to attract customers. For example, Seargeant (2009) looks at several advertisements from the Japanese *eikaiwa* or private English communication industry, noting that the idea of authenticity is very much anchored to the idea of ‘native-speakers’, despite the problematic nature of this association. He examines how certain adverts place English within the framework of wish-fulfilment or achieving success. He looks in detail at Nova, a large chain of *eikaiwa* which markets itself as being close to train stations and for exclusively hiring ‘native speakers’. Bailey (2006) also examines the way that the predominantly white male ‘native speaker’ is used to market the *eikaiwa* in a way which creates a kind of fantasy or ‘wonderland’, especially one which is charged with eroticism towards the white western males from the perspective of Japanese females. This aspect is examined in more detail in a

later paper (Bailey 2007), and is also something discussed by Takahashi (2013) and Kelsky (1994, 1999). Similarly, other Asian countries such as Korea, China and Hong Kong also feature advertisements which visually depict white ‘native speakers’ as the teacher/instructors in their advertisements, and there are even English-language theme parks, such as Gateway Language Village in China and Gyeonggi English Villages in Korea (see also Seargeant 2005 for a detailed analysis of Japanese versions of this phenomena). It is interesting to note that native-speakerism in language school sales rhetoric also expresses itself when other languages are marketed, as evidenced by US versions of these language-theme parks in Minnesota, called the Concordia Language Villages. There are in fact a number of such villages which offer an ‘authentic’ experience of another European culture by mimicking the architecture and importing worker/speakers from Spain, France and Germany.

Of course, such practices vary from country to country, but in many cases the authentic model of English as represented in advertising clearly originates from Kachru’s (1985) inner-circle, in other words ‘native-speakers’ of English. In some ways, although damaging to those wishing to learn (and especially those who teach) English in these contexts, this ‘othering’ of English could also be seen as a form of defensive practice. For example, Yamagami and Tollefson (2011) analysed the discourse on globalisation in Japanese media and found that it was just as likely to be presented as a threat as it was to be presented as an opportunity. This relates to what Fairclough (2001) has termed the ‘globalisation of discourse’, which does not necessarily refer to discourse homogenisation, but rather an awareness of ‘the other’ and its relation to ‘the self’ on the scale of national identity. In other words there is an ‘us’ and there is a ‘them’, part of the process of ‘othering’ which lies at the heart of the definition of native-speakerism (Holliday 2005).

We can see here some of the ways in which conceptual connections between authority, culturism, and cultural capital are both created and played out in the real world. Advertising rhetoric such as that described above is intended to play on the associations, in the minds of the public and potential students, between the authority and authenticity of Western cultures and the learning of English as a foreign language. By promoting English learning using images of ‘native speakers’, the perceived authenticity and the actual power of the West as the centre of ELT is strengthened, as is the belief that cultural capital can be earned by gaining access to it.

In this section we have presented four ways in which notions of authenticity may influence or be produced by a native-speakerist ideological stance, combining to cause serious problems in the lives of teachers deemed to be ‘non-native speakers’. We have only been able to discuss these subjects briefly, but further

research would be able to both flesh out the connections suggested here, as well as to identify other areas in which the mutually influencing and reinforcing concepts of authenticity and native-speakerism connect both theoretically and in the real world.

4 Conclusion and suggestions for further research

In this paper we have argued that the links between native-speakerism and the way authenticity is conceptualised in language learning and teaching are deeply entwined and that ingrained prejudices manifest themselves in ways which seriously handicap those 80% of English language teachers who are labelled as ‘non-native speakers’ (Braine 2010; Canagarajah 2005). We have pointed towards three of what we believe to be the foundational theoretical connections between these two concepts: authority, culturism, and cultural capital. Authority and authenticity are deeply entwined, and under a native-speakerist ideology, authority is granted to those who are considered to be ‘authentic’ users and representatives of the language, so-called ‘native speakers’ from the political West. This authority is built and reinforced through culturist ‘othering’ of students and speakers from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, allowing the West and its ‘native speaker’ representatives to consolidate its power in global TESOL, thus providing itself with cultural capital and giving the impression that the only way to gain this capital is to gain access to the West and its institutions.

These theoretical foundations manifest themselves in a number of different ways. We discussed how the idea of so-called Western ‘native speakers’ being the authentic bearers of a language leads to students having negative perceptions of ‘non-native speaker’ teachers and of themselves. This, when combined with the market demand for ‘native speaker’ professionals (based both on student preference and professional ideology) results in discrimination against ‘non-native speaker’ teachers. Inevitably, the force of these interacting factors results in ‘non-native speaker’ professionals having negative self-images, and feeling professionally devalued. These effects are, we have argued, both responsible for and reinforced by the sales rhetoric of the ELT industry which presents the West as sometimes aspirational, sometimes threatening, but always the object of English study. All of these effects combine and mutually influence each other to create the ideology of native-speakerism - the ideology that the English-speaking West and its ‘native-speaker’ representatives hold the keys to the ideal model of English and to the ideal methods for its teaching. The

connections we have presented demonstrate that authenticity and native-speakerism are intimately connected, building, reinforcing, and supporting each other in an inexorable process of ideological development.

We have argued that, despite apparent links between authenticity and native-speakerism, there has yet to be a serious attempt to examine the connections between these two contentious subjects. In order to deepen our understanding of these interrelated concepts, more research needs to be done in this area. It is necessary for researchers to begin to investigate the beliefs and attitudes that lead to native-speakerism, which may rest on personally unconsidered and unchallenged notions of ‘authentic speakers’ and ‘authentic users’ of English in the realm of language learning and teaching. Previous research into native-speakerism has focused on macro-level economic driving forces which lie behind linguistic imperialism and related concepts such as the ‘monolingual fallacy’ and the ‘native speaker fallacy’ mentioned earlier (Phillipson 1992), while Holliday (2005) looked more closely at the politics and ideology that drive native-speakerist beliefs. Considering the points raised in this paper, we believe that researchers need to focus more attention on the notion of ‘authenticity’ which is both a product of and a producer of this ideology, and on how cultural legitimacy is awarded through culturist notions of authenticity. In particular, we think that work which examines the lived experiences of various teachers and practitioners would be likely to yield the most promising avenues for inquiry, especially if such work were to focus on the production and influence of notions of authenticity in relation to problematic, discriminatory, and self-othering aspects of native-speakerism in the field.

As professionals working in applied linguistics, we need to understand how the notions of authenticity that we propagate and either benefit or suffer from, work to uphold unequal power relations and legitimize discrimination against many members of our profession. In addition to the research suggestions outlined above, there should be a questioning of the foundational assumptions of our profession. Rather than contrast ‘centre’ and ‘periphery’, we should discuss the nexus between power and identity as it relates to different types and models of English, and we should try to build our understandings in order to move towards equality and the emancipation of English as an international language.

References

- Al-Shahrani, A. 2013. Non-native English speaking teachers and employment discrimination. *Magic INNO: New Technologies in Language Training Specialists in International Relations* 4. 260–273.
- Alseweed, M. A. 2012. University students’ perceptions of the influence of native and non-native teachers. *English Language Teaching* 5(12). 42–53.

- Altbach, P. G. 1981. The university as center and periphery. *The Teachers College Record* 82(4). 601–621.
- Amin, N. 1999. Minority women teachers of ESL: Negotiating white English. In G. Braine (ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching*, 93–104. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Badger, R. & M. N. MacDonald. 2010. Making it real: Authenticity, process and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics* 31(4). 578–582.
- Bailey, K. 2006. Marketing the eikaiwa wonderland: Ideology, akogare, and gender alterity in English conversation school advertising in Japan. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 24(1). 105–130.
- 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. doi:10.1080/09663690701562438.
- Bernat, E. 2008. Towards a pedagogy of empowerment: The case of ‘impostor syndrome’ among pre-service non-native speaker teachers in TESOL. *English Language Teacher Education and Development* 11(1). 1–8.
- Block, D., J. Gray & M. Holborow. 2012. *Neoliberalism and applied linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. 2010. *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. & B. Rampton. 2012. Language and superdiversity. *MMG Working Paper (Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity)* 12(05). http://pubman.mpdl.mpg.de/pubman/item/escidoc:1615144:3/component/escidoc:1615143/WP_12-09_Concept-Paper_SLD.pdf
- Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Braine, G. 1999. From the periphery to the center: One teacher’s journey. In G. Braine (ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching*, 15–28. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Braine, G. 2010. *Nonnative speaker English teachers: Research, pedagogy, and professional growth*. London: Routledge.
- Breen, M. P. 1985. Authenticity in the language classroom. *Applied Linguistics* 6(1). 60–70.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. & K. K. Samimy. 1999. Revisiting the colonial in the postcolonial: Critical praxis for nonnative-English-speaking teachers in a TESOL program. *TESOL Quarterly* 33(3). 413–431.
- Canagarajah, A. S. 1996. Appropriate methodology and social context. *ELT Journal* 50(1). 80–82. doi:10.1093/elt/50.1.80.
- Canagarajah, A. S. 1999. *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. 2005. *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, A. S. 2011. Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review* 2. 1–28.
- Canagarajah, A. S. 2012. Teacher development in a global profession: An autoethnography. *TESOL Quarterly* 46(2). 258–279. doi:10.1002/tesq.18.
- Canagarajah, A. S. 2013. *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York: Routledge.
- Clark, E. & A. Paran. 2007. The employability of non-native-speaker teachers of EFL: A UK survey. *System* 35(4). 407–430.
- Cobb, R. (ed.). 2014. *The paradox of authenticity in a globalized world*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Creese, A. & A. Blackledge. 2010. Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal* 94(1). 103–115. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x.
- Creese, A., A. Blackledge & J. K. Takhi. 2014. The ideal 'Native Speaker' teacher: Negotiating authenticity and legitimacy in the language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 98(4). 937–951. doi:10.1111/modl.12148.
- Dadour, E. S. & J. Robbins. 1996. University-level studies using strategy instruction to improve speaking ability in Egypt and Japan. In R. L. Oxford (ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives*, 157–166. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Davies, A. 1995. Proficiency or the native speaker: What are we trying to achieve in ELT? In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of HG Widdowson*, 145–158. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Davies, A. 2003. *The native speaker: Myth and reality* (2nd ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- de Swaan, A. 2001. *Words of the world: The global language system*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. 2001. *Language and power* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Longman.
- Flynn, K. & G. Gulikers. 2001. Issues in hiring nonnative English-speaking professionals to teach English as a second language. *CATESOL Journal* 13(1). 151–161.
- Galtung, J.. 1971. A structural theory of imperialism. *Journal of Peace Research* 8(2). 81–117. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/422946>.
- Gilmore, A. 2011. "I Prefer Not Text": Developing Japanese Learners' communicative competence with authentic materials. *Language Learning* 61(3). 786–819.
- Golomb, J. 1995. *In search of authenticity: Existentialism from Kierkegaard to Camus*. London: Routledge.
- Goto Butler, Y. 2007. How are nonnative-english-speaking teachers perceived by young learners? *TESOL Quarterly* 41(4). 731–755. doi:10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00101.x.
- Graddol, D. 2003. The decline of the native speaker. In G. Anderman & M. Rogers (eds.), *Translation today: Trends and perspectives*, 152–167. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Guest, M. 2002. A critical 'checkbook' for culture teaching and learning. *ELT Journal* 56(2). 154–161. doi:10.1093/elt/56.2.154.
- Haque, E. & B. Morgan. 2009. 15 un/marked pedagogies. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice*, 271–285. London: Routledge.
- Harmer, J. 2008. *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). London: Pearson/Longman.
- Harper, D. 2013. Online Etymology Dictionary (2001–2013). <http://www.etymonline.com>.
- Hashimoto, K. 2013. The construction of the 'native speaker' in Japan's educational policies for TEFL. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*, 159–168. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Hayes, B. E. 2013. Hiring criteria for Japanese University English teaching faculty. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*, 132–146. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Heimlich, E. 2013. The meaning of Japan's role of professional foreigner. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*, 169–179. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Henry, A. 2013. Digital games and ELT: Bridging the authenticity gap. In E. Ushioda (ed.), *International perspectives on motivation*, 133–155. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Holliday, A. 1994. The house of TESEP and the communicative approach: The special needs of state English language education. *ELT Journal* 48(1). 3–11. doi:10.1093/elt/48.1.3.
- Holliday, A. 2003. Social autonomy: Addressing the dangers of culturism in TESOL. In D. Palfreyman & R. C. Smith (eds.), *Learner autonomy across cultures: Language education perspectives*, 110–126. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Holliday, A. 2005. *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holliday, A. 2006. Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal* 60(4). 385–387. doi:10.1093/elt/ccl030.
- Holliday, A. & P. Aboshiha. 2009. The denial of ideology in perceptions of ‘Nonnative Speaker’ teachers. *TESOL Quarterly* 43(4). 669–689. doi:10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00191.x.
- Houghton, S. A. & D. J. Rivers. 2013. Introduction: Redefining native-speakerism. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*, 1–14. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Hung, D. & D.-T. Victor Chen. 2007. Context–process authenticity in learning: Implications for identity enculturation and boundary crossing. *Educational Technology Research and Development* 55(2). 147–167. doi:10.1007/s11423-006-9008-3.
- Hyland, K. 2015. *Academic publishing: Issues and challenges in the construction of knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk, H. G. Widdowson & Y. Cantù (eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*, 11–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kelch, K. & E. Santana-Williamson. 2002. ESL students’ attitudes toward native-and nonnative-speaking instructors’ accents. *CATESOL Journal* 14(1). 57–72.
- Kelsky, K. 1994. Intimate ideologies: Transnational theory and Japan’s “yellow cabs”. *Public Culture* 6(3). 465–478.
- Kelsky, K. 1999. Gender, modernity, and eroticized internationalism in Japan. *Cultural Anthropology* 14(2). 229–255. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/656564>.
- Kim, H.-K. 2011. Native-speakerism affecting nonnative English teachers’ identity formation: A critical perspective. *English Teaching* 66(4). 53–71.
- Kubota, R. 1999. Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly* 33(1). 9–35. doi:10.2307/3588189.
- Kubota, R. & A. Lin. 2009. Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Introduction to research and practice. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice*, 1–24. London: Routledge.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. 2014. The decolonial option in English teaching: Can the subaltern act? *TESOL Quarterly*. (Online first). doi:10.1002/tesq.202.
- Lasagabaster, D. & J. M. Sierra. 2002. University students’ perceptions of native and non-native speaker teachers of English. *Language Awareness* 11(2). 132–142.
- Lasagabaster, D. & J. M. Sierra. 2005a. The nativeness factor: An analysis of students’ preferences. *ITL Journal of Applied Linguistics* 148. 21–43.
- Lasagabaster, D. & J. M. Sierra. 2005b. What do students think about the pros and cons of having a native speaker teacher? In E. Llorca (ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession*. 217–241. New York: Springer.
- Lindholm, C. 2008. *Culture and authenticity*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Ling, C. Y. 2002. *The attitude of university students in Hong Kong towards native and non-native teachers of English*. (Masters' Degree unpublished dissertation). Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Ling, C. Y. & G. Braine. 2007. The attitudes of university students towards non-native speakers English teachers in Hong Kong. *RELC Journal* 38(3). 257–277. doi:10.1177/0033688207085847.
- Lowe, R. (2015). A matter of degrees: Native-speakerism and centre qualification bias in Japan. *The Journal of English as an International Language* 10(2). 1–17.
- Mahboob, A. & R. Golden. 2013. Looking for native speakers of English: Discrimination in English language teaching job advertisements. *Voices in Asia Journal* 1(1). 72–81.
- Mahboob, A., K. Uhrig, K. L. Newman & B. S. Hartford. 2004. Children of a lesser English: Status of nonnative English speakers as college-level English as a second language teachers in the United States. In L. D. Kamhi-Stein (ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals*, 100–120. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Matsuda, A. 2003a. Incorporating world Englishes in teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Quarterly* 37(4). 719–729. doi:10.2307/3588220
- Matsuda, A. 2003b. The ownership of English in Japanese secondary schools. *World Englishes* 22(4). 483–496.
- Mishan, F. 2005. *Designing authenticity into language learning materials*. Bristol: Intellect Books.
- Moussu, L. 2002. *English as a second language students' reactions to nonnative English-speaking teachers*. (Master of the Arts Dissertation). Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.
- Moussu, L. & E. Llurda. 2008. Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching* 41(3). 315–348.
- Norton, B. 2013. *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed.). Bristol: Multilingual matters.
- Pennycook, A. 1994. *The cultural politics of English as an international language* (Reprint 2013 ed.). Oxon: Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. 2009. *Linguistic imperialism continued*. Hyderabad: Orient Blackswan (Routledge).
- Pinner, R. S. 2014. The authenticity continuum: Towards a definition incorporating international voices. *English Today* 30(4). 22–27. doi:10.1017/S0266078414000364
- Pinner, R. S. 2016. *Reconceptualising authenticity for English as a global language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Reves, T. & P. Medgyes. 1994. The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teacher's self-image: An international survey. *System* 22(3). 353–367.
- Richards, J. C. & R. W. Schmidt. 2013. *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Harlow: Routledge.
- Rivers, D. J. 2013. Implications for identity: Inhabiting the 'native speaker' English teacher location in the Japanese sociocultural context. In D. J. Rivers & S. A. Houghton (eds.), *Social identities and multiple selves in foreign language education*, 35–56. London: Bloomsbury.
- Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- Saito, A. 2012. Is English our lingua franca or the native speaker's property? The native speaker orientation among middle school students in Japan. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 3(6). 1071–1081.

- Sasayama, S. 2013. Japanese college students' attitudes towards Japan English and American English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 34(3). 264–278.
- Seargeant, P. 2005. "More English than England itself": The simulation of authenticity in foreign language practice in Japan. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15(3). 326–345.
- Seargeant, P. 2009. *The idea of English in Japan: Ideology and the evolution of a global language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Selvi, A. F. 2010. All teachers are equal, but some teachers are more equal than others: Trend analysis of job advertisements in English language teaching. *WATESOL NNEST Caucus Annual Review* 1. 156–181.
- Song, S. & Y. Zhang. 2010. Re-imagining the employment of nonnative-English-speaking teachers in EFL contexts. *TESOL Matters* 2(4). 23.
- Susser, B. 1998. EFL's othering of Japan: Orientalism in English language teaching. *JALT Journal* 20(1). 49–82.
- Suzuki, A. 2011. Introducing diversity of English into ELT: Student teachers' responses. *ELT Journal* 65(2). 145–153.
- Swan, A., P. Aboshiha & A. Holliday (eds.). 2015. *(En)countering native-speakerism: Global perspectives*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Takahashi, K. 2013. *Language learning, gender and desire: Japanese women on the move*, vol. 16. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Tan, M. 2005. Authentic language or language errors? Lessons from a learner corpus. *ELT Journal* 59(2). 126–134. doi:10.1093/eltj/ccj026
- Tsuneyoshi, R. 2013. Communicative English in Japan and 'native speakers of English. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*, 119–131. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ushioda, E. 2009. A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation, self and identity. In E. Ushioda & Z. Dörnyei (eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*, 215–228. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ushioda, E. 2011. Motivating learners to speak as themselves. In G. Murray, X. Gao & T. E. Lamb (eds.), *Identity, motivation and autonomy in language learning*, 11–25. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- van Lier, L. 1996. *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. London: Longman.
- Vertovec, S. 2007. Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(6). 1024–1054. doi:10.1080/01419870701599465.
- Vertovec, S. 2010. Towards post-multiculturalism? Changing communities, conditions and contexts of diversity. *International Social Science Journal* 61(199). 83–95. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2451.2010.01749.x.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1978. *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1979. *Explorations in applied linguistics*, vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1994. The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly* 28(2). 377–389. doi:10.2307/3587438.
- Wu, K.-h. & C. Ke. 2009. Haunting native speakerism? Students' perceptions toward native speaking English teachers in Taiwan. *English Language Teaching* 2(3). 44–52.
- Yamagami, M. & J. Tollefson. 2011. Elite discourses of globalization in Japan: The role of English. In P. Seargeant (ed.), *English in Japan in the era of globalization*, 15–37. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bionotes

Robert J. Lowe

Robert J. Lowe is a lecturer in the Department of English Communication at Tokyo Kasei University, Japan. His main area of research is native-speakerism in English language teaching, with a particular focus on the professional issues it causes in Japanese higher education. He has also produced work on special educational needs in ELT and the shadow education industry in Japan, and is a co-host of the TEFLology podcast.

Richard Pinner

Richard Pinner's research focuses on the way authenticity is cultivated and maintained in language learning with particular focus on contexts where English is used as an international foreign language. He has published several articles, most recently in *Language Teaching Research*, *English Today* and has a forthcoming monograph for *Multilingual Matters'* SLA series entitled *Reconceptualising Authenticity for English as a Global Language*. He keeps a blog at uniliterate.com.