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Abstract

This dissertation explores the construction and effects of the notion of “native speaker,” on teachers, mostly graduate teaching associates, in a Japanese language program at a large university in the American midwest. Specifically, it attempts to answer the following two research questions: (1) How do language teachers and students of Japanese in this program perceive native and nonnative language teachers? and (2) How does the iconic construct of “native speaker” affect the language teachers of Japanese in this study? To answer these research questions, both quantitative and qualitative data have been collected from teachers and students of Japanese, and for the purpose of comparison, Chinese, using a triangulation approach that combines survey questionnaires (N=593) with interviews (10 hours of audio recordings) and observations (80 hours of video recordings).

Prior research has described the unique challenges that nonnative-speaking teachers face as language teachers (e.g., Braine, 1999). In support of struggling nonnative-speaking language teachers, researchers have noted their advantageous characteristics as well as ways they can contribute as language professionals, owing to their unique backgrounds (e.g., Abe & Yokoyama, 1990; Benke & Medgyes, 2006; Sukle, 1977). Additionally, strategies to overcome the challenges they face have been recommended (Horwitz, 1996).
However, many studies on this topic rely on their own intuitive grasp of what a native speaker is, and do not provide a definition of the term. As well, studies on this topic conducted outside the context of TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) are limited in the U.S., as Ferguson (2005) and Meadows and Muramatsu (2007) note. Moreover, there is a tendency to regard native and nonnative speakers as two homogeneous groups in a dichotomy with certain idealized and stigmatized characterizations (Doerr, 2009a; Sato & Doerr, 2008; Tanaka, 2013). This view has often disregarded characteristics found in both groups, when they do not fit well into the dichotomy (Irvine & Gal, 2000).

The present study provides additional insights to this topic by examining its quantitative and qualitative data through Clark’s (1996) notion of community and Irvine and Gal’s (2000) three semiotic processes of language ideology and linguistic differentiation, namely: (1) iconization, (2) fractal recursivity, and (3) erasure. Specifically, iconic and ideological representations are created through a process of iconization, in which certain linguistic features linked with social groups or activities are transformed to be iconic representations of them, which involves some degree of abstraction. In the process of fractal recursivity, or an opposition salient at some level of relationship which is projected onto some other domains, or domains, as a similar dichotomy, differentiation between native and nonnative speakers is projected onto other levels of dichotomy such as standard and non-standard, linguistically correct and

---

1 There are non-TESOL studies on this topic outside of the U.S., such as studies conducted in Japanese language education in and outside of Japan (cf. Abe & Yokoyama, 1991; Yokoyama, 2005; Hirahata, 2014; Tanaka, 2013).
incorrect, or even morally good and bad. Erasure refers to the practice in which those who do not fit into the dichotomy are disregarded and/or explained away. My quantitative and qualitative data illustrate how the educated, standard-dialect speaker is iconized, as s/he is treated as the model native speaker, how native-speaker status is perceived with idealized characteristics, and what language teachers do to adjust their “divergent” characteristics when they feel that they are different from the iconized model.

Major quantitative findings from the survey data collected from teachers and students of Japanese and Chinese are as follows: (1) language students, in comparison to their teachers, assumed native speakers to have more specific and idealized characteristics; (2) language students and teachers indicated that they respectively preferred or expected their students to prefer native-speaking teachers of Japanese and Chinese than nonnative-speaking teachers; (3) in comparison to students who are native speakers of English, native speakers of Chinese and Korean were found to have more specific and idealized characterization of “native speaker” and a stronger preference for native-speaking teachers; (4) native speakers of English who are ethnically Asian had a weaker tendency to prefer either native or nonnative-speaking teachers, in comparison to racially white participants; (5) those who grew up speaking multiple languages, in comparison to those who grew up speaking English, had a stronger preference for nonnative-speaking teachers; (6) teacher participants, in comparison to beginning-level student participants, expected their students to prefer both native- and nonnative-speaking teachers more than their students actually did; (7) learners of Japanese, in comparison to
learners of Chinese, had a stronger preference for native-speaking teachers, and slightly lower preference for nonnative-speaking teachers.

My ethnographic and qualitative data were used to account for communal and individual factors that are not captured in the quantitative data. Qualitative data illustrate how the notion of “Japanese native speaker” has been iconized in the language program as educated uptown\(^2\) Tokyo dialect speakers who are not experienced communicating with foreigners. Such characterizations were used to put an emphasis on pronunciation and pitch accent of the standard dialect during the teacher training, as well as establishing language program policies such as encouraging students and teachers to not use English in speaking/listening classes. Certain communal differences between the Japanese and Chinese programs, in particular, teaching assignments and a seemingly stronger adherence to the standard language, may have contributed to a stronger preference for native-speaking teachers in the Japanese program. The effects of the notion of the standard language “native speaker” on the four focal participants of Japanese teachers were documented with a focus on their (non)acquisition of the standard pitch accent and their reactions to the guidelines set by the language program.

In addressing pedagogical implications, ways to “deconstruct” the iconic standard, while still incorporating a standard dialect in language programs are discussed. Suggestions for helping language teacher trainees improve their language proficiency and deal with their anxiety are proposed, and a call is made to question and rethink our assumptions about native and nonnative speakers.

\(^2\) Specifically, the upland or Yamanote parts of Tokyo.
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Chapter 1: Introducing a Problem

“Boku wa ima nihongo de syabette imasu. Nihongo wa bokokugo desu.”
‘I am speaking Japanese. Japanese is my native tongue.’

This is a line is from a short YouTube clip called “But we’re speaking Japanese!” created by Ken Tanaka, a white individual who grew up in Japan. The short clip takes place in a restaurant in Japan where ethnically non-Japanese individuals who appear to be gaikokujin ‘foreigners’ are sitting at the table trying to place an order. Despite their fluent Japanese, the waitress has a perplexed reaction and tries to talk to the only one of the group members who appears to be ethnically Japanese. But to her dismay, this individual cannot speak Japanese (because she grew up in the U.S.).

The terms “native speaker” and “nonnative speaker” are used quite frequently in daily conversations as well as in academic settings. In fact, we often see “native or near native fluency” specified as one of the qualifications for a language teaching position. We as humans like to categorize things to organize our information, and are also quick to often associate certain characteristics with one group or another, sometimes with bias. For instance, there seems to be a widespread but generally unremarked assumption that monolingual native speakers have irrefutable authenticity when it comes to deciding what

---

3 In this dissertation, the romanization used in Japanese: the Spoken Language (Jorden and Noda, 1987) will be used to represent spoken language, its marking of pitch accent excepted. Hepburn romanization is used to represent non-spoken language.

4 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oLt5qSm9U80.
is appropriate in their language. Consequently, it is not surprising that language spoken by nonnative speakers is widely regarded as deviating from those norms (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Ohira, 2001)—or this deviation is at least the default assumption made of nonnative speakers. When this belief manifests itself as the more specific assumption that native speakers are more effective and qualified as language teachers than nonnative speakers, it has been called “the native speaker fallacy” (Phillipson, 1992).

This particular assumption has negatively impacted many nonnative language teachers of English (Braine, 1999; Llurda, 2006) and other foreign languages (Horwitz, 1996). In defense of nonnative language teachers, their strengths have been identified, specifically by noting advantages that stem from their experience as learners of the language they teach. For instance, their unique experience—unavailable to natives—of having learned the language as a foreigner can be expected to leave them readier to explain the language in detail and better understand learners’ challenges, which will help in providing emotional support for them (Medgyes, 1992; Abe & Yokoyama, 1990).

Further, the nonnative English teacher movement in TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) (Braine, 1999; Llurda, 2006) and strategies given to nonnative-speaking foreign language teachers (Horwitz, 1996) have addressed unique needs of nonnative language professionals. In response, workshops and training regimens have been provided specifically for nonnative language professionals to help them

---

5 Although there have been many studies on native and nonnative English language professionals in the past two decades, the number of studies conducted in other foreign languages in the U.S. is still relatively small (Meadows & Muramatsu, 2007).

6 As in previous studies that address this topic, “speaking” is used here and throughout to specifically refer to linguistic nativeness as opposed to other connotations that the word “native” might denote.
develop their linguistic ability and pedagogical techniques (Braine, 2010; Yokoyama, 2005). It has been reported that, as a result of these efforts, many nonnative language professionals have gained higher self-esteem and improved their work environment (Braine, 2010, pp. 5-6; Park, 2012; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999).

On the other side, it has also been pointed out that not all native speakers benefit from their native-speaker status. For example, some linguistically native speakers of English (Nero, 2006) and Japanese (Okubo, 2011) have been perceived as nonnatives because of their ethnic background, (native) dialectal accent, and skin color. Moreover, native language teachers do not always enjoy the privilege of being hired over nonnative language teachers. In fact, competent native-speaking language teachers have been passed over in the teaching job market for social, political, and economic reasons (Kubota, 2009). Additionally, studies of Spanish language teachers in the U.S. have shown that, while the majority of students did not indicate a preference, of those who did indicate their preference, nonnative-speaking teachers of Spanish were more preferred than native-speaking counterparts (Ferguson, 2005; Meadows and Muramatsu, 2007).

As these cases illustrate, the practice of dichotomizing natives and nonnatives as two homogeneous groups is at best misleading (Doerr, 2009a; Sato & Doerr, 2008; Tanaka, 2013). This is because individuals routinely perceive “natives” and “nonnatives” differently, depending on a wide variety of factors (Ortega, 2013). These factors include, but are not limited to, linguistic ability, educational background, competence in other language(s), dialect, citizenship, ethnic background, skin color, and even gender and sexual orientation.
Alternatively, Doerr (2009a), Sato and Doerr (2008), and Tanaka (2013) point out that one way to deconstruct the dichotomy is to study those who do not fit in the dichotomy through ethnographic studies. Such individuals would include heritage speakers, dialect speakers, and those who are linguistically but not “ethnically” native speakers. It is true that there is a general preference in the relevant research and/or among the general public for dealing with individuals who fit the typical category of a native or a nonnative speaker. Indeed, such preference has led to a neglect of atypical or less commonly encountered cases of language socialization, which are increasingly noted. It has also been pointed out that studying such individuals may reveal underlying ideologies that are otherwise indiscernible (Garrett, 2008).

1.1. Research objectives

The aim of the present study is to investigate the construction and effects of the notion of “native speaker,” in a Japanese language program at a large university in the American midwest. By so doing, it is hoped that this study will provide additional insights into the studies of native and nonnative foreign language teachers in non-English domain settings in the U.S.

---

7 This is not, of course, to suggest that other programs have avoided the same iconization process.”

8 One might object that using the terms “native” and “nonnative” in surveys and interviews runs the risk of confirming the fallacy, as a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy. However, the surveys and instruments used in this study pose questions at a more specific level, so as to gauge which, how many, and in what combinations beliefs judged to be relevant to the fallacy are held, or not held. Further, teachers and learners come in considerable variety, in terms of background, aims looking forward, and more. It may even be the case that the fallacy does not exist in foreign language contexts other than ESL (English as a Second Language) and EFL (English as a Foreign Language), so it cannot be assumed. It is possible to examine attitudes and beliefs relevant to something without presupposing the subjects’ belief in that something. Also, the terms “native” and “nonnative” are used in this research to draw on and compare our results with
Specifically, part of this study will explore perceptions of teachers and students in the context of the professional development of Japanese language teachers. To acquire a more complete view of this notion, both quantitative and qualitative data have been collected from students and teachers of Japanese with (1) survey questionnaires, (2) interviews, and (3) observations, so that our conclusions are the products of a triangulated method of inquiry (Pavlenko, 2007). For the purpose of comparison, Chinese language teachers and students in the same department were studied in the same manner. In terms of language teaching approach, both the Chinese and Japanese language programs surveyed share the same language instruction approach called the pedagogy of performing another culture, the Performed Culture Approach ("PCA") (cf. Walker, 2010; Christensen & Warnick, 2006).

For purposes of quantitative analysis, both teachers, mostly graduate teaching associates (GTAs), and students were invited to participate in the survey questionnaires and interview sessions so as to identify different perspectives on the questions posed, as well as general trends in how native speakers are perceived. As part of the qualitative analysis, principles of language socialization (Garrett, 2008; Ochs E. , 1996) have been applied in observation sessions to look for recurring patterns in Japanese language teachers’ individual development in relation to the standards and policies set by the language program. The collected data will also be examined in the theoretical framework of Clark’s (1996) notion of community, and Irvine and Gal’s (2000) three...
semiotic processes of language ideology and linguistic differentiation, namely, iconization, fractal recursivity, and erasure.

1.2. Definitions of terms

Identifying the terms and concepts with which an issue has been discussed can help characterize it, at least partially, and will serve to clarify how they are understood in this study, in particular. The list below is offered for these purposes.

**Native** and **nonnative** speaker—According to Cambridge Dictionaries (2016), “native speaker” is defined as “someone who has spoken a particular language since they were a baby, rather than having learned it as a child or adult.” Similarly, Merriam-Webster (2016) defines it as “a person who learned to speak the language of the place where they were born as a child rather than learning it as a foreign language.” On the other hand, “nonnative speaker” is defined as “someone who has learned a particular language as a child or adult rather than as a baby” (Cambridge Dictionaries, 2016).

In foreign or second language programs, language teachers are often categorized in terms of this dichotomy of native and nonnative teachers. In such contexts, native-speaking language teachers are usually taken to be those who grew up speaking and being educated in the target language, while nonnative-speaking language teachers are those who learned the target language later than childhood, and not in their homes. Since many students in the U.S. are L1 (first language) English speakers, nonnative-speaking foreign language teachers in the U.S. are often assumed to be L1 English speakers who learned the target language.
Historical, political, and idealized aspects of the ways in which people think of native speakers will be taken up in Chapter 2.

**Divergent** language teachers—The specifier “divergent,” when applied to language teachers, refers to anyone whose traits as a language teacher are not captured in the dichotomy of native and nonnative speakers of the target language, as they are typically regarded. “Divergent” here may include any individuals with characteristics “deviating” from the standard or typical image of a native or nonnative speakers of the target language in the U.S.—such as dialect speakers, heritage speakers, and nonnative speakers of the language taught and/or studied whose native languages are not English (given that the majority of foreign language students are native speakers of English in the U.S.). The needs for studying divergent language teachers is discussed in 2.5.

**“Native-speaker” definition**—In the survey, “Native-speaker” definition refers to participants’ characterizations of a native speaker. In addition to the definition provided above, “Native-speaker” definition used in the survey report may include specific and idealized characteristics associated with native-speaker status. Section 3.1.2 discusses survey items related to “Native-speaker” definition and how its index scores were calculated. The descriptive statistics results are found in 4.1 and the inferential statistics results are discussed in 4.6.

**Preference**—In the survey, when respondents select a preference for native- or nonnative-speaking language teachers in given circumstances, the preferred group is considered by them to have certain advantages over the other group. Section 3.1.3

---

9 On the other hand, if the student body is made up of many nonnative speakers of English, native speakers of English may be considered “divergent.”
discusses survey items related to preference and how Preference index scores were calculated. The descriptive statistics results are discussed in 4.3 and the inferential statistics results are found in 4.6.

Descriptions of independent variables used in the statistical analysis (i.e. Status as a teacher or student, Language program, Language level, Gender, Age, Race, and Native language)\textsuperscript{10} will be provided in 3.1.5, and the inferential statistics results are discussed in 4.6.

**Index**—Verb to point to the presence of some variable in the immediate situation-at-hand. Linguistic indicators, in speech or writing, of a variable accessible in that context, such as the social affiliations and the typical activities of speakers as part of their everyday behavior (Irvine & Gal, 2000, p. 37; Ochs E., 1996, pp. 410-411). The cognate noun is “index.”

**Iconization**—A process of transforming the sign relationship between linguistic features (or varieties) and the social image(s) that they index. It refers to linguistic features becoming so strongly linked with social groups or activities (e.g., Japanese people eating rice) that they come to be regarded as representations of their inherent nature or essence. The connections indexed by linguistic features to social affiliations may be historical, contingent (conditional or depending on given contexts), or

\textsuperscript{10} Words (or phrases) that begin with an upper-case letter refer to categories in the questionnaires.
Section 5.2 discusses how native speakers of Japanese and Chinese were iconized in the language programs investigated.

**Fractal Recursivity**—An opposition, salient at some level, of a relationship that is projected onto some other level. This dissertation follows Irvine and Gal (2000) in using the term to refer specifically to the dichotomizing and partitioning process between groups or linguistic varieties recurring on different levels. For instance, in Nguni languages, click consonants were originally indexes of foreignness (on one level or domain) but then they became an index of respect (on another) (Irvine & Gal, 2000, pp. 38, 46). Oppositions found in survey respondents’ characterizations of native and nonnative speakers are discussed in 4.4 and 4.5 and are summarized in Table 16 in Section 4.5.

**Erasure**—A process of rendering invisible persons or activities that are inconsistent with an ideological scheme, by leaving them unremarked, or somehow explaining them away. For instance, if a social group or a language is imagined as homogeneous, its internal variation may be disregarded or “erased.” Such unfit elements must, per the ideology, either ignored or transformed (Irvine & Gal, 2000, p. 38).

Sections 2.2 and 2.3 provide discussions about how individuals with minority backgrounds are disregarded and/or conformed to the standard set by the majority. Section 5.2 provides a discussion on how language students disregarded diverse traits of

---

11 Irvine and Gal (2000, p. 38) further explain that “by picking out qualities supposedly shared by the social image and the linguistic image, the ideological representation—itself a sign—binds them together in a linkage that appears to be inherent.”
their language teachers that did not fit into the homogeneous dichotomy of native and nonnative.

**Language Socialization**—It is “the human developmental process whereby a child or other novice (of any age) acquires the knowledge, skills, orientations, and practices that enable him or her to participate in the social life of a particular community” (Garrett, 2008, p. 189; cf. also Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986).

Language socialization occurs primarily when children or novices interact with older and/or more experienced persons as well as peers. It is a not a passive, top-down process where experts are the providers and novices the recipients. Rather, it is a reciprocal process in which both experts and novices co-construct meaningful interactive contexts with each other (Garrett, 2008, p. 198). In educational contexts, for example, students may help shape the teachers’ role and provide teachers with occasions for learning. Language socialization experiences of four Japanese language teachers will be documented in Sections 5.6-5.9.

1.3. Research questions and hypotheses

This study will specifically address the following questions:

(1) How do language teachers and students of Japanese in this program perceive native and nonnative language teachers?

---

12 Further, through language socialization, children and novices develop communicative competence, which involves acquiring linguistic proficiency and culturally based knowledge, in order to use a given language (or languages) in culturally intelligible, and socially appropriate ways. Such proficiency and knowledge allow them to function as competent members of, or participants in, a particular community. Garrett also points out that through language socialization, children and novices learn how to think, behave, relate to others, make sense of happenings in their community, and even how to feel in certain situations and how to manage those feelings.
a. How do they define a native speaker?

b. Do they prefer a native or nonnative language teacher?

c. How does one’s background (i.e. Status as a teacher or student, Language program, Gender, Age, Language level, Race, and Native language) relate to students’ and teachers’ definition of a native speaker and preference for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers?

In their “Native-speaker” definition or characterizations, research participants may have certain expectations or characterization for a native speaker that may or may not be idealized. It is assumed that such characterizations are manifested in their “Native-speaker” definition—the more characteristics are included, the more specific his/her “Native-speaker” definition will be.

As previous studies of nonnative language teachers seem to suggest, and as this study assumes, that language students have a certain preference for native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers in given conditions. As well, language teachers in this study may also think that language students have a preference for native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers. Specifically, native-speaking teachers are commonly assumed to be preferred in certain areas such as modeling pronunciation. Likewise, nonnative-speaking teachers are assumed to be preferred in certain areas such as teaching grammar or providing emotional support. Based on a previous study’s finding (Meadows and Muramatsu, 2007), it is hypothesized that overall, native-speaking teachers of Japanese and Chinese are preferred over their nonnative-speaking counterparts.

The null hypothesis assumes that one’s background (i.e. Status as a teacher or student, Language program, Language level, Gender, Age, Race, and Native language)
does not have any significant relationship with one’s characterization of “native speaker” or preference for native- and/or nonnative-speaking language teachers. Alternatively, one or more characteristics of this study’s individual participants may relate significantly with their characterizations of “native speaker” and preference for native- or nonnative-speaking teachers. A set of hypotheses for each variable will be discussed in 3.1.5.

(2) How does the iconic construct of “native speaker” affect the language teachers of Japanese in this study?

a. How and by whom are native speakers characterized in a language program?

b. How are language teachers positioned or considered as native or nonnative speakers of the target language?

c. How do language teachers of Japanese deal with self-identified characteristics that are not consistent with the typical dichotomy of native and nonnative speakers?

A number of assumptions inform these questions. It is assumed that teachers and students have a more-or-less certain image of a native and nonnative speaker in their minds. A certain type of native speaker may be used, for example, as a model in training teachers or in the assigned language textbook(s) and learning media, and therefore as “the standard” in the given language program. In the language socialization process, as it plays out in this university’s Japanese and Chinese programs, it is expected that language users of Japanese and Chinese will be exposed to the concept of native and nonnative speaker, which has been and will be co-constructed by experts and novice language users.

If there is evidence of dichotomization of native and nonnative speaker in this program, it is supposed that teacher participants in the study will be differentiated
socially as native and nonnative speakers. It is also assumed that it is possible for these teachers to be positioned and repositioned as native and nonnative speakers of the target language over time.

Underlying ideologies of “good” and “bad,” or “more” and “less desirable,” language teachers may be manifested in social interactions between language teachers (who may be new to the language program) and teacher trainers, and language students, as well as peers of the teachers and students. It is assumed that the subjects’ image of a native and nonnative speaker is not a static one (though it may be identified as if it is), but, rather, a dynamic one that is changing over time. Both expert and novice users of language are assumed to play a role in shaping or reshaping this concept or image, for themselves and others.

Finally, it is supposed that foreign language teachers, as performers of that role, are assumed to provide models for certain linguistic forms or behaviors that are considered correct, accurate, or socially/culturally appropriate. Language teachers may or may not possess, or be able to acquire the competence to model such “correct” linguistic forms or behaviors, and they may even develop certain strategies that include characteristics that are inconsistent with perceived standards. If so, the data, quantitative and qualitative, will tell.

1.4. Significance of the problem

This study, as one of the few studies that have been conducted in the U.S. on the native speaker fallacy outside of TESOL, attempts to provide additional insights to
previous findings reported on the same topic. Due to the effects of globalization and
ethnic diversification in education and elsewhere, there are increasing numbers of
divergent language teachers who do not fit into the simple dichotomy of native and
nonnative speakers. By closely describing local cases of divergent language teachers of
Japanese and Chinese, this study attempts to illustrate the underlying ideologies behind
the concept of the native speaker such as characterizing them as a homogeneous group of
people with a certain racial background and a high level of competence in all domains of
their first language. Such underlying ideologies may be identified by looking at how
native speakers are perceived by individuals and by the communities they belong to in the
language program (e.g., groups of language teachers and students engaged with different
target languages, learning environments, teacher trainers, peers, etc.) in the survey. Such
ideologies may also be found through observations and interviews so as to document how
divergent language teachers in the university’s language programs deal with perceived
standards set using the notion of native speaker.

1.5. Summary

This study investigates the construct and effects of the iconization of “native
speaker” in one Japanese language program in American higher education. With its
results, it calls for a more careful look at how native-speaking language teachers are
viewed and grouped together by researchers or by language-teaching professionals
themselves and their peers. It is hoped that the findings and discussion offered in this
dissertation will help native, nonnative, as well as any other kinds of language teachers, to move beyond the native speaker fallacy.

In considering some implications from the results of this study, ideas and suggestions for improving foreign language teacher training and foreign language instruction will be proposed, along with an assessment of positive and negative aspects of language standardization. It is hoped that this study will encourage more sharing of insights and concerns among foreign language teachers regarding the ways in which their identities and experience might be relevant to their professional endeavor, whether they think of themselves as native, nonnative, or whatever else, and in the end, help lead to more, and more aware collaboration among the full range of foreign language teachers.

The chapters that follow present a review of literature; methodology; quantitative and qualitative results and discussions; and conclusions, each in turn.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

As mentioned in the Introduction, the aim of this study is to further explore the iconization of the construct “native speaker,” along with its effects, in their contexts of a Japanese program at a large university in the American midwest. In this chapter, a theoretical framework concerning the iconized construct of the native speaker, along with relevant research conducted on native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers, will be reviewed. In 2.1, the interpretation of “native speaker” at the lexical level will be reviewed. In 2.2, the interpretation of “native speaker” at communal and individual levels will be described, and the question of how certain ideological characteristics are associated with native-speaker status considered. In 2.3, the process of how such ideological characteristics are standardized in different communities will be documented. Section 2.4 will discuss the relativity of the construct of the native speaker’s “authority” and “power.” Section 2.5 offers suggestions for reconceptualizing the construct of the native speaker, and then discusses ways to investigate the construct and effects of the iconized native speaker. Finally, Section 2.6 provides a context and motivation for investigating native, nonnative, and divergent speakers of Japanese in the U.S.
2.1. Interpretation of “native speaker” and “nonnative speaker” at the lexical level

As noted in 1.2, the most general definition of native speaker used in dictionaries is someone “who has spoken a particular language since they were a baby” (Cambridge Dictionaries, 2016) or “learned to speak the language of the place where they were born as a child” (Merriam-Webster, 2016). Such language that native speakers learn to speak is usually referred as their first language (L1) or mother tongue.

However, outside the dictionaries, ideas about one’s first language or mother tongue are in fact subjective and filtered by experience, beliefs and assumptions, which can yield definitions that do not match the typical dictionary definition. Doerr (2011, pp.1-3) points out that the language that makes native speakers native is subject to interpretation. Specifically, she quotes Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson’s (1989) different interpretations of the word “mother tongue,” a term that is often used interchangeably with “native language”:

(1) the language(s) one learns first,
(2) the language(s) one knows best,
(3) the language(s) one uses most, and
(4) the language(s) one identifies with.

As the optional parenthesized plural suffix ‘s’ implies, according to these definitions, it is possible for one person to have multiple languages as his or her mother tongue, and the term “native speaker” may encompass monolinguals, as well as both simultaneous and late multilinguals. For example, if someone is raised as a simultaneous multilingual, acquiring two languages such as Japanese and English from

---

13 Simultaneous multilinguals are those who grow up speaking more than one language. Late multilinguals are those who learn a particular language different from their first language as a child or adult rather than as a baby.
childhood, both languages may be considered their first or native language. In such cases, one may be considered a native speaker of Japanese and English.

However, it is said to be quite rare to develop both “first” languages 100% equally because one language may be dominant in certain contexts while the other may be dominant in other contexts, depending on how languages are used in a given community. For instance, if English is used at school and Japanese at home, English becomes the dominant first language at school and Japanese becomes the dominant first language at home. Growing up in such linguistic environments, commonalities shared by such simultaneous multilinguals by virtue of their “first languages” would be much different from that of commonalities shared among monolingual speakers. These commonalities are what Clark (1996) refers to as communal common ground, which “represents all the knowledge, beliefs, and assumptions they take to be universally held in the communities to which they mutually believe they both belong (p. 332).” When commonalities of monolinguals are used as the norm to compare multilingual individuals’ capacities for using their “first languages,” the latter may be found lacking, insofar as they have lived neither language in 100% of the social domains of their lives.

Similarly, when frequency of use is considered, it is also possible for late multilingual speakers, or those who grow up speaking one language and learn to communicate in additional language(s) later in their lives, to have more than one “first” language. When such individuals move to a linguistically different community and start using a language other than their first-acquired language more frequently in certain situations, they develop commonalities or “everyday notions of culture” (Clark, 1996, p.
334) in their non-first language. As a result, their “first” or “dominant” language may shift depending on the contexts of use such as domestic vs. academic and/or professional settings. In fact, they may not be able to appropriately act in their first-acquired language in such unfamiliar settings because they lack the everyday notions of appropriate culture.

Moreover, what seem to be equivalent lexical terms across languages referring to the notion of “native speaker” may actually not express the exact same idea (Ohira, 2001). From a Japanese perspective, the English phrase “native speaker” is often considered an equivalent of *bokokugowasha* (母国語話者) ‘speaker of the motherland language.’ This is because within Japan, the country is commonly thought of as a monolingual country and the majority of Japanese consider the Japanese language the language of their nation—a situation that may not exist in other, multilingual countries. This excludes racially non-Japanese individuals such as *zainichi Kankokujin* ‘permanent Korean residents of Japan,’ and any other ‘foreigners’ with non-Japanese racial backgrounds, from being considered native speakers of Japanese, since their native country is not Japan, even if they grew up speaking Japanese in Japan. A slightly different but frequently used term is *bogowasha* (母語話者) ‘speaker of his/her mother’s tongue.’ But this “native speaker” equivalent does not refer to children who grow up

---

14 Cited in Tanaka (2013, p. 96). This is of course true for many lexical “equivalents” across languages.

15 For instance, ethnic Korean individuals are referred as outsiders as they are often referred to as *zainichi* which implies “foreign citizens temporarily staying in Japan,” even though some of them have been naturalized or held their citizenship since birth (Tanaka, 2011). Moreover, it has been reported that such linguistically, but not ethnic, native speakers of Japanese in certain Japanese schools have been placed in a special language classroom (as opposed to a class for typical Japanese students), mostly due to their ethnicity (Okubo, 2011).
speaking a first language other than their biological mother’s language, such as adoptees and children of divorced parents.

Finally, a borrowed term neitibusupīkā (ネイティブスピーカー) ‘native speaker,’ is also frequently used. It is not unusual for loanwords to acquire meanings or restrictions in usage that do not apply in the source language, and it seems that the borrowed term neitibusupīkā has acquired certain ideological associations in Japanese language. In fact, a clipped version, neitibu, is sometimes used to refer to high proficiency in a foreign language, e.g., anata no eego wa neitibu desu ne ‘Your English is native (very good, like a native speaker),’ or it may simply refer to language spoken by gaikokujin ‘foreigners’ with the assumption that they are all native speakers of English, in contexts of English language education. For instance, young Caucasian individuals are often displayed as native-speaking English instructors in advertisements found in Japan, such as the promotional photo in Figure 1, from NOVA, a chain of English language schools in Japan.
As in this photo, many of the photos found on the website feature a young white individual as a language instructor, which is accompanied by one of the sales points of NOVA—*kōshi wa zen’in neitibusu pīkā no gaikokujin* (講師は全員ネイティブスピーカーの外国人) ‘Instructors are all native-speaker foreigners.’ This example shows that the social status of *gaikokujin* ‘foreigner’ is explicitly linked with being a native speaker of English,¹⁷ which is implicitly linked with the capability to teach English language. Essentially, all “foreigners”—people who look and talk like this—are believed to be qualified to teach the English language. This is what Phillipson (1992) called the native speaker fallacy.

---


¹⁷ As any number of manga cameos will attest, a *gaijin* (short for *gaikokujin*) has oftentimes features such as white skin, blue eyes, and blond hair. This assumption of treating all *gaikokujin* homogeneously as white individuals disregards all other non-white, non-English speaking *gaikokujin*, although the majority of foreigners living in Japan today are in fact from Asia (Ministry of Justice, 2015). Similarly, some ESL student participants from Moussu’s (2006) study in the U.S. did not identify all teachers from the U.S. as native speakers of English. She suspects that her students’ judgment was influenced by their teacher’s appearance, fluency in non-English language, and “accent” (p. 110).
Nonnative speakers, on the other hand, are often defined as “someone who has learned a particular language as a child or adult rather than as a baby” (Cambridge Dictionaries, 2016), or something similar. As the following letter of rejection written by a language school principal to a nonnative-speaking teacher of English in London implies, this term has a pejorative connotation: “I am afraid we have to insist that all our teachers are native speakers of English. Our students do not travel halfway round the world only to be taught by a nonnative speaker (however good that person’s English may be)” (Illés, 1991).18

Because of the pejorative connotation that sometimes comes with the prefix “non-,” it has been suggested that the term “nonnative” be replaced with a more positive phrasing. For instance, nonnative speakers have been re-framed (dropping the “non-”) as speakers of their “base language,” the one they start out from, as opposed to those whose first language is the learners’ target language—yielding the contrastive terms “base native” and “target native” (Jorden & Walton, 1987), as “L2 (Second language) users” or “multicompetent speakers” (Cook, 1999)19 and as “translinguals” (Canagaraja, 2013).20

---

19 Cook (1999) points out that “native speakers” have been thought as models of linguistic capability, order of acquisition, and knowledge. Second language learners will always remain “incomplete/failed native speaker[s]” from a time-based viewpoint because they have not had contact with the target language since birth or early childhood. According to Cook, the practice of language programs having a goal for students to attain a native-level competence contributes to their loss of motivation. In order to focus more positively, Cook proposes to perceive second language learners as “L2 users” or “multicompetent speakers” instead of terms that suggest they are at best an “approximation to monolingual native speakers.”
20 Canagaraja (2013) argues that academic discourse of L2 acquisition/TESOL/ESL, etc. has been dominated by a monolingual orientation that has colored perceptions around the English language instructional enterprise. He identifies two central tenets of the monolingual orientation—(a) efficient communication occurs successfully in the context of a common language with shared norms, and (b) these norms are defined by the so-called native speaker. As a counter argument, Canagaraja introduces the term “translinguals,” for speakers who demonstrate the ability to use their language(s) successfully across
These alternative terms have been introduced to emphasize significant, factual characteristics that can be stated positively, without a “non-,” which are not apparent in the simple “nonnative speaker.”

However, there is an increasing number of researchers and language teachers who choose to continue to use the term “nonnative.” This is perhaps due in part to the fact that the term “nonnative speaker” has gained some positive characterizations as a result of the so-called nonnative-speaking teacher movement (Braine, 2010, p. 6), and studies that have, similarly, pointed out positive characteristics of nonnative-speaking language teachers (e.g., Medgyes, 1992; Abe & Yokoyama, 1990; Horwitz, 1996). The following comment from Xia, a nonnative-speaking teacher of English from East Asia in the U.S., illustrates how she started to associate the term “nonnative” with positive characteristics. Having been positively influenced by her supportive and encouraging mentor teacher in her MA TESOL program, Xia said, “I am never afraid of being recognized as a nonnative English speaker. I am kind of proud… I speak two languages… I want to improve my English but not for the purpose of being identified as a native English speaker” (Park, 2012; p. 141). Her comment illustrates that the term “nonnative” can be regarded as a lexical item with positive connotations.

Moussu’s (2006) study on the effects of time on students’ attitudes provides another example of how the perception of nonnative-speaking teachers changes with time.

---

21 Section 2.2 provides more details about Park’s study.

---

23
and exposure. Specifically, she collected her data using the same sets of questionnaires at the beginning (N=804) and at the end of the semester (N=643). While overall results showed that students’ attitudes were more positive towards native-speaking teachers of English than towards nonnative-speaking English teachers, interestingly, students taught by nonnative-speaking English teachers held a significantly more positive attitude towards nonnative-speaking teachers at the end of the semester, than students taught by native-speaking counterparts. In other words, Moussu found that ESL students’ positive attitude towards nonnative-speaking teachers increased significantly with time and exposure.\(^{22}\)

From a foreign language teacher’s perspective, Horwitz (1996) discusses how nonnative speakers perceive their language ability in the target language differently in their dealings with what she termed as “foreign language anxiety”—a feeling of nervousness that foreign language speakers feel when speaking in front of people in their foreign language. By summarizing her data obtained from interviewing a group of nonnative-speaking foreign language teachers\(^{23}\) from her earlier studies (Horwitz, 1992; Horwitz 1993), she explains that foreign language teachers who were more anxious about their language ability were more likely to say they would avoid teaching practices that value spontaneous language use that is more target language-intensive for the teachers (e.g., role-play activities, discussions and/or grammatical explanations in the target language, etc.), even though they considered these activities valuable. However, she also

\(^{22}\) The same phenomenon was also seen with those who were taught by native-speaking teachers.

\(^{23}\) Such as certified practicing and nonpracticing Russian teachers, and preservice English teachers (primarily from Korea and Taiwan).
points out that people who are anxious about their language ability do not necessarily have actual target language deficiencies. She says that in many cases, “it is the high achiever who both recognizes and magnifies small imperfections in target language productions” (p. 367) because of his/her motivation and ego-investment. In other words, those with high foreign language anxiety are not necessarily less proficient in the language than those who seem to be more confident with their language ability. In sum, some nonnative-speaking foreign language teachers have a tendency to minimize their language ability while others have a tendency to not worry their ability.

Another frequent assumption about nonnative-speaking language teachers is that they are often considered to be language teachers who share the same base language as with their language students. For example, Meadows and Muramatsu (2007, p. 108) used the following item in their survey to investigate students’ beliefs about native- and nonnative-speaking teacher of Spanish: “I prefer an American teacher because I can ask questions in English.” As this survey item implies, in the U.S., nonnative-speaking language teachers are commonly considered “Americans” of whom students “can ask questions in English.” This kind of characterization is not necessarily true, because there are other “non-American,” nonnative-speaking teachers of foreign languages in the U.S. whose first language and culture are not English. Being a nonnative speaker of the target language, such language teachers may have a difficult time teaching the language, as well as in relating to students with whom they do not share their first language or culture.

In sum, as phrases, “native speaker” and “nonnative speaker” may be interpreted differently depending on the contexts of their use, from the syntax to the discourse and
the interactant’s present situation. Needless to say, the commonalities of that accompanying a “first language” that is shared among certain groups of monolinguals, among simultaneous multilinguals, and among late multilinguals will differ in each case (Ortega, 2013). It is also true that not everyone interprets the term “nonnative” with a pejorative connotation, and there is a range of nonnative-speaking language teachers, who may or may not have a first language and culture that they possess in common with their students. This begs the question of who defines “native speaker” and “nonnative speaker” and how they define them. As long as there is not a widespread agreement on criteria, it can be arbitrary. Therefore, one must be careful when claiming or interpreting generalizations about native and nonnative speakers by paying close attention to the demography of particular types of “native speakers” and “nonnative speakers” in detail.

2.2. Interpretations of “native” and “nonnative speaker” on the communal and individual levels

Different assumptions are not only associated with the terms, but also with certain shared commonalities (Clark, 1996) held in regard to a shared language24 across different parts of a linguistic community (Slobin, 1996). According to Clark (1996, pp. 333-334), individuals belong to an immense number of communities based on their shared language, nationality, gender, sexual preference, education, place of residence, occupation, religion, hobby, subculture, and ethnic origin, etc. Each community has its own set of beliefs, rules, perspectives, practices, and understandings, which may or may

---

24 Clark states that “language use varies not only by major language communities… but by any cultural community that corresponds to people’s social identities” (p. 353).
not influence how its members perceive “native” and “nonnative” speakers in their community. This communal common ground or the everyday content of culture (p. 334) is not uniformly distributed in the population and may be different at the level of personal common ground. In fact, individuals may display varying degrees of awareness of local language ideologies depending on social dimensions (e.g., class, gender, language, and generations) and socio-cultural groups (Doerr, 2009a).

In linguistics, furthermore, idealistic theory defines native speaker as someone who has perfect control of using the language without being influenced by the various “performance” factors of real life (Ohira, 2001). As a result, any individuals who do not live up to such criteria are at risk of not being considered qualified arbiters of grammaticality and acceptability for the purposes of studies related to linguistics, such as psycholinguistics and second language acquisition studies.

In the context of language teaching, individuals who are taught and/or believe in such idealized characterizations of native speaker may hold negative attitudes towards nonnative-speaking teachers. For instance, Moussu (2002) reported that Korean and Chinese students at an ESL program in the U.S. expressed negative feelings and distrust towards nonnative-speaking English teachers more frequently than others in her survey study (N=84). Moussu (2006) conducted a follow-up study using the survey data from

---

25 For example, cultural beliefs, practices, conventions, values, skills, and know-how (p. 334).
26 Personal common ground represents “all the mutual knowledge, beliefs, and assumptions that [at least two interactants] have inferred from personal experience with each other” (p. 332).
27 Cited in Tanaka (2013, p. 96)
28 Cited in Braine (2010, p. 31).
29 Also cited in Braine (2010, p. 36).
students from 12 different ESL programs (N=1040 ESL students). Specifically, Moussu studied whether her ESL students’ self-reported backgrounds (i.e. Students’ first languages, Gender, Class subject,\textsuperscript{30} Proficiency level,\textsuperscript{31} Expected grade, as well as Teachers’ native languages) influenced students’ attitudes towards native- and nonnative-speaking teachers of English. Her study found that the students’ and teachers’ first languages strongly influenced students’ attitudes towards native- and nonnative-speaking teachers of English. Specifically, native speakers of Asian languages, especially the Korean speakers, had the most negative attitudes towards nonnative-speaking teachers,\textsuperscript{32} whereas native speakers of Spanish, French, and Portuguese language backgrounds had relatively more positive attitudes.\textsuperscript{33}

On the other hand, there are other contexts where language learners do not seem to hold such clear preference. For instance, more than half of the participants in Ferguson’s (2005) survey study on native- and nonnative-speaking teachers of Spanish at

\textsuperscript{30} Grammar, Reading and Writing, and Listening and Speaking, and other subjects such as culture and test preparation, etc.

\textsuperscript{31} Beginning, Intermediate, and Advanced

\textsuperscript{32} Asian language-speaking students such as Korean and Chinese native speakers also had a more negative attitude towards native-speaking teachers of English than students in other language groups.

\textsuperscript{33} A brief report on other variables: Gender did not seem to influence their attitudes significantly, though male subjects seemed to be a little more accepting of nonnative-speaking teachers of English than female subjects. Interestingly, students at the higher advanced level were found to be more satisfied with their nonnative-speaking teachers of English than lower-level students. Moussu reported that the reasons for this paradox are unknown, although she suspected that it may have something to do with their teaching qualities and/or advanced-level students being more exposed to nonnative-speaking teachers. Perhaps, advanced-level students are better “resource managers.” Having more learning experience, they are perhaps more aware of and appreciate the strengths that nonnative-speaking teachers can provide in their language instruction. Further, Moussu reported that students expecting a high grade had a very positive attitude towards both native and nonnative-speaking teachers, while those who were expecting a low grade had a very negative attitude. Interestingly, students taught by nonnative-speaking teachers of English were found to be more satisfied with their speaking and listening class than grammar class. Finally, Moussu reported that students did not seem to have a positive attitude towards native speakers of other varieties of English as much as they appreciated native speakers of North American varieties.
a U.S. university (N=154) could not simply indicate whether native- or nonnative-speaking teachers were more preferred. Ferguson suspected that this was because there were too many other individual factors that attributed to a language teacher’s effectiveness besides his/her identity as a native or nonnative speaker of the target language. Some of these factors include the language teacher’s knowledge of the subject area, teaching style, proficiencies in the institutional and target languages, sociolinguistic knowledge, knowledge of language teaching methodologies, cultural affiliation, self-identification, political labeling, the sequence or timing which determines whether languages are acquired or learned, social and teaching environment, time spent in the target community, the frequency of the teachers’ contact with native speakers of the target culture, knowledge of professional organizations, and levels of students, etc. (Liu, 1999; Reves & Medgyes, 1994).35

In TESOL, since the majority of English speakers from what Kachuru (1992) called the Inner Circle (Figure 2 below) are white, this racial commonality easily takes on iconic status for them, as in the case of the NOVA advertisement represented in Figure 1.

34 See 2.4 for a discussion on their survey results.
Consequently, non-white individuals and any nonnative speakers of English are sometimes regarded as less qualified in the job market for English language teachers, and are often not demanded by English language institutions and learners of English language (Braine, 2010). For instance, Nero (2006), an African-American, discussed how her “nativeness” was questioned as an English language instructor due to her skin color. Moreover, Braine (2010, p. 4) reports about how nonnative-speaking English teachers have a hard time finding work when they return to their countries after obtaining higher degrees and teacher qualifications in the West. He explains that “some language program

---

36 Inner Circle of English-speaking societies include countries that use English as a primary language, such as the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, and Canada, etc. The Outer Circle countries such as India, Nigeria, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Malaysia, the Philippines, etc. use English as a lingua franca between different ethnic and language groups. The Expanding Circle represents countries elsewhere, such as China, Russia, Japan, non-Anglophone Europe, South Korea, Egypt, and Indonesia, in which English is used primarily as a medium of international communication.

administrators—notably in Japan, Korea, and Hong Kong, for instance—appeared to prefer unqualified native speakers of English instead of qualified local teachers.” When this kind of specific communal demands are imposed by language program administrators, those who do not have the stereotypical native speaker traits (i.e. race, ethnicity, pronunciation, dialect, etc.) may be regarded as “unfit” for their language programs. Even if they are hired as language teachers, when strict standards are imposed by a certain language program in the areas of linguistic accuracy and pronunciation, they may become very cautious about their language use (Horwitz, 1996). As a result, they may decide to avoid risks, and to that end reduce their creativity, their use of the target language, and the instructional options they provide, in fear of not meeting the standards set by the program or making a mistake in front of students or other teachers.

To counter this, nonnative-speaking language teachers’ unique strengths have been discussed in the fields of TESOL (e.g., Medgyes, 1992), Japanese language education (e.g., Abe & Yokoyama, 1991; Sukle, 1977), and foreign language education in general (e.g., Horwitz, 1996). For instance, these studies have pointed out that nonnative-speaking language teachers have an enhanced ability to explain the language in detail, and the ability to provide emotional support, learning strategies, and be a model of a successful learner, etc., all of which come from having the language-learning

38 Braine (2010) did not provide a specific context, so whether it was for K-12 and/or higher education and/or adult EFL class is unknown.

39 In his presentation, Sukle proposed a team of language teachers consisting of both target native (native speakers of the target language) and base native (native speakers of the language of the students) for an ideal language program. As part of his presentation, he discussed how base natives could contribute to the language instruction with their abilities to detect difficulty in the target language and to explain in terms other base native students would understand.
experience and possibly a shared first language and culture with learners (Medgyes, 1992; Abe & Yokoyama, 1991).

These advantages do not, of course, eliminate performance anxiety among the same teachers. To help nonnative-speaking foreign language teachers alleviate foreign language anxiety, Horwitz (1996) provided some suggestions for language educators, such as (1) recognizing one’s own and others’ feelings of foreign language anxiety and culture shock, (2) giving permission to be less than perfect, (3) becoming more aware of the language learning process, (4) imagining oneself speaking well, within the stresses of classroom teaching, (5) making a plan to improve one’s language proficiency, (6) giving credit for target language achievement, and (7) being supportive of colleagues and of students (p. 368-371). As a practical implication for foreign language teacher training, Horwitz (1996) states that “efforts to develop and upgrade the language proficiency of nonnative teachers—both pre-service and in-service—must be supportive and sensitive, and specific interventions directed at language anxiety should be included” (p. 371).

Being able to take advantage of these positive aspects of their identities and having support from their teaching community has helped many nonnative-speaking teachers feel empowered in their language teaching communities (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999; Park, 2012; Shin, 2006). For example, Samimy and Brutt-Griffler created an opportunity (a pilot 10-week seminar for ESOL\textsuperscript{40} teachers in North America) for nonnative-speaking English graduate students to critically analyze causes of their perceived powerlessness. Through classroom dialogues, reflective

\textsuperscript{40} English to Speakers of Other Languages.
writing assignments, such as corresponding with a nonnative-speaking English researcher, namely Peter Medgyes, and writing professional autobiographies, participants came to see how Western cultural hegemony (Norton, 1997) is reinforced in teacher education classrooms, which “silenced multicultural voices” and “domesticated” them into subscribing to an “ESL ethos” (p. 427-428). Samimy and Brutt-Griffler report that in the process of class participation and writing assignments, many of them were led to generate a new sense of agency as international English professionals to promote diversity in the field.

In Park’s study (2012) briefly mentioned earlier, the presence in the community of a supportive nonnative-speaking mentor teacher, Ms. Tomiko, was the factor that seemed to help Xia to validate her identity as a nonnative-speaking English teacher. Specifically, Park used electronic autobiographical narratives, electronic journal entries, and individual interviews to collect data. As a learner and user of English, Xia was comfortable using her “Chinglish” to communicate informally with colleagues in her graduate school program, but she felt insecure as an ESOL teacher because she thought her English had to be perfect. However, Park reports how Xia’s view changed as the result of having Ms. Tomiko as her mentor, and seeing how hard Ms. Tomiko worked to

41 Specifically, they were assigned to write in response to Medgyes’ (1994) The Non-Native Teacher, which discusses topics such as “the dark side of being a nonnative,” “the bright side of being a nonnative,” and “who’s worth more: the native or the nonnative.”


43 This expectation for language teachers to speak “perfectly” is also commonly held by language learners. From the qualitative data obtained from interview sessions (N=9), Meadows and Muramatsu (2007) found that seven out of nine participants believed that, while they only needed the basic communicative competence to be a successful speaker, they held their teachers to a much higher standard with the ability to demonstrate the standard pronunciation and cultural knowledge.
build her credibility as an international teacher in her community in an elementary school context. Park reports that Xia realized what motivated and engaged the young students was not how well Ms. Tomiko spoke English to them, but the attitude she exhibited towards her students and the relationships that she established with them to fulfill their academic needs. In one of the narrative snapshots that Park presented, Xia commented, “the kids are so bright that if you care for them, then they know. They can tell from your face, your eyes, and they really like you. If you don’t, then they can tell, and they will stay away from you. They are like clams, and they are going to close” (p. 140). With Ms. Tomiko’s influence as an environmental factor, Xia’s identity as a nonnative-speaking teacher of English seemed to be, slowly but surely, validated. Xia’s positive experience was thus enabled by a school community that allowed qualified nonnative-speaking teachers of English to teach an ESOL class.

Shin’s study (2006) provides another example of environmental factors at the communal level that allowed her nonnative-speaking teachers of Japanese to be “empowered.” The study took place in a university study abroad program in Japan where nonnative-speaking teachers of Japanese were assigned to team-teach with native-speaking teachers. Shin’s hypothesis was that the study-abroad students would have negative attitudes towards nonnative-speaking teachers in the beginning, but on the

---

44 Specifically, Tomiko’s commitment to her ESOL students exhibited in her behavior of working late hours to prepare for the next day’s lesson, and listening to students, were described as “a form of pedagogy of love and transformation” (p. 140-141).

45 Interestingly, other participants in Park’s study had different experiences and outcomes. One of the participants had many negative experiences throughout her educational journey, which resulted in self-marginalization of her identity as an English learner. Another participant decided to take advantage of her identity as a native speaker of Korean and ended up teaching her dominant language instead of English.
contrary, they quickly adapted to the team-teaching system without much bias towards their nonnative-speaking teachers. Specifically, the study abroad students looked for interpersonal and social skills from nonnative-speaking Japanese teachers outside of class such as talking about how foreigners in Japan deal with things related to college, food, medical problems, part-time job, and apartment searching, etc. Unlike in Park’s study, whether or not these nonnative-speaking teacher participants received support from their mentors was not reported, but the community of teachers and students that supported their teaching curriculum, specifically the team-teaching system, allowed the nonnative-speaking teachers of Japanese to take advantage of their unique backgrounds.\textsuperscript{46} Studies conducted by Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999), Park (2012), and Shin (2006) provide examples of how environmental factors at the local communal level can alleviate the pressures that nonnative-speaking language teachers may feel from the society that fosters the idea of native speaker fallacy.

Although participants from Shin’s study were able to validate their identities as nonnative-speaking teachers of Japanese, the iconic status of native speaker is still powerful in Japanese communities, and individuals who do not share the expected traits with the majority continue to be marginalized. In Japan, the Japanese government uses citizenship status to divide \textit{nihonjin} ‘Japanese people’ from \textit{gaikokujin} ‘foreigners’ (Ministry of Justice Immigration Office, 2011), and the iconic native speaker of Japanese

\textsuperscript{46} Meadows and Muramatsu’s (2007) study of nonnative-speaking teachers of foreign languages provides another perspective. In the interview, six out of nine foreign language students (including learners of Spanish, Italian, Japanese, and Chinese) acknowledged the expertise of native- and nonnative-speaking teachers, and said they would need both to succeed in their language study. The remaining three exhibited a strong preference for having a team of language teachers consisting of only native speakers, though, interestingly, one of them also said that his classmates would actually benefit more from having a native-nonnative combination.
is often considered as a monolingual speaker of Japanese who is ethnically Japanese. This is because the majority of these citizens are indeed ethnically Japanese (about 98%), and grew up speaking only Japanese in Japan, developing proficiency in speaking the preferred Tokyo dialect. Consequently, many people in Japan unconsciously assume all “Japanese citizens” to be “ethnically Japanese” and “linguistically native speakers of Japanese” (Tanaka, 2013). Similarly, researchers and language professionals tend to unconsciously assume ethnically Japanese people to be native speakers of Japanese. Subsequently, teacher-training programs, job markets for Japanese language education, and linguistics studies in Japan tend to target this population exclusively, in fulfilling their needs.

Such native speakers of Japanese are typically demanded by employers (e.g., business, or Japanese language institutions) and learners of Japanese. This is perhaps because it has been traditionally assumed that the Japanese language belongs to the Japanese people (Jorden and Walton, 1987, p. 120), and native-speaker status is associated with certain ideologically necessary characteristics such as the ability to control the Japanese language perfectly and the ability to evaluate the Japanese language of non-Japanese (Morimoto, 2001). In fact, the Japanese language of Japanese people is often regarded as the correct Japanese, while the Japanese language of foreigners is regarded as deviant (Zheng, 2011). Needless to say, native speakers of Japanese who

---


48 Also cited in Tanaka (2013). Tanaka cites her own study (2006) on the content of Japanese language textbooks to illustrate that such ideology has been continuous since the postwar period. Specifically, she revealed how “Japanese language” is treated as something that belongs to “the Japanese people” while everyone else is positioned as “outsiders.”
are ethnically Japanese are treated as the model in Japanese language textbooks for learners of Japanese to follow.

With this homogeneous mindset as a nation, Japanese communities continue to marginalize people and dialects that do not fit in with this standard. In fact, Japan has been using the Tokyo dialect as its standard language (*hyōjungo*) since the late nineteenth century, as other dialects have been suppressed and are disappearing. Though there has been a movement in support of trying to revitalize Japanese dialects recently, the use of dialects in the national school curriculum is still not widely encouraged. For example, Doerr and Lee (2011) reported that diaspora students seemed to have mixed feelings about being required to use standard Japanese in a government-funded weekend Japanese school in the U.S. They report that the use of other dialects(s) such as the Kansai dialect or language(s) such as English is at times perceived as indicating a lack of competency in standard Japanese, and when pointed out, the users feel marginalized as if they were deviating from the standard. Moreover, Doerr and Lee (2011, pp. 75-78) report an interesting discussion held about the consumption of rice by elementary school students enrolled in the same setting. In their discussion, children who eat rice everyday were considered more “Japanese” than those who ate something else such as bread or pasta. In other words, one’s identity as a Japanese person is also indexed by the activity of eating rice. These examples illustrate that the hierarchical social relationship between a more typical or “genuine” Japanese and less typical Japanese is projected from day-to-day activities such as the use or non-use of standard Japanese, as well as the activity of eating or not eating rice.
Since the majority of Japan’s population speak only Japanese, high-level proficiency in other foreign languages may be regarded as deviation from the majority and a loss of ethnic purity (Jorden and Walton, 1987, p. 121).\textsuperscript{49} For instance, there are many so-called nikkeijin ‘people of Japanese descent’ in the Japanese diaspora, and these potentially many heritage speakers who grow up outside of Japanese communities may or may not speak Japanese. To the extent that they are Japanese in appearance, they are oftentimes expected to speak and act Japanese when they visit or work in Japan. But when they fail to speak or act “Japanese,” they receive perplexed reactions and are regarded as “outsiders” in Japanese communities (Takamori, 2011).\textsuperscript{50} Because of such incidents, Takamori claims, heritage speakers of Japanese develop certain linguistic strategies such as affecting a perceptible American accent, so as to avoid being expected to be and thus to act Japanese, and appearing not to speak Japanese because they can get “so much better service” if they are thought of Americans who cannot speak Japanese (p. 95).

As in the case of the ethnically non-Japanese individuals who were taken to be gaikokujin ‘foreigners’ in the epigraph to Chapter 1, people deviating from the expected appearance as Japanese are also marginalized, even when they speak the language from early childhood. For example, people from some Japanese communities had mixed

\textsuperscript{49} Interestingly, Meacham’s (2007) study illustrates how students’ social status as incompetent users of English is constructed and reinforced through “revoicing,” in which English words were constantly transformed into Japanese pronunciation using Japanese phonology (i.e. challenge > /tyarenzi/). Although students may find it easy to understand “revoiced” English, Meacham points out that this method would establish students’ status as a borrower of English. Such practice reinforces their status as an incompetent speaker of English, which allows Japanese speakers to preserve their linguistic or ethnic purity.

\textsuperscript{50} Similarly, Jian and Shepherd (2010, p. 128) discuss how Chinese-American students are marginalized in China because Chinese natives do not see them as one of them, or as Americans.
feelings when Ariana Miyamoto (Figure 3 below) became the newly crowned Miss Universe Japan (Wingfield-Hayes, Rupert, 2015). She is biracial and identifies herself as a *hāfu* (lit. ‘half,’ sometimes spelled “*hafu*” from the English word “half”) because her mother is ethnically Japanese and her father is ethnically African American. Reactions on Twitter included comments such as “Is it ok to select a *hafu* as Miss Japan” and “It makes me uncomfortable to think she is representing Japan.”

Figure 3. Photo of Ariana Miyamoto who was selected as Miss Universe Japan

In this manner, members of Japanese communities often think of the icon of their community as a monolingual speaker of Japanese who is ethnically Japanese. The icon is also a native speaker of Japanese, and as we have observed above, native-speaker status is associated with certain idealized characteristics such as the ability to control the Japanese language perfectly, or being an expert on Japanese culture, as well as certain shared behaviors such as the habit of eating rice and the inability to speak a foreign language. Subsequently, those who do not share such idealized characteristics and commonalities are considered deviant and are candidates for marginalization.
Another example of iconization can be seen in the context of Spanish language education in the U.S. In her study of language students’ preference for native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers of Spanish, Ferguson (2005) selected classes taught by “typical” Spanish language teachers and students found in the U.S. to collect data from. Specifically, she selected classes taught by native speakers of Spanish from Mexico and Puerto Rico, perhaps because she had already established that speakers from those regions were regarded as iconic representations of Spanish teachers in her school.\textsuperscript{51} Classes taught by teachers with minority backgrounds, such as speakers of Basque and Catalan, were not included in the survey.\textsuperscript{52} For comparison, she collected data from classes taught by nonnative speakers of Spanish as well. Specifically, she selected those that were taught by native speakers of English born and raised in the United States who learned Spanish as a foreign language and completed advanced degrees in Spanish, as typical representations of Spanish class found in the U.S. For students, data collected from native speakers of English who were born and raised in the U.S. were included in the analysis, but heritage speakers were excluded because they did not represent the majority of foreign language students of Spanish. In this fashion, those who did not have

\textsuperscript{51} Specifically, Ferguson conducted a demographic survey from all graduate assistant teachers of Spanish in the program (N=89) to select a set of specific, iconic Spanish language teachers and their assigned classes to investigate. Besides the region of their acquired or learned Spanish language, Ferguson used other criteria such as their years of teaching experience, gender, age, cultural backgrounds and travel experiences.

\textsuperscript{52} Ferguson (2005) suspects that certain cultural and educational affiliations and accent are more prestigious and preferred than others, and calls for a study that explores language teachers’ diversity in more detail (e.g., by home country/region, level of proficiencies, academic backgrounds, belief systems, preferred teaching techniques, and personalities, etc.).
shared traits with the iconic “native” and “nonnative” speakers were excluded in Ferguson’s study.\(^{53}\)

As these examples from various linguistic communities illustrate, the concept of native speaker is tied to a set of language ideologies by certain interests of a specific group, according to Pennycook (1994, pp. 175-176).\(^{54}\) Specifically, Pennycook lists three language ideologies that are associated with the conventional concept of the “native speaker.” First, there seems to be an association between holding the citizenship in a nation-state and being a native speaker, as in the case of Japan. Second, there is a propensity to grant native speakers the presumption of a high level of competence in all domains of their first language, as in the case of those who hold to the idealistic theoretical definitions espoused in some schools of linguistics. And third, there is a tendency to regard language as a fixed homogeneous system within a homogeneous community, as may be evident in all of the examples mentioned above. The idea that “one nation” equals “one language” creates the illusion that language is a homogeneous system spoken in a homogeneous speech community. It resembles Saussure’s ([1916] 1983) idea of a language as a fixed code shared by a homogeneous speech community within the same synchronic slice of time. This assumption is commonly accepted in countries like Japan and, to a lesser extent, the U.S., where the population is dominated by one large group of citizens with certain shared characteristics, such as their racial/ethnic background and linguistic competence in a certain variety of language (i.e. a

\(^{53}\) The survey results will be provided in 2.4.

\(^{54}\) Cited in Doerr (2009a. pp. 18-19).
dialect that is considered the standard). When this group constitutes a majority of the population, this kind of commonality can create the illusion that not only does their language belong to them exclusively (cf. Jorden & Walton, 1987, p. 120; Poniewozik, 2012), but that their language is the nation’s language.\footnote{For example, the idea of the U.S. being a “melting pot” is still opposed by some Americans. In the newspaper article “Coca-Cola's "It's Beautiful" Super Bowl Ad Brings Out Some Ugly Americans” (Time: 02/02/2012), it was reported that certain “American” people on Twitter criticized Coca Cola for allowing “America the beautiful” to be sung in different foreign languages and dialects. After the commercial was broadcasted, there were comments along the lines of “We Speak ENGLISH here” and “America the beautiful is sang [sic] in English” on some parts of the Internet (Poniewozik, 2012).}

From this ideological stance, the dominant majority introduces standardization policies to enforce their norm on other community members, such as with the English-only school policies that have been adopted in parts of the U.S. and across the globe (e.g., Phillipson, 1992; Freeman & Freeman, 2011). It is difficult to provide an estimate of how many language programs have such policies in place, but in the U.S., this policy is perhaps commonly seen in areas where the population is dominated by monolingual speakers of English, where there is a scarce number of school teachers with multilingual backgrounds. Freeman and Freeman (2011, pp. 161-170) lists some language immersion programs (i.e. English immersion, Structured English immersion, ESL Pullout Traditional instruction, ESL Pullout or Push-in Content Instruction, Early Exit or Transitional Bilingual Education)\footnote{See Freeman & Freeman (2010, p. 168-169) for each language program’s description, language result, and examples of academic results. Freeman & Freeman (2010) also list some programs (i.e. late exit or maintenance programs, enriched immersion, bilingual dual-language education) that provide long-term support for minority language speakers to become bilingual and biliterate.} that result in students suppressing and/or forgetting their minority language at the price of learning English. As the names of these language programs imply, these language programs attempt to immerse or prepare to immerse their
students with English-only instruction. Such a policy sets monolingual speakers of American English as the standard and when not actually prohibiting, discourages any use of minority languages in class. If the minority language is not frequently used outside of school, minority language speakers may lose their minority language because these programs do not encourage or help them keep their minority language. Any characteristics deviating from the standard scheme are compared to, and expected to conform to, the standard.

Doerr (2009a; p. 18-19) explains how these ideologies correspond to the three interconnected semiotic processes that Irvine and Gal (2000) have identified: iconization, fractal recursivity, and erasure. In the process of iconization, exemplary and ideologically motivated representations of the native speaker come to be indexed by certain commonalities and interests shared by a certain dominant population in the linguistic community (e.g., monolingual speakers of Japanese who are ethnically Japanese in Japanese communities). According to Irvine and Gal, this is reinforced in a process resembling “fractal recursivity,” in that an opposition that is salient at one level of social life is projected onto some other level. For instance, a hierarchical social relationship between native (upper, greater) and nonnative (lower, lesser) speakers in a community can be projected onto other levels, or domains. When someone holds a specific view regarding native speakers that is in line with the idealized theory of linguistic competence, the social status of native speaker can be projected as an index of one’s quality of language (i.e. the domain of theoretically perfect vs. imperfect), which may project onto other domains as well, such as standard vs. non-standard, linguistically
correct vs. incorrect, or even morally good vs. bad. Finally, in the process that Irvine and Gal call “erasure,” those who do not possess the common traits that are iconic of “native speaker” are relegated to insignificant status and disregarded. For example, individuals who belong to linguistic and/or racial minority groups are oftentimes demoted to a category of “insignificant,” their existence or contributions minimized in their communities, as in the cases of nikkejin, gaikokujin, and hāfu in Japanese communities, as well as in any cases of minority groups in various aspects (e.g., linguistically and racially, etc.) across various contexts. This occurs when a certain iconic representation of people or language comes to be regarded as fixed or homogeneous in a given community.

Supported by these kinds of language-related ideologies, people generally accept the conventional concept of the “native speaker” as something universal or timeless, objective and neutral, and beyond political contestation (Woolard, 1998). At the same time, these ideologies neglect the diversity and heterogeneity that exist within sub-groups of people in the community, such as people’s linguistic ability, competence in other language(s) and/or dialect(s), gender, educational background, citizenship, ethnic background, skin color, economic status, and sexual orientation, etc. (Doerr, 2009a; Ortega, 2013). And those who may lack the traits that are iconic for “native speaker,” or

---

57 An earlier study by Labov (1972) also argues against the same kind of false generalizing to other domains—in the case from a (mis)perceived inability to verbalize or engage verbally with others, or the perceived grammatical deficiencies of the Black English Vernacular (BEV) (e.g., copula deletion, negative concord, etc.), to deficiencies in the intelligence of the speakers of this dialect. His study has examples of African-American boys barely communicating in school-style settings, along with others of such boys telling stories masterfully, outside of school. Basically, he shows that (a) the BEV isn’t lexically, grammatically or story-wise at all deficient, and that (b) there’s no reason to assume that these non deficiencies are indicators of any lack of intelligence.

58 Quoted in Doerr (2009a, p. 18).
who instead possess deviant characteristics, are through standardization (i.e. in forms of language education) brought to conform to the standard set by the “native speaker.”

In sum, interpretation of “native speaker” and “nonnative speaker” may be influenced by certain ideologies shared among particular communities, along with beliefs and experiences held by individuals. It is because, as Clark says, “words evolve in a community in direct response to their usefulness and usability in that community” (p. 341). There are ideologies associated with native-speaker status, and in this construct, an iconic representation of a community is embodied, and often regarded as an ideal worthy of being inculcated in all community members through standardization. In the process, individuals with deviant traits, both native and nonnative speakers, either conform to the standard or risk being variously disregarded.

2.3. The native speaker and standardization

The enforcement of “correct” language is common in countries with a standard language. To do so, authority entities and figures such as government, school, and teachers impose the use of standard language as a medium of instruction in schooling and/or in media. The use of dialects or other varieties of languages is not encouraged, or is even prohibited in such settings (Doerr & Lee, 2011).

When a certain linguistic variety is imposed as the standard language for a larger whole, native speakers of the standard language are legitimized over other “deviant” language speakers in the population, such as dialectal, multilingual, as well as nonnative speakers. Through standardization these deviant individuals are brought into
conformance with the monolingual standard through schooling and language. Or, they are discounted, disregarded and/or explained away, in the process Irvine and Gal (2000) call erasure.

Cekaite’s (2012) study provides an example of the effects of the language standardization by documenting the language socialization experience of Jasmin, a seven-year-old Somali immigrant girl, in a first grade Swedish classroom. Jasmin was not willing to conform to standards for engaging in school and her affective stance (i.e. emotional response) as well as the affective reactions of her teacher and peers led to her being pegged as a “bad” or problematic student. For example, Jasmin preferred to work alone because she did not like to work in groups with other students. However, her initial participation in individual tasks was characterized by resigned negative stances that seemed to imply her lack of academic skills such as “I cannot” or “I don’t know” (p. 650). In response, her teachers tried to accentuate equality by downplaying differences and failures. Specifically, in attempt to engage her in her institutional responsibilities of learning, they addressed her individually by using a second person pronoun ‘you’ and encouraged her to try harder by saying things like “Yes you can,” and “You’re so clever” (pp. 650-651). Such affectively positive responses from her teachers illustrate the wider societal ideologies of egalitarian individualism and emphasis on the individual’s rights and responsibilities of constructing one’s own knowledge.

However, her peers’ evaluations and criticisms highlighted the distinctions and inequalities between them and her. Instead of downplaying and masking her academic, linguistic, and ethnic differences, they positioned her as an incompetent student and a
cheater who copies from others by saying things along the lines of “She is still working on the easiest exercise book, Ladybug,” and “You and Jasmin just copy from Alma” (pp. 652-653). Because of the repeated criticisms from her peers, eventually, her noncompliant responses to instructional directives became unwilling stances and outright refusals expressed, for example, as “I don’t want to,” or out-loud cries.

In response to her repeated noncompliant actions, her teachers started to recurrently use generalized norm statements such as “Sometimes one has things to do,” and “One has things to work on” (p. 653). This is a clear change from the way they had addressed her individually with positive responses, as mentioned earlier. These generalized norm statements were direct negative evaluations of her affective stance. These are evaluative and emphasize a general work ethic and nonnegotiable cultural expectations, which are intended to indicate that her noncompliant actions are unacceptable. In this manner, her identity is positioned as that of a cultural novice who, ignorant of culturally shared norms and expectations, must be instructed in them.

Doerr (2009b, pp. 198-204) provides another example in the context of TESOL, with a case study of a Japanese ESL student named Kyoko in the U.S., who purposely code-switched between “her” English, which she used with her Asian friends, and the so-called standard American English that was taught in class. Kyoko came to the U.S. with her American husband in 2001, and before going back to Japan in 2003, attended ESL classes for at least three semesters. 59 She attended all three levels of ESL class offered in

---

59 The family actually expected to live in the U.S. for a long time, but her husband’s company started to fare poorly and he moved to a company located in Japan and the family moved back to Japan as well.
the language program, specifically, an elementary course, an intermediate course, and an advanced course.⁶⁰

According to Doerr (2009b), Kyoko, at least initially, restricted herself to the space of “nonnative speaker” interaction, despite her aspiration to join the “American” community. Kyoko said that she was having a difficult time joining in a conversation with other American mothers because their conversation topics seemed all unfamiliar to her. She felt more comfortable interacting with other nonnative speakers because she could ask questions about things that are obvious to mainstream Americans, who might associate her mispronunciation and grammatical mistakes as an index of low intelligence (Lippi-Green, 1997).⁶¹ Kyoko used her own English with her Asian classmates who were also learning the language, but she did not have European or Mexican friends “because their English [was] too good” (p. 199). Kyoko said that she was more comfortable with the topic of conversation when interacting with other “foreigners” or “non-mainstream Americans” who tended to speak English with little fluency and did not correct her grammatical mistakes and pronunciation.

Kyoko said that she particularly found her experiences in the ESL classes useful when she felt it was okay to make mistakes as long as she could communicate. On the other hand, Kyoko said that she did not like her classroom experience when her teacher and classmates required her to use standard American English in class. Specifically, Kyoko noted one teacher who called on each student to have them repeat after her. As a result, Kyoko explained that she became “self-conscious of her pronunciation, especially

---

⁶⁰ Each class ran for one semester.
⁶¹ Cited in Doerr (2009b, p. 200).
distinguishing between “l”s and “r”s, which is difficult for many Japanese speakers” (p. 198). This is an interesting observation because being able to distinguish between “l”s and “r”s could be regarded as a sign of improvement, yet, Kyoko highlighted her “self-consciousness.” Perhaps to avoid embarrassment, Kyoko strategically developed a code-switching habit to use standard American English in class, but continued to use “her” English by selectively interacting with her Asian friends from ESL class outside of classroom context. Eventually, as a result of having to socialize with her daughter’s American friends’ mothers, Kyoko made friends with an American family. She saw this incidence as an instance of overcoming her “weakness,” which seemed to help her feel more accepted in the U.S.

This example shows how the use of the standard language used by iconic representation of the U.S. is communally legitimized over a non-standard variety (i.e. use of a minority language or “her” English), which could potentially affect non-standard language speakers like Kyoko’s social status as a student in class from a “classroom morals” stand-point. She might or can be considered a “good” student if she used standard American English, but “bad” if she used her own English. This judgment would be another example of the fractal recursivity that extends the association between cooperative learners and uncooperative learners to levels of standard vs. non-standard, cooperative learners and uncooperative learners to levels of standard vs. non-standard,

---

62 Whether Kyoko had genuine control over “standard” English phonology, structure, and usage is not reported and unknown. In fact, the interview was conducted in Japanese and Kyoko was not in the class that Doerr observed. Doerr reported that she met Kyoko met at the daycare/preschool that both of their child went. Doerr found that Kyoko was a student at the ESL program that her study took place after they became friends.

63 In an interview, Kyoko described her code-switching between ‘her English’ and standard American English as similar to her code-mixing her native tongue, using her dialect at home and Standard Japanese at school. Doerr suspects her experience of being required to learn and use the standard language in her L1 might have affected her view of the acquisition of the standard language in her L2.
and finally of morally right vs. wrong. Reflecting on Kyoko’s experience, Doerr talks about the importance of proactively challenging the hierarchy between the standard and non-standard language. For example, Doerr noted that Kyoko could have used “her” English in class, so that “native speaker” would be given a chance to get used to and understand non-standard English by “nonnative speakers” (Kubota, 2001).

There are other complications associated with the language standardization process. When a monolingual standard is imposed through standardization, multilingualism may be seen as a threat because multiple languages can prompt the perception of multiple loyalties, unpredictability, and a lack of trustworthiness (Irvine & Gal, 2000). Feeling the pressure of such possible responses, some bilingual and multilingual speakers in Japanese communities report hiding their ability to speak another language besides Japanese as in the cases of nikkeijin (Takamori, 2011) and speakers of the Kansai dialect of western Japan (Doerr & Lee, 2011). Likewise, some native speakers of a minority language or dialect in the U.S choose to self-deny or hide their “native speaker” status in their minority language (Freeman & Freeman, 2011; pp. 9-10; Park, 2012; Doerr, 2009b). These things happen because of the hierarchy among languages in

---

64 Cited in Doerr (2009b, p. 202). This idea seems to resonate with the idea of kyōseigo ‘symbiotic language’ (Okazaki, 2002, as cited in Furuichi, 2005, p. 25), which is created by native and nonnative speakers in order for them to interact and negotiate, and by so doing, nurture ‘symbiosis awareness.’ In the context of local community outside of school, Furuichi talks about unique roles that nonnative speakers can play to bridge the gap between speakers of Japanese and speakers of other languages by providing cognitive, affective, and social support for learners. At the least, by adding multilingualistic members into the community, the idea of kyōseigo challenges the illusion that Japan is a homogeneous monolingual country.

65 Cited in Doerr (2009a, p. 28).

66 Freeman and Freeman (2011, pp. 1-21) provides different cases of minority language speakers in the U.S. to illustrate the very diverse nature of English language learners facing academic challenges, which depends on a myriad of factors in school (i.e. underfunded school programs to support multilingualism and inexperienced teachers who do not know how to deal with multilingualism, etc.) and outside of school (i.e.
a multilingual community, which is a direct consequence of standardization. Speakers of minority languages hide their competence in them since acknowledging competence in such a language can be socially damaging within the larger society.

Unfortunately, in this manner, many bilingual and multilingual individuals are still brought into conformance with the monolingual standard of the larger society. For instance, many parents in the Dominican Republic no longer use Patois, their indigenous creole language, to communicate with their children (Paugh, 2012). Instead, English is spoken to children at home, and classes at school are taught in English because it is considered more useful in the global economy and a surer path to a prosperous life. Although, there have been some movements to revive their indigenous language in the Dominican Republic, Paugh explains that the population of Patois speakers is declining because it is considered non-standard, old-fashioned, and socially debilitating.

In the case of the Dominican Republic, the status of being a speaker of English has evolved in response to its usefulness and usability in the community, real or perceived. Acquiring the status of a native speaker of English is highly regarded and therefore enforced through parenting and schooling. On the other hand, the status of a native speaker of Patois, their country’s indigenous language, has actually regressed in response to its becoming regarded by more people as less useful in the community, due to the long-term historical and economic influences of linguistic imperialism—a spreading of Western values to maintain existing power through language education (Phillipson, 1992).

poverty, race, religion). In Park’s study, Xia was trying to hide her “Chinglish” as an ESOL teacher. Kyoko in Doerr’s study also tried to hide “her” English.
Language standardization is not only enforced by teachers, but also by students via what Mokkonen (2012) calls subteaching. Subteaching is an instructional arrangement that gives students moral and institutional authority to force social actions to conform to expected ways of using language in the classroom (Tholander, 2002). In Mokkonen’s study, those who spoke the minority language were seen as “bad” students and were constantly corrected by other “good” students who enforced the English-only policy by subteaching. In this dichotomy, language status (i.e. standard language vs. non-standard language) is projected onto a moral domain (i.e. of good vs. bad)—an example of the fractal recursivity noted by Irvine and Gal (2000). Under such circumstances, speakers of minority languages may start to feel bad about using their minority language, and may feel inferior to those who speak the standard language because their linguistic defaults do not align with speakers of the standard language.

Finally, there are many other examples of deviations from culturally expected standards of behavior that have negative connotations. For instance, there is a tendency in the U.S. to regard southern dialect as uneducated and deficient (Labov, 1972), and anyone who does not acquire standard English, such as working class children, are also considered uneducated (Willis, 1977). In the East Asian countries like Japan, China, and Korea, the idea of ryōsai kenbo ‘good wife, wise mother’67 was produced to maintain the feudalistic gender hierarchy and, in Japan, the use of “masculine” expressions by female speakers has long been regarded as deviating from the standard of stereotypically

---

67 Women’s roles were defined as mastering domestic skills and bearing and raising children as opposed to serving in leadership positions.
Likewise, language varieties of sexual minorities in Japan have been considered deviant and did not receive attention until recent years (Abe H., 2010). Since native-speaker status is associated with the standard language in the typical linguistic community, it is possible that people come to regard certain deviating linguistic varieties (i.e. dialect and/or uneducated) as well as other, non-standard social characteristics (i.e. gender and sexual orientation, or being an immigrant) as indexes of deviation from the native speaker standard and the values and stances associated with it.

These examples would appear to illustrate that standardization of behavior in a community assists the ceding of absolute power to those whose traits match or best approximate the iconic native speaker. The native-speaker status of the target, standard, prestige language is legitimized through standardization. Specifically, one’s status as a native or nonnative speaker is reinforced or reshaped by community members by means of school policy and subteaching, and certain linguistic varieties or activities are subordinated to dominant ones. In the process of standardization, negative characterizations are easily attached to deviating varieties of language and personal traits.

However, native speakers who do not live up to the standard may also be regarded as deviant, and even if they do live up to the standard in one community, their superiority

---

68 Which is defined by the use of a variety of linguistic forms such as honorifics, the polite prefix お- for nouns, certain indirect expressions, self-reference and address terms, and certain sentence-final particles.

69 Quoted in Okamoto (2014, p. 82).
is not guaranteed in other communities. This relativity of the construct of native speaker’s “authority” will be discussed in the next section.

2.4. The native speaker is not all powerful as a language teacher

Discussions so far seem to indicate that native speakers may be all powerful as language teachers, since their power is assured through standardization. But it is important to point out that the superiority of native speakers is a quite contingent construct, which is created by discourse in local settings, and it does not always guarantee final authority, even in matters linguistic. For instance, it has been noted and lamented that many educated young people in Japan who are ethnically and linguistically Japanese, have limited opportunities in their youths to develop proficiency in using honorifics (Dunn, 1999). In order to counter this deficiency, social events that encourage college students to use formal, honorific speech are created, and employers devise job training courses specifically meant to develop the appropriate use of honorifics. These facts seem to indicate that in this case native speakers do not have a “complete language” and are also prone to make mistakes in their native language even after they have received education in their native language communities.

Kubota (2009) also shows that the perceived superiority of “native-speakerness” is not always or in every linguistic respect absolute, and one’s status as a native speaker

---

70 It must be noted that people do not emulate “native speaker” archetypes like robots, everywhere and/or all times. Code-switching between the standard and non-standard dialects is a fact of local life, as is the indexing a great range of varied stances—social, epistemic, affective, and more.


72 Cited in Tanaka (2013, p. 102).
does not always guarantee a job position or a higher salary. Kubota illustrates her point with a case in which an untrained nonnative-speaking Japanese teacher was hired over a trained native Japanese teacher in a U.S. high school.\(^{73}\) The decision to choose the nonnative-speaking teacher of Japanese was mainly based on her status as a native speaker of English.\(^{74}\) Both students and parents demanded a more trained Japanese teacher, but the principal apparently had the idea that having a nonnative speaker of English might hinder communication in school, and the decision was not changed (p. 238-241).\(^{75}\)

Hirahata’s study (2014) provides another example of the limits of the native speaker’s linguistic authority. Through interviewing Japanese language educators in Asian countries outside of Japan, Hirahata found that native speakers who have been sent to teach the language abroad have limited authority in local areas. In such settings, the Japanese language is not the lingua franca, which puts speakers of Japanese in a minority position, including native speakers. The ability to use standard Japanese does not provide much authority for native-speaking teachers of Japanese in such settings, since the community lacks utterly the interest and consensus that create such authority. In fact,

---

\(^{73}\) Though this candidate had lived in Japan as an English language teacher for a few years, her Japanese proficiency was far below the Intermediate High level on the ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) OPI (Oral Proficiency Interview) scale—the expected oral proficiency level for teacher candidates in Japanese teacher education programs. In fact, in an informal assessment, her oral proficiency was Novice High on the ACTFL OPI scale (Kubota, 2009, p. 240).

\(^{74}\) Another factor might have been the difficulty of obtaining a working visa for non-U.S. citizens. Yet, Kubota claims that the prejudice against nonnative English-speaking teachers seemed to be more likely since the investigated district had been traditionally supporting non-U.S. citizens in obtaining a visa to teach for the district (Kubota, 2009, p. 240-241).

\(^{75}\) It was later revealed that the principal wanted to have the new teacher teach another subject in addition to Japanese (and the candidate who was a nonnative speaker of Japanese conveniently had a license to teach social science).
native-speaking Japanese language teachers in such settings struggle to manage day-to-day interactions with their limited competence in the local language, under the customs of local people and students.

Moreover, studies on native- and nonnative-speaking teachers of Spanish in the U.S. (Ferguson, 2005; Meadows, 2007) have revealed that native-speaking teachers of the target language are not always preferred over nonnative-speaking counterparts. Ferguson’s survey results from students (N=154) showed that participants at the community level believe native-speaking instructors can provide a better oral fluency model for students, and are superior instructors in the areas of pronunciation (91%), speaking (85%), reading (56%), listening (61%), colloquial language (77%), culture (77%), and vocabulary (60%). On the other hand, students believed nonnative-speaking teachers are better teachers of grammar (65%) and writing (51%). The list seems to indicate that the communal preference for native-speaking teachers is relatively strong, but when it came to language teacher’s overall effectiveness, as mentioned in 2.2, more than half of the participants (52%) did not accept one group over the other uncritically based merely on instructor’s identity as a native or nonnative teacher. Interestingly, among those who showed a preference (N=78; 48%), there were more participants who showed a preference for nonnative-speaking language teachers of Spanish (N=47; 29%). This is perhaps due to the amount of teacher training that investigated teachers received. Interestingly, Ferguson’s observational data show that nonnative-speaking instructors

76 In the survey, Ferguson used a five-point Likert scale (i.e. Strongly agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, and Strongly disagree). Participants were asked about their general attitudes and beliefs on pedagogical effectiveness of native and nonnative teachers of Spanish. In the analysis, Strongly agree and Agree as well as Strongly disagree and Disagree were combined.
overall used the target language (i.e. Spanish) in class to a higher degree than native-speaking instructors. In fact, they used a variety of activities that are not found in the textbook, and their L1 use (i.e. English) was limited to only a couple of instances when major confusion had accrued. On the other hand, Ferguson reported that native-speaking teachers relied more on activities from the textbook, and used translation and code-switching from Spanish to English throughout the entire class period during observation periods. In other words, native-speaking teachers of Spanish were found to rely on English language (despite it being their second language or L2) more in their language classes. Perhaps incidents like this led more student participants to perceive their nonnative-speaking teachers of Spanish to be more effective as language instructors.

Meadows and Muramatsu (2007)’s study also indicated that their participants preferred nonnative-speaking teachers of Spanish (i.e. Americans) over native-speaking counterparts. Specifically, they used a survey questionnaire to investigate “American” language students’ beliefs about native- and nonnative-speaking teachers in the context of four introductory language courses (Japanese N=49, Chinese N=48, Spanish N=71, and Italian N=19) at University of Arizona. The average score of Spanish student

---

77 Specifically, she observed language classes of two native-speaking teachers and two nonnative-speaking teachers. She observed each teacher’s class twice.

78 Specifically, cloze activity and a movie are listed, but no further descriptions were provided.

79 This finding is interesting because, according to Ferguson, it contradicts the popular assumption that nonnative-speaking instructors have a tendency to use their L1 (i.e. English) more frequently in class.

80 In the survey, participants were given seven statements to indicate their preference by selecting one of the 4-point Likert scale options provided for each statement (4-Strongly agree, 3-Agree, 2-Disagree, 1-Strongly disagree). The statements that participants were given in the survey include: “I prefer a native speaker as my foreign language teacher”; “It doesn’t matter if my language teacher is a native or not”; and “I prefer an American teacher because I can ask questions in English.” Besides participants’ enrolled language class and gender, other pertinent background information, such as their native language, is not reported, so the kind of “American” students who participated in their study is not clear. Perhaps the
participants’ preference for having a native-speaking Spanish teacher was significantly lower (2.36) in comparison to that of student participants in Japanese class (3.34), Chinese class (3.40), and Italian class (3.12). Meadows and Muramatsu pointed out one communal factor that may have created discrepancy between Spanish and other languages, and that was that Spanish was widely used in the investigated area. They suspected that the use of Spanish in the region was common for many people in the area, and assumed that their students no longer considered it as a “foreign” language. Another possible reason is differences in how students perceive native-speaking language teachers for different languages. For instance, representations of Spanish speakers in mainstream films in the U.S. have been limited to narrow stereotypes (Powers, 2003). Perhaps, students might have had the impression that native speakers of Spanish invariably have “broken” English that is difficult to understand, and were therefore not as preferred as other “American” teachers of Spanish, with whom they could communicate in English easily. These studies seem to indicate that native-speaking teachers of Spanish do not benefit from their native-speaker status as language teachers.81

81 Another potential reason for non-preference for native speakers of Spanish is perhaps due to the fact that Spanish is spoken in a number of regions of the world (http://www.ethnologue.com/language/spa). It may be that nonnative speakers tend to have what is considered to be “standard” in their particular language program, while native speakers tend to represent their own region’s variety, which may not be well accepted by the language students because their regional dialect is not considered to be “standard.” The case of “Modern Standard Arabic” (the literary standard language) provides another interesting case. Interestingly, there is no “native speaker” of this literary dialect because it is learned as a L2 in school, in
As mentioned earlier, just like any other term, the meaning of “native speaker” is not static, and it may be interpreted differently depending on a variety of community interests and individual factors, even in the same language. Like any individuals, native speakers are subjected to the idealized nature of the iconized native speaker in certain given communities and circumstances, and their authority is further contingent on their expertise in certain subjects and settings. While native-speaking teachers have certain advantageous traits, they are not necessarily preferred over nonnative-speaking teachers. In essence, being a native speaker does not automatically bestow one with a high level of competence and authority in all domains of one’s first language.

2.5. Reconceptualizing the construct of “the native speaker”

Acknowledging advantageous characteristics of nonnative-speaking teachers and the communal efforts to allow them to take advantage of such characteristics in various language programs have certainly helped them in their profession. But Doerr (2009a)\(^\text{82}\) argues that evaluating nonnative speakers only outside the realm of their linguistic ability (where most of their advantages lie) is just avoiding the argument that native speakers are more advantageous in their linguistic ability than nonnatives, and thus the illusion that “native speaker” equals standard and “nonnative speaker” equals deviant continues on.\(^\text{83}\)

---

\(^{82}\) Cited in Tanaka (2013, p. 100).

\(^{83}\) It also has been pointed out that describing individuals in terms of other dichotomous classifications such as “L2 users and non-L2 users” or “expert and non-expert” still risks privileging one over the other, and create an inaccurately homogeneous view of individuals (Varenn and McDermott, 1999, cited in Doerr 2009a, p. 38).
Doerr (2009a) and Tanaka (2013) suggest shifting the focus of the discussion here from the “traditional” homogeneous dichotomy to the “untraditional” heterogeneous nature of atypical or divergent speakers, who do not fit the dichotomy. In other words, they suggest shifting the focus of research from the ideologies of native and nonnative speakers (i.e. merely discussing attributes of native and nonnative speakers) to the effects of the ideologies on divergent speakers. To do so, they propose studying the social construct of the native speaker in diverse institutional and socio-cultural settings, and studying untypical or what I termed “divergent” individuals. This includes people in general including language teachers and students. These individuals may include dialect speakers, heritage speakers, and those who are linguistically native speakers but ethnically different from the iconized native speaker in the community. For instance, studying code-switching behaviors of multilingual speakers, particularly between the standard language and their minority language or dialect, can provide valuable insights. As in the cases of nikkeijin in Takamori’s study (2009) and the ESL learner in Doerr’s study (2009b), they may strategically use different dialects so as to “maneuver, resist, and change power relations exercised in a particular context and beyond” (Doerr, 2009a, p. 42). Conducting ethnographic studies to document such micro-level experiences of divergent individuals should help illustrate how the power of the native speaker comes to realization. It could also provide a chance for divergent individuals to give voice to their unique perspectives, which may question and deconstruct the abstractness of the concept of the native and nonnative speaker.
Conducting ethnographic studies on divergent language teachers is useful and needed because earlier studies of language socialization have been concerned mainly with children, and there is a need for studying the language socialization of adults in a variety of settings (Garrett, 2008). For example, in educational settings, there are relatively fewer studies about adults’ learning experiences in classroom settings, despite the fact that formal education is becoming regarded as a lifelong enterprise in the U.S. and other societies (Ohta, 1999).\textsuperscript{84} In fact, adults continue to be socialized into new roles, statuses, identities, and practices when they participate in new communities as the result of emigration, religious conversion, and other significant life changes. In their new communities, they learn to use languages in new ways as they try to master appropriate registers, styles, and discursive genres in their vocational, professional and virtual lives (Nguyen & Kellogg, 2010).\textsuperscript{85}

Finally, with the effects of globalization, the number of “divergent” individuals is increasing in what have previously been considered as homogeneously monolingual communities. Studying such divergent individuals in such settings may lead to a reconceptualization of the native speaker and the language standard set by community members.

\textsuperscript{84} Quoted in Garrett (2008, p. 199).

\textsuperscript{85} Nguyen and Kellogg’ study is a good example of a virtual community and online practices in the context of academic discourse. Nguyen and Kellogg observed how peers in the study influenced each other via online discussions to come to a more refined understanding of the word “stereotype.” As opposed to just learning the definition of the word, Nguyen and Kellogg documented how adult students learned the ways of “acting, feeling, and knowing” (Ochs E., 2002) the word “stereotype” through peer-to-peer socialization.
2.6. Native, nonnative, and divergent speakers of Japanese in the U.S.

People still frequently use the dichotomy of native/nonnative speaker to categorize language speakers. As has been discussed, using this dichotomy is too simplistic, as it disregards a range of divergent individuals who do not fit in the dichotomy. That said, studying the ideologies associated with native-speaker status in a given community would still be useful in analyzing the effects of identified ideologies on language professionals. For instance, in spite of the fact that the majority of the Japanese language teacher population is made up of nonnative speakers of Japanese (i.e. foreigners) outside of Japan (71.8%), interestingly, nonnative-speaking Japanese teachers are a minority in the U.S. (23.1%) (Japan Foundation, 2012). In other words, native speakers of Japanese make up a majority in the U.S. and in Japan despite the trends seen elsewhere in the world. While the number of secondary-school nonnative-speaking Japanese teachers in the U.S. is relatively higher (44.1%), the number of nonnative-speaking Japanese teachers in primary and tertiary education settings is much lower. Though the dichotomy of native and nonnative speakers is too simplistic, and the kinds of “native” and “nonnative” speakers described in these data set are somewhat uncertain, the percentages still give us an idea of the trends in the population of Japanese language teachers.

Hirahata (2014), in her dissertation on native-speaking Japanese teachers across the world, lists some possible factors that might have affected this discrepancy in ratio in North America. Specifically, she lists the following: the underdevelopment of teacher-training programs specifically designed for nonnative-speaking Japanese teachers, the
relative ease of finding and hiring native-speaking Japanese teachers in North America, and the influence from national policies or systems on hiring language teachers at the tertiary education level. However, Hirahata notes that her list is speculative. In fact, the Japan Foundation has not investigated the reason behind the ratio incongruity between native- and nonnative-speaking Japanese teachers in different locations throughout the world.\footnote{Another potential explanation is greater availability of advanced-level nonnative speakers of Japanese outside of the U.S., perhaps due to Japanese expansion policies prior to World War II. There was a lesser need for people in the U.S. to learn Japanese because it was the occupying nation in post-war Japan.}

With the large portion of language teachers of Japanese in the U.S. being native speakers of Japanese, there may be some communal or individual mindsets that support the superiority of “native speaker.” If so, there may be some trends in job employment or learners’ mindsets where native speakers of Japanese are preferred over qualified nonnative counterparts as language teachers. For example, in the hiring process, one of the requirements that candidates for Japanese language teachers in the U.S. often see is having native or near-native fluency, proficiency, or competency in Japanese.\footnote{See job descriptions found in some of the opening positions in the American Association of Teachers of Japanese website (https://www.aatj.org/jobs).} In fact, some language institutions only recruit native speakers of Japanese, presumably based on their institutional needs and demands from learners. Perhaps, as the numbers native speakers teaching in Japanese language programs in the U.S. suggest, native speakers of Japanese are generally preferred over their counterparts as language teachers in the U.S. If such is the case, then nonnative speakers of Japanese may be feeling the pressure, in terms of job opportunities as well as in their work settings from their learners. But one
can only speculate, since studies on this topic outside of English language education conducted in the U.S. are still limited in number (Meadows & Muramatsu, 2007). The present study attempts to fill the gap in the research by studying the ideologies associated with native-speaker status, as well as their effects on divergent language teachers of Japanese.

With the increasing number of students and teachers with a first language other than English in the U.S., studies on this topic in the U.S. all add up to an interesting case. This is because one’s perception of a native speaker may be influenced by communal and individual factors that make up the multinational, multicultural “pot” in the U.S. Characterizations of native and nonnative speakers of Japanese may be quite unique in this diverse setting.
Chapter 3: Methodology

So far, various communities of native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers have been documented in the theoretical framework provided by Irvine and Gal’s (2000) notions of iconization, fractal recursivity, and erasure. As well, their association with certain language ideologies as well as ways to reconceptualize the construct of the native speaker have been discussed. This study further explores the construction and effects of the notion of “native speaker” on teachers in the context of a Japanese language program in American higher education, by addressing the following research questions: (1) How do language teachers and students of Japanese in this program perceive native and nonnative language teachers? and (2) How does the iconic construct of “native speaker” affect the language teachers of Japanese in this study? As one of the few studies on the topic that have been conducted in the U.S. outside of TESOL, it attempts to provide additional insights to previous quantitative findings reported on the same topic. The study also qualitatively investigates how users of Japanese, in comparison to Chinese, are socialized into their new roles as language teachers and how they deal with perceived standards set by the notion of native speaker in the language program.

Both quantitative and qualitative data have been collected from teachers and students of Japanese and Chinese in each language program investigated. Specifically, students were asked to take one survey, the Student Questionnaire (see Appendix A;
N=564), and teachers were asked to take two surveys, Teacher Questionnaire Part 1 (see Appendix B; N=29) and Teacher Questionnaire Part 2 (N=20) (See Appendix C). The survey data were combined with observations (80 hours of video recordings) and interviews (10 hours of audio recordings).

Quantitative data were collected from the closed-ended items of the survey questionnaires (viz. Student Questionnaire and Teacher Questionnaire Part 1). Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics (i.e. multiple regression analysis using STATA 14) were used to look for general trends in how “native speaker” is defined and perceived by language teachers and students of Japanese and Chinese in the investigated language programs.

Qualitative data were collected from the open-ended items of the survey questionnaires (i.e. Student Questionnaires, Teacher Questionnaire Part 1, and Teacher Questionnaire Part 2), as well as from the observation and interview sessions. In the process of collecting qualitative data, four attributes of language socialization studies

---

88 The Student Questionnaire and Teacher Questionnaire Part 1 are similarly structured. They both have closed-ended and open-ended items, but are worded from two different perspectives (one from a teacher’s perspective and the other from a student’s perspective). All items in Teacher Questionnaire Part 2 are open-ended items and qualitative in nature. More will be said about the questionnaire items in the following sections.

89 Regression analysis is a common way to discover an association between selected explanatory and dependent variables. For the purposes of this study, participants’ background characteristics, specifically, Status as student or teacher, Language program, Age, Gender, Language level, Native language, and Race, are going to be used as explanatory or independent variables, in order to estimate quantified characterizations of the notion of “native speaker” and a variety of preferences as the dependent variables (i.e. Preference for native- or nonnative-speaking language teachers as well as No preference). Multiple regression encompasses both linear and nonlinear relationships that may exist between independent and dependent variables for the participating subjects. Multiple regression analysis can be used to predict the value of the dependent variables based on the value of independent variables.

90 STATA is a statistical software package whose programs have been used for more than 30 years in various academic disciplines, such as behavioral sciences, economics, education, medicine, and sociology, etc. (http://www.stata.com/). It has a broad suite of statistical tools, which include multiple linear regression.
were incorporated (cf. Garrett, 2008), namely, (1) longitudinal design, (2) a substantial corpus of naturalistic audio-video data, (3) a holistic and theoretically informed ethnographic perspective, and (4) a linkage between micro and macro levels of analysis. The rationale for combining three different methods for data collection—survey questionnaires, observation and interviews—was to validate the data through cross verification, and to avoid any biases that might follow from relying on a single method or perspective. In the following sections, the data collection and analysis process will be discussed in detail, first for the quantitative data (3.1) and then for the qualitative data (3.2).

3.1. Quantitative Data

In order to quantitatively analyze participants’ collective characterizations of “native speaker” and participants’ opinions about native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers, results from closed-ended questions in the survey (i.e. Student Questionnaire and Teacher Questionnaire Part 1) were used. To ensure their validity and comparability, these items sought a wide range of opinion statements that were used in prior research (specifically, Benke and Medgyes, 2006, and Meadows and Muramatsu, 2007). These survey items were reviewed by and tested with teachers and students of Japanese in a preliminary study in the summer of 2014.
3.1.1. Survey Participants

Teachers and students of Japanese and Chinese at the investigated language programs in Autumn Semester 2014, Spring Semester 2015, and Autumn Semester of 2015 were invited to participate, by e-mail or classroom announcement in the survey portion of this study. Most of the teacher participants were GTAs whose teaching experiences were typically less than 5 years, and about one third of the teacher population was first-year teachers who were new to the language program. Upon obtaining permission from teachers in each language class, the researcher visited the classroom and made a brief announcement about the study in the middle of the semester or towards the end of the semester. Students were then given 10 to 15 minutes in class to complete the Student Questionnaire. Teachers were also invited to complete Teacher Questionnaire Part 1 in or outside of class. The research was voluntary and participants did not receive compensation for the study. Due to a lack of parental consent to participate in this study, anyone younger than 18 at the time of data collection was excluded. The completed responses were input into Excel by the researcher.

In total, there were 29 teachers\(^{91}\) (J=13, C=16) who completed Teacher Questionnaire Part 1 and 564 students (J=375, C=218) who completed Student Questionnaire. At the beginning of these surveys, both teachers and students were asked to provide some background information concerning their Gender, Age, Language program, Language level, Race, and Native language(s).

\(^{91}\) There were 26 graduate students, two full-time lecturers (J=2) and a faculty member (C=1).
The ratios between male and female participants were well balanced between teachers and students as well as between the Japanese and Chinese language programs. Specifically, there were 11 male teachers (J=6, C=5) and 291 male students (J=192, C=99), and there were 18 female teachers (J=7, C=11) and 265 female students (J=166, C=99). There were 8 students (J=4, C=4) who did not provide a response about their Gender (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11(J=6, C=5)</td>
<td>291 (J=192, C=99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18 (J=7, C=11)</td>
<td>265 (J=166, C=99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unanswered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (J=4, C=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Numbers of survey participants by their self-reported Gender

As for the Ages of participants, the majority were between the ages of 18 and 24, and older participants were relatively scarce. To summarize, there were 3 teachers (J=2, C=1) and 495 students (J=311, C=184) between the ages of 18-24 and, 15 teachers (J=5, C=10) and 46 students (J=38, C=8) between and the ages of 25-30, and 11 teachers (J=6, C=5) and 14 students (J=10, C=4) who were 31 or older. There were 9 students (J=3, C=6) who did not provide a response concerning their age. These distributions are summarized in Table 2.

---

92 As previously noted in footnote 10, words (or phrases) that begin with an upper-case letter refer to categories in the questionnaires.
As for participants’ Language level or the number of years studying the target language, the majority of participants were found in Level 1. The higher the level, the fewer participants there were. Specifically, there were 357 students (J=236, C=121) in Level 1 (entry-level courses\textsuperscript{93} for studying Japanese/Chinese language), 120 students (J=72, C=48) in Level 2 (lower-intermediate courses in studying Japanese/Chinese language), 87 students (J=46, C=32) in Level 3 or higher (upper-intermediate to advanced courses in studying Japanese/Chinese language), and 29 teachers (J=13, C=16).\textsuperscript{94}

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Age & Teacher & Student \\
\hline
18-24 & 3 (J=2, C=1) & 495 (J=311, C=184) \\
25-30 & 15 (J=5, C=10) & 46 (J=38, C=8) \\
31 or older & 11 (J=6, C=5) & 14 (J=10, C=4) \\
Unanswered & 0 & 9 (J=3, C=6) \\
\hline
Total & 29 & 564 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Numbers of survey participants by their self-reported Age}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{93} Levels 1 through 3 courses in this program come in several tracks, which vary in pacing but not in contents and credits. Content- and credit-wise, for example, Level 1 is equivalent to “First-year,” Level 2 to “Second-year,” and so on.

\textsuperscript{94} Most of the teacher participants were assigned to teach either Level 1 or 2, and a smaller number of teachers were assigned to teach Level 3 or higher. Some teachers had more than one teaching assignment (e.g., teaching Level 1 and Level 3, etc.).
Racial representation among participants breaks down as follows. The most frequent racial identification was white, which was followed by racially Asian. Participants with other racial backgrounds were relatively fewer. There were 10 teachers (J=6, C=4) and 282 students (J=167, C=115) who identified themselves as white. There were 35 students (J=25, C=10) who indicated they were racially black. There were 17 teachers (J=5, C=12) and 184 students (J=134, C=50) who indicated they were racially Asian. There were 8 students (J=5, C=3) who indicated they were racially Hispanic. There were 2 teachers (J=2, C=0) and 20 students (J=11, C=9) who indicated they were multiracial Asian and white. There were 15 students (J=11, C=4) who indicated they were multiracial of other races. There were 7 students (J=5, C=2) who reported they were racially of other backgrounds. Finally, there were 12 students (J=3, C=9) who did

---

95 There were some Chinese students who were in courses that spanned Level 2 and Level 3 courses in the same semester at the time of data collection. Since these students had not yet completed their second level at this point, they were assigned as Level 2 students.

96 This includes 6 racially white-black students, 3 racially white-Hispanic students, and 1 student of white-black-Asian-native American racial background, 1 student of white and unspecified racial background, 1 student of black and unspecified racial background, and two students with unspecified multiracial backgrounds.

97 This includes 2 self-identified “Arabic” students, 1 “Russian” student (in addition to another Russian student who identified himself as white), 1 “Latin” student, 1 self-identified “Somali” student, and 2 students with unspecified racial backgrounds.
not provide a response concerning their racial background. This distribution is summarized in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>10 (J=6, C=4)</td>
<td>282 (J=167, C=115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35 (J=25, C=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17 (J=5, C=12)</td>
<td>184 (J=134, C=50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (J=5, C=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian &amp; White</td>
<td>2 (J=2, C=0)</td>
<td>20 (J=11, C=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other biracial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15 (J=11, C=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (J=5, C=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanswered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 (J=3, C=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Numbers of survey participants by their self-reported Race

Finally, as for participants’ self-reported Native language(s), the most frequently claimed one was English, followed by Chinese, then various multilingual language speakers, Korean, and finally other languages including Japanese. The specifics break down as follows. There were 9 teachers (J=5, C=4) and 400 students who indicated that their native language was English. There were 13 teachers (J=2, C=11) and 92 students (J=88, C=4) who indicated that their native language was Chinese. There were 3 teachers (J=3, C=0) and 1 student (J=0, C=1) who indicated that their native language was Japanese. There were 1 teacher (J=0, C=1) and 9 students (J=5, C=4) who reported that their native language was Korean. There were 19 students (J=14, C=5) who reported that English and Chinese were their native language. There were 1 teacher (J=1, C=0) and 18 students (J=13, C=5) who reported having more than one native language. There were 2 teachers (J=2, C=0) and 18 students (J=9, C=9) who reported having a different native
language. Seven students (J=3, C=4) did not report their native language. Table 5 summarizes the distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native lang(s)</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>9 (J=5, C=4)</td>
<td>400 (J=231, C=169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>13 (J=2, C=11)</td>
<td>92 (J=88, C=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>3 (J=3, C=0)</td>
<td>1 (J=0, C=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1 (J=0, C=1)</td>
<td>9 (J=5, C=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English + Chinese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19 (J=14, C=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other multilingual</td>
<td>1 (J=1, C=0)</td>
<td>18 (J=13, C=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other lang</td>
<td>2 (J=2, C=0)</td>
<td>18 (J=9, C=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unanswered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (J=3, C=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Numbers of survey participants by their self-reported Native language(s)

While the majority of the participant population is dominated by native speakers of English, most of which are racially white individuals, it is interesting to note the trends in the number of other racial minority groups, the Asian population in particular, making up a large portion of the language student population. This population includes monolingual native speakers of English who grew up in English speaking communities,

---

98 One student further specified his Chinese as Cantonese.
99 Includes 3 English and Spanish speakers, 2 English and Arabic speakers, 2 English & Korean speakers, 1 English & Japanese speaker, 1 English, Chinese, and Khmer speaker, 1 English, Chinese, and Malay speaker, 1 English, Arabic, and French speaker, 1 English and Lithuanian speaker, 1 English and Kannanda speaker, 1 English and Filipino speaker, 1 English and Telugu speaker, 1 English and Somali speaker, 1 English and Lao speaker, 1 English and Russian speaker, 1 English, Chinese, Portuguese and French speaker.
100 Includes native speakers of 5 Spanish students, 3 Malay students, 2 Vietnamese students, 1 Russian teacher, 1 German teacher, 1 Arabic student, 1 Indonesian student, 1 Portuguese student, 1 Kannanda student, 1 Hindi student, and 3 students with unspecified language.
monolingual native speakers of Chinese who are studying abroad in the U.S., and
multilingual speakers of English and Chinese (and a few Korean) who grew up in
multilingual communities. Based on their unique linguistic backgrounds, each group may
categorize native speakers differently and may display different degrees of preferences
towards native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers.¹⁰¹

3.1.2. Defining “native speaker”

To illustrate how language teachers and students characterize a native speaker,
participants’ definitions were sought out. Specifically, as part of the Student
Questionnaire and Teacher Questionnaire Part 1, certain characteristics of native speakers
were laid out for participants to select or ignore, in defining “native speaker.” There were
a total of 19 statements given, each of which included one characterization of a native
speaker. In the survey, participants were simply asked to indicate whether they would
include any of the following characteristics in their definition of a native speaker, and
then given a list of items such as one’s childhood language, nationality, ethnic
background, gender, sexual orientation, linguistics ability, behavior, culture,
socioeconomic status, education, and teaching ability, etc. These items represent features
that have figured in definitions and characterizations of “native speaker” in the research
literature reviewed and discussed in Chapter 2. Each of the 19 statements presented

¹⁰¹ Unfortunately, other racial and linguistic minority groups who are grouped in the “Other” category will
not be well represented in the statistical analysis. While it is beyond the scope of this study to document
each of such participants in detail, the qualitative analysis part of this study attempts to provide some of
their unique perspectives.
students and teachers with three options: “Yes,” “No,” and “Not necessarily” to choose from in responding. The survey items were the same for both teachers and students.

To come up with a continuous variable to be used as the dependent variable in a multiple regression analysis, participants’ “Native-speaker” definition was scored based on the following scheme:

1. Add 1 point if a participant selected “Yes.”
2. Add 0.5 point if a participant selected “Not necessarily”
3. Add no points if a participant selected “No”

A total index score close to 19 indicates a rather specific, and perhaps idealized, “Native-speaker” definition. For example, if a participant selected “Yes” for 11 items, “Not necessarily” for 6 items, and “No” for 2 items, then their total index score adds up to 14. The higher the number, the more specific, and perhaps more idealized, that participant’s characterizations of “native speaker” is.

3.1.3. Preference for selecting a language teacher

To investigate how native- and nonnative-speaking teachers of Japanese and Chinese are perceived by their students and teachers, participants were given opinion statements indicating whether they had (a) a preference for native-speaking teachers, (b) had no preference for either, or (c) a preference for nonnative-speaking teachers. Specifically, as part of the Student Questionnaire and Teacher Questionnaire Part 1, participants were asked to respond to a total of 17 opinion statements. These statements probed preferences for having a native or nonnative-speaking teacher for various aspects of language teaching such as “beginning-level speaking/listening” or “reading/writing”
classes, “advanced-level speaking/listening” or “reading/writing” classes, “grammar,” “pronunciation,” “colloquial expressions,” and “culture,” etc. To come up with a “fair-and-balanced” set of items to choose from, these statements included aspects of instruction usually deemed advantageous to native-speaking teachers (e.g., pronunciation), as well as those thought to favor nonnative-speaking teachers (e.g., explaining grammar) (e.g., Abe & Yokoyama, 1990; Benke & Medgyes, 2006; Ferguson, 2005), along with statements with neutral contents (e.g., general preferences).

Both teachers and students were given the same conditions, but survey items were worded differently, i.e. from their respective perspectives. For instance, the first item in the Student Questionnaire was phrased as “In the beginning-level speaking and listening classes, I prefer a…”, but in Teacher Questionnaire Part 1, the corresponding item was phrased “In the beginning-level speaking and listening classes, students tend to prefer a…”

Since this part of the survey was conducted in combination with the definition part, participants were not given a set of characterizations of native and nonnative speaker in the survey. Thus, the kinds of native or nonnative speaker that participants had in mind were not controlled for in the data set that resulted from these survey instruments.

The data collected created three types of Preference index scores (i.e. dependent variables), namely, (a) Preference for native-speaking teachers, (b) No preference for either, and (c) Preference for nonnative-speaking teachers. As in the case with the definition, to come up with a continuous variable to be used as the dependent variable in
a multiple regression analysis, participants’ Preference index score was scored based on the following criteria.  

1. Add 1 point for Preference for native-speaking teachers for every statement for which participants chose native-speaking teachers.

2. Add 1 point for No preference for every statement for which participants chose No preference.

3. Add 1 point for Preference for nonnative-speaking teachers for every statement for which participants chose nonnative-speaking teachers.

A total value close to 17 in each Preference index score indicates a strong preference or non-preference for native- or nonnative-speaking teachers. For instance, if a participant selected “Preference for native-speaking teachers” for 7 items, “No preference” for 5 items, and “Preference for nonnative-speaking teachers” for 5 items, s/he has a slightly stronger preference for native-speaking teachers. If another participant selected “Preference for native-speaking teachers” for 2 items, “No preference” for 14 items, and “Preference for nonnative-speaking teachers” for 1 item, then it shows that this particular participant is likely to not prefer one or the other. In other words, this participant is perhaps willing to be taught by either and/or simply does not care whether his/her teacher is a native or nonnative speaker of the target language.

---

102 A Likert scale has been commonly used in prior research as in the cases of Benke & Medgyes (2006) and Meadows and Muramatsu (2007), but this study attempts to numerate Preference index scores differently for the purpose of using a multiple regression, which requires a continuous variable to be used as the dependent variable. While the average score of all Likert scale items can also be used for multiple regression analysis, this study attempts to come up with a single numerated Preference index score that accounts for all items that are used in the survey. This overall numerated Preference index score can be used to seek out significant relationships that may exist between participants’ overall native speaker preference and certain traits of participants.
3.1.4. Descriptive statistics

To describe, analyze, and summarize the quantitative data, descriptive statistics were used to look for common trends that might emerge from the data. For the “Native speaker” definition category, item-based descriptive statistics were compiled using the frequency of ‘Yes’ chosen for each item to rank-order characterizations of native speakers that participants included in their definitions. For the preference category, item-based descriptive statistics were likewise compiled to rank-order popular items using the frequency chosen for native-speaking teachers and nonnative-speaking teachers.

3.1.5. Multiple Regression

Continuous variables calculated for “Native-speaker” definition and Preference index scores were used to conduct a multiple regression analysis against participants’ background. Specifically, four regression analyses were conducted using STATA 14: one with the “Native-speaker” definition index score as the dependent variable and three with each Preference index score (i.e. Preference for native speakers, No preference, and Preference for nonnative speakers) as the dependent variable. Each regression analysis was conducted once with teachers included, and once without teachers. The following independent variables (i.e. aspects of participants’ backgrounds) were used in the regression analyses.

1. Status (status as a *student or teacher)
2. Language program (taking/teaching *Japanese or Chinese),
3. Gender (*male or female)
4. Age (grouped as *18-24, 25-30, and 31 or more)

103 An asterisk indicates a referent category used for each independent variable.
5. Language level\textsuperscript{104} (grouped as *Level 1, Level 2, Level 3 or higher, and teachers)
6. Race (*White, Black, Asian, Multiracial, Other race)
7. Native language (*English, Chinese, Korean, Multilanguage, Other language)

All of the independent variables will be treated as categorical variables.\textsuperscript{105} Since categorical variables require a referent category to be compared against other groups in the same category, a referent group was chosen for each category as the most frequent or focal group in the category. In the following, a set of hypotheses will be proposed for each variable (1a-7f).

As one of the independent variables, Status as a teacher or student was included so as to see if language teachers and students in the language program characterized “native speaker” of the target language differently. Additionally, preference towards native- and nonnative-speaking teachers that students have and their teachers expect their students to have will be compared. Students and teachers in Moussu’s study took a different set of survey questionnaires, so the difference between students’ responses and teachers’ responses was investigated on a different domain. But in this study, as explained, students and teachers, though from different perspectives, responded to the same survey items, which makes it possible to compare their similarities/differences on the same ground. It is hypothesized that teachers’ characterization of “native speaker” will be less specific and idealized than that of students (1a). This is because teachers,

\textsuperscript{104} Students enrolled in first and second semesters (or their intensive equivalents) are grouped in Level 1, third and fourth semesters are in Level 2, fifth and more are in Level 3 or higher.

\textsuperscript{105} Technically, Level and Age are ordinal variables, since attributes of these variables are grouped in categories that have an order that can be ranked. But the distance between attributes is not the same. For example, the distance between Level 1 and Level 2 is not the same as the distance between Level 2 and Level 3 or higher, as well as the distance between Level 3 or higher and teachers).
with more experience in the target language, are expected to be more aware of the relativity or contingency in the construct of native-speaker superiority. Assuming teachers to have that awareness, it is hypothesized that teachers’ expectation of students’ preference for native-speaking teachers is lower than that of students’ actual preference (1b). With relatively longer experience in learning foreign languages (e.g., English, Japanese, and Chinese, etc.), teachers may be more aware of the nonnative-speaking teacher’s strengths than their students, so it is assumed that teachers’ expectation of students’ preference for nonnative-speaking teachers is higher than that of students’ actual preference (1c).

The subject language, labeled as Language Program (i.e. Japanese and Chinese), was included as one of the independent variables to see if there is a communal difference between participants in the Japanese language program and the Chinese language program in their characterization of “native speaker” of the target language and their preference for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers. Moussu’s (2006) study reported that different subjects in ESL that students were taking had a strong influence on their attitudes towards their native- and nonnative-speaking teachers. While Moussu’s use of the word “subject” refers to different subjects within the same language (i.e. speaking/listening class, reading/writing class, and grammar class, etc.), this study intends to investigate different subjects or language programs in terms of different languages (i.e. Japanese vs. Chinese). A previous study by Meadows and Muramatsu (2007) found that participants of Chinese students and Japanese students both showed a strong preference for native-speaking teachers, but no statistical difference between these
language class groups was reported. Based on Meadows and Muramatsu’s finding, this study hypothesizes that there will be no statistical difference between the Japanese language program and Chinese language program in their characterizations of “native speaker” of the target language (2a), as well as Preference index scores for native-speaking teachers (2b) and nonnative-speaking teachers (2c) (i.e. the null hypothesis). However, if the null hypothesis is rejected, then it indicates that there may be some communal differences in how “native speaker” of the target language is characterized and its effects may be manifested differently in communities of the Japanese language program and Chinese language program.

Gender was included as one of the independent variables, though Moussu (2006) reported that Gender did not have a significant influence on students’ attitudes towards native- and nonnative-speaking English teachers. But Moussu made an observation that, on average, though statistically not significant, male participants had more positive attitudes towards nonnative-speaking teachers than their female counterparts. Based on this observation, it is hypothesized that female participants will have a more specific, idealized characterization of “native speaker” of the target language (3a) and a stronger preference for native-speaking teachers (3b), and a lesser preference for nonnative-speaking teachers (3c).

Age was included as one of the independent variables to see if there is any relationship between participants’ age and their characterization of native speaker and preference for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers. Moussu’s study did not include this variable in her statistical analysis, but she found that her participants’ attitudes for
native- and nonnative-speaking teachers changed over the course of a semester.

Similarly, with the increase in age, participants’ characterization of “native speaker” of the target language and preference for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers may change. It is hypothesized that participants’ characterization of “native speaker” of the target language becomes less specific and idealized as they become older (4a). It is because older participants are likely to have encountered situations in which they realize the superiority of native speaker to be a relative construct. Assuming older participants to have that realization, it is assumed that older participants have less preference for native-speaking teachers than younger participants (4b). On the other hand, as with the case with language teachers with more learning experience and exposure to a variety of teachers, older participants may be more aware of the strengths that nonnative-speaking teachers have, so it is assumed that older participants’ preference for nonnative-speaking teachers is stronger than that of younger participants (4c).

Language level was included as one of the independent variables to see if there is any relationship between participants’ assigned language level and how they see native- and nonnative-speaking teachers. Moussu’s study found that students’ self-reported proficiency level had a statistically significant influence on ESL students’ attitudes towards native- and nonnative-speaking teachers of English. Contrary to her hypothesis, her finding indicated that ESL students at higher levels were more satisfied with their nonnative-speaking teachers than lower-level participants. As with the case with the independent variable Age, with higher-level participants being exposed to language teachers longer and having more chances to recognize the relative construct of the
superiority of native speaker, it is assumed that participants’ characterization of “native speaker” of the target language becomes less specific and idealized as they move to a higher level (5a). However, higher-level participants may show more preference for native-speaking teachers of the target language (5b) since they are dealing with more difficult concepts in the target language, which, they may think, may be difficult for nonnative speakers to explain and teach. Consequently, their preference for nonnative-speaking teachers may be reduced (5c).

Race or ethnic background (i.e. White, Black, Asian, Multiracial, and Other) was included as one of the independent variables to see if there is any relationship between one’s racial background and how they see native- and nonnative-speaking teachers. Moussu’s study did not include this variable, but participants’ ethnic backgrounds do not have one-on-one correspondence with their native language(s) and there may be certain racial communal differences in how participants with different ethnic backgrounds perceive “native speaker” of the target language. Based on Moussu’s finding about Asian language speakers’ negative attitudes towards nonnative-speaking teachers of English (assuming that her Asian language speakers were also racially Asian), it is hypothesized that people who are racially Asian have a more specific, and idealized characterization of “native speaker” of the target language (6a), and have a strong preference for native-speaking teachers of the target language (6b). Their preference for nonnative-speaking teachers is expected to be lower (6c). It must be noted that this hypothesis does not capture racially Asian people whose native language is not one or more of Asian languages (e.g., native speakers of English who are racially Asian). Further, people with
multiracial backgrounds may see “native speaker” differently from participants who reported to have a single racial background. With exposure to more diversity, it is hypothesized that participants with multiracial backgrounds’ characterization of “native speaker” of the target language is less specific and idealized (6d), and they are less likely to have a preference for native-speaking teachers than participants with a single racial background (i.e. the racially white referent group) (6e). Growing up as multiracial individuals and perhaps being a minority in monoracial-dominant communities in the U.S., they may embrace the diversity that nonnative-speaking teachers bring, so it is hypothesized that their preference for nonnative-speaking teachers to be more than that of racially white participants (6f). The null hypothesis will be used for other racial minority groups (i.e. Black and Other) since no study has been conducted on how racially Black individuals perceive native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers, and the “Other” group is merely a collection of individuals with a minority racial background.

Finally, participants’ Native language (i.e. English, Chinese, Korean, Multilingual, and Other) was included to see if there is any relationship between one’s native language and how they see native- and nonnative-speaking teachers. As mentioned, Moussu (2002; 2006) found a strong association between participants’ first language and how they viewed native speakers. In particular, Asian language speakers were found to have a negative attitude towards their nonnative-speaking teachers of English. Based on this observation, it is hypothesized that speakers of Asian languages (i.e. Chinese and Korean) have an idealized characterization of native speaker (7a) and have a strong preference for native-speaking teachers (7b). Consequently, they are
expected to show less preference for nonnative-speaking teachers (7c). Having been exposed to more diversity in their life, as in the case with multiracial participants, it is hypothesized that multilingual native-speakers have a less specific and idealized characterization of a native speaker of the target language (7d), and are less likely to show preference towards native-speaking teachers (7e). Assuming that they embrace the diversity that nonnative-speaking teachers bring into language classes, they may show more preference for nonnative-speaking teachers (7f). As in the case with Race, the null hypothesis will be used for the “Other” group, since this group is a collection of individuals with a minority linguistic background. Table 6 provides the summary of number of participants in detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Variables (Frequency)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>*Students (564)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang Prog</td>
<td>*Japanese (375)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese (218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>*Male (302)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unanswered (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-24 (498)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-30 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unanswered (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Level 1 (357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2 (120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3 or higher (87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>*White (292)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian (201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unanswered (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Lang(s)</td>
<td>*English (409)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese (105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multilingual (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unanswered (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Participants’ demographics

106 Includes both all multilingual speakers including those who listed both English and Chinese as their native language (see Table 5).
107 Since the number of native speakers of Japanese was only 3, they are included in this category.
3.2. Qualitative Data

So as to account for communal and individual factors that may influence the construction and effects of the notion of “native speaker” in the Japanese language program investigated, qualitative data were collected using open-ended items in surveys (viz. the Student Questionnaire, Teacher Questionnaire 1, Teacher Questionnaire 2) along with observation and interview sessions. In the following sections, the qualitative data collection and analysis process will be discussed in relation to the four attributes of language socialization studies (Garrett, 2008), namely, (1) longitudinal design, (2) a substantial corpus of naturalistic audio-video data, (3) a holistic and theoretically informed ethnographic perspective, and (4) a linkage between micro and macro levels of analysis.

3.2.1. Longitudinal design

To investigate the construct of the native speaker and its effects from a qualitative perspective, this study kept track of the socialization process of teachers of Japanese who were new to the language program, namely, Harumi, Regina, Suzan, and Frank at a large university in the American midwest (N=4). Their introductions will be provided at the end of this section. Specifically, their development as teachers was observed over the course of two semesters for Regina and Frank, three semesters for Suzan, and four semesters for Harumi, beginning with a week-long teacher-training workshop that was held prior to Autumn Semester in 2014. The teacher training was supervised by a

---

108 Regina graduated and Frank went on a 9-month study abroad after the second semester. Suzan and Harumi stayed, but Harumi taught during the Summer Semester in 2015 whereas Suzan did not.
racially white professor from the Japanese division of the department along with two teacher trainers—an ethnically Japanese teacher trainer in charge of training the new Japanese teachers and a Caucasian teacher trainer in charge of training the new Chinese teachers. All of the training sessions conducted specifically for teachers of Japanese and Chinese new to the program were observed and video recorded.

To see how these focal teachers of Japanese in the study may have changed over the course of time, their intensive practicum teaching experiences and feedback sessions, classroom or one-on-one teaching experiences were video recorded, at least twice in each semester, including the teaching practicum sessions during the initial teacher training.\textsuperscript{109} Furthermore, to see how language teachers in training fit into larger systems of cultural meaning and practice, classroom or one-on-one Individualized Instruction (I.I.) teaching experiences of other teachers of Japanese and Chinese in the same department were video recorded and documented for comparison. As will be explained more in 5.3, this particular department used a team-teaching arrangement for language instruction, in which native- and nonnative-speaking teachers were assigned to teach a course together and took turns in teaching. Native-speaking teachers were mainly assigned to teach speaking/listening-focused classes, a variety of what the program calls Act classes,\textsuperscript{110} whereas nonnative-speaking teachers were more often assigned to provide instructions on grammar, pragmatics, and communicative culture, which is referred to as Fact classes in the program. Fact classes are usually conducted in English, in discussing these aspects of

\textsuperscript{109} Except for the Summer Semester in 2015.

\textsuperscript{110} Act classes may also include integrated reading and writing activities, as well as classroom management activities such as taking attendance, collecting or returning homework assignments and quizzes. Written quizzes also took place, but that portion of class was not recorded.
the target language—which thus comes into play as well. The observation sessions focused on Act class sessions since Act class sessions took place more frequently, and nonnative-speaking teachers were often assigned to teach Act sessions, whereas native-speaking teachers of Japanese were rarely assigned to teach Fact classes. Both Japanese and Chinese programs used this team-teaching arrangement for language instruction mainly for beginning- and intermediate-level language courses. Advanced-level courses were mostly taught by target language native-speaking teachers. Due to teacher participants’ availability and time conflicts with the researcher’s schedule, some of the teachers were only observed once while others were observed multiple times.

3.2.2. Substantial corpus

In the process of collecting a substantial amount of field-based naturalistic audio-video data, a total of 80 hours of teacher experiences relevant to language teaching were video recorded over four semesters. These video recordings consist of 14 hours of teacher-training sessions and 3 hours of follow-up sessions that took place in Autumn Semester of 2015, as well as 56 sessions of 55-minuites classroom teaching sessions (J=30, C=26), which translates to roughly 53 hours, and 42 sessions of 15-minutes I.I. sessions (J=27, C=15), which total roughly 10 hours. In both cases, observation includes what happens a few minutes before, during, and a few minutes after teaching.111 As a supplement, though the act of interviewing could be considered a form of intervention and is not as naturalistic as observational data, interview data were also collected from 26

111 Naturally, some class sessions ended early and some went over time.
teachers (J=10, C=6) and 25 classroom students (J=25, C=0), totaling about 10 hours, for analysis.

Observation and interview sessions conducted with Japanese and Chinese teachers are summarized in the following tables (Tables 7 & 8). Unless marked otherwise, observation sessions took place in Act classes. In total, there were 16 teachers of Japanese teachers observed and also 16 teachers of Chinese teachers observed. The ascending sequence of numbers from left to right (in columns “Teacher training” through “Au 15”) refers to the number of teaching sessions observed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Assigned class level</th>
<th>Teacher training</th>
<th>Au 14</th>
<th>Sp 15</th>
<th>Su 15</th>
<th>Au 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Classroom 112 1-2</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>5113</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9, 10, 11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japanese/English</td>
<td>I.I. 114 1-2 Class 1</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>5115</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>I.I. 1-2</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>(5),  (6), (7)</td>
<td>(8), (9), (10)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(11), (12), (13), (14), (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>I.I. 1-2</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>(5), (6)</td>
<td>(7), (8), (9)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>English/ (Japanese)</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>1, 2116</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2117</td>
<td>3117</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Class 1, 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Class 1 I.I. 1-2</td>
<td>1, 2118</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>I.I. 1-2</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Class 1 I.I. 1-2</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>I.I. 1-2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>I.I. 1-2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>I.I. 1-2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>I.I. 1-2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Japanese teachers’ sessions observed

---

112 Classroom.

113 Underlined numbers indicate an audio-recorded interview session that took place after the observation. There were many other mini-interview sessions that took place without audio recording as well.

114 Individualized Instruction (one-on-one recitation session comprising variable-credit courses). To distinguish from classroom instruction, numbers representing observational sessions of I.I. are in parentheses.

115 There were two other unrecorded sessions observed.

116 * indicates a Fact class session.

117 Focused entirely on reading/writing activities in Japanese, conducted in spoken Japanese.

118 Chinese I.I. session. This particular participant was assigned to teach both Japanese and Chinese courses.
Table 8. Chinese teachers’ observed sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Assigned Class level</th>
<th>Teacher training</th>
<th>Au 14</th>
<th>Sp 15</th>
<th>Su 15</th>
<th>Au 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Class 1 I.I. 1-4</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Class 1-2</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Class 1 I.I. 1-4</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Class 1 I.I. 1-4</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>(5), (6), (7)</td>
<td>8, 9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>I.I. 1-4</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>I.I. 1-4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1), (2), (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>I.I. 1-4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>I.I. 1-4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Class 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3. Holistic and ethnographic perspectives

In order to develop an ethnographic perspective that is holistic and theoretically informed, qualitative data were collected through survey questionnaires, observations, and interviews. The qualitative data were collected with the aim of comparing them with relevant findings from previous studies in TESOL and other foreign languages, and to analyze them with reference to theoretical framework of Clark’s (1996) notion of communities, as well as Irvine and Gal’s (2000) analysis of language ideologies, specifically, the processes of iconization, fractal recursivity, and erasure. For instance, as part of the Student Questionnaire and Teacher Questionnaire Part 1, both teachers and

119 Chinese one-on-one sessions cover Levels 1-4.
students were asked to list one pro and one con of having a native- or nonnative-speaking teacher. Further, since courses in the program are commonly taught by teams of native- and nonnative-speaking teachers, subjects were also asked whether and why they would prefer having a team of native and nonnative language teachers. In another portion of the survey, teachers were asked whether and why they would consider themselves a native or nonnative speaker of the target language. Students, on the other hand, were asked whether and why they would consider their teachers to be a native or nonnative speaker of the target language. In case they were uncertain about their or their teachers’ identities as a native or nonnative speaker, both teachers and students were also given the option of expressing their uncertainty (i.e. by replying “I cannot tell.”). In all cases, they were prompted to provide a reason for their response. From the qualitative data obtained from the surveys, some incidents of fractal recursivity, or association of native-speaker status with certain idealized characteristics, emerged and were documented for analysis.

Additionally, teacher participants were asked to take Teacher Questionnaire Part 2 (N=18; J=9, C=9)\(^{120}\) so as to provide additional information with regards to pertinent social interactions that may not be captured in observational sessions. Specifically, teachers were asked to describe social interactions that, in the judgment of the researcher, might have affected the shape of their developmental trajectories. For example, they were asked to provide relevant information about where they grew up, and whether they grew up in a monolingual or multilingual family. Then, they were asked what language(s) they used growing up, or what language(s) they currently use in their social life, with family

\(^{120}\) This survey was adapted from Park’s (2012) study.
members, friends, and people they see in academic and work settings. Since all of the teachers speak at least two languages, they were asked to provide an estimated ratio of different language use for each language in different settings (e.g., English 30% and Japanese 70% when socializing with friends). Further, in the same survey, they were asked in detail about their motivation in learning and teaching Japanese or Chinese, about their experience of the hiring process, about positive or negative teaching experiences, their perceptions of their own pronunciation skills, and for their reflections on their teacher training and teaching.

As part of the observation sessions, incidents judged relevant to the construction and/or adherence to the iconized native speaker were noted especially during the initial intensive teacher-training regimen (of 14 hours over one week) and follow-up teacher-training sessions. Such possible effects as emerged of the standard “native speaker” on individual teachers were noted in the video recordings of their teaching across multiple semesters. Heterogeneous characteristics—such as non-standard pronunciation and usage, etc.—that seemed to be disregarded during observation sessions were noted as well, for their similarity to, or instantiation of erasure, in Irvine and Gal’s (2000) sense.

Interview sessions took place not long after observation sessions. During interview sessions, teacher participants were prompted to talk about their in-class experience, such as their error correction behaviors, and their out-of-class experience, such as lesson preparation, grading, and interaction with students. As needed, they were asked to relate their experience as a language teacher to their identity as a native or nonnative speaker of the target language. Some of the interview sessions with teachers
took the form of “playback interviews,” in which they were asked to navigate their own video-recorded class session(s) aloud, i.e. to talk about aspects of what we viewed, with the researcher or the participant pausing the playback as needed. In such playback interviews, participating teachers were asked to talk about any incidents where their self-perceived identity as a native or nonnative speaker seemed to them to affect their actions.

In addition to interview sessions with teachers, 25 students of Japanese from Summer Semester 2015 participated in interview sessions. During their interviews, they were asked whether and why they thought of their teachers as a native or nonnative speaker of the target language. Interviews with students were conducted as a group or in a one-on-one setting, whichever was convenient for them. Table 9 provides demographic information about the students who participated in the interview sessions.

121 These students were taking intensive language course at Levels 1, 2, or 4. Unlike in Autumn and Spring Semesters, in which the daily schedules of the students enrolled in one language course can vary quite a bit, most of these students were available to be interviewed between classes because they were only taking Japanese in the summer, and most agreed to be interviewed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Students (numbers of)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>L1 English (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 Chinese (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 Vietnamese (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>L1 English (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 Chinese (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 Lao &amp; English (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>L1 English (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 Chinese (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 Vietnamese (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Interviewed students (Summer 2015)

As part of the interview sessions, both teachers and students were prompted to talk about any other relevant experiences that came to mind. To help ensure that interviewees shared their thoughts without being biased by the researcher’s questions during the interview, the researcher took pains to avoid asking questions in ways that might hint that a particular answer was favored over others.

3.2.4. Micro and macro levels of analysis

Finally, patterns found in target language teachers’ teaching experiences and in their development as language teachers at the micro level were documented for analysis. For instance, the development of their pronunciation (pitch accent, in particular), error correction behaviors, as well as their use or non-use of English with students in and out of class were documented. These micro-level patterns were then considered in relation to the standards and expectations set by the language program at the macro level (including the iconized native speaker). For many individuals, the standards for language, situated usage, and pedagogy set by the program through teacher training were repeated, and thus
co-constructed, by novice teacher participants in their discussions (inside and outside their training classes) and practicum teaching. Any observable or inferable effects of the iconized native speaker on participating teachers were documented. These dynamic, situated activities were transcribed as a key unit of analysis. In terms of teacher development, different kinds of outcomes emerged for each individual teacher.

In the following, a brief introduction of the focal participants (those whose language socialization experience will be analyzed in detail) will be provided in the order of Harumi, Regina, Suzan, and Frank.

3.2.5. Focal Participants

Harumi

Having been brought up in Okinawa Japan, Harumi self-identified as a native speaker of Japanese. She considers herself a native speaker of Japanese because, she says, she feels she can express herself without having any linguistic and cultural difficulties. Despite the fact that she was exposed to certain Okinawan dialects growing up, she considers herself to have grown up as a monolingual speaker. She has a master’s degree in TESOL, acquired from a U.S. university, but she feels most comfortable and confident using Japanese with her family and friends, and in academic situations, as well as when using media. She started teaching Japanese elsewhere and had received teacher training prior to coming to the language program investigated in this study. Her initial intention in teaching Japanese was simply as a means of financial support for her degree, but as she became more interested in teaching it, she decided to pursue a career related to teaching
Japanese as a foreign language. Her academic specialization in her present degree program is in Japanese language pedagogy. In addition to the intensive teacher-training regimen and its follow-up class sessions, eight class sessions that she taught were video recorded, as well as three audio-recorded interviews, over four semesters.

*Regina*

Regina was raised in a midwest American city as a multilingual. Specifically, she grew up speaking Japanese with her mother and English with her father. Although she was not entirely sure what she would consider herself, she settled on self-identifying as a native speaker of Japanese since she used Japanese more than English at home growing up, and did not formally “learn” Japanese as a second language in her childhood. She also considers herself a native speaker of English because she did not formally “learn” it as a second language. She said that she started teaching Japanese simply because she was offered a graduate teaching associateship in the program. Her specialization was Japanese linguistics. She said she had no prior teacher training or teaching experience. In addition to teacher training and follow-up sessions, a total of two class sessions and one one-on-one I.I. teaching session were video recorded,\(^{122}\) and two audio-recorded interviews were conducted in two semesters. She graduated at the end of the second semester of this study.

\(^{122}\) There were two additional one-on-one I.I. sessions observed but they were not video recorded because the students did not want to be video recorded.
**Suzan**

Having grown up in a monolingual family in Germany, Suzan self-identified as a native speaker of German. She started learning British standard English in class at the age of 11, while being exposed to untranslated American media at home. She reports having had international pen pals to write letters to in English. She considers herself a nonnative speaker of Japanese because she did not begin learning Japanese until age 26. Though she feels she is reasonably fluent and confident in her ability to converse in a variety of contexts in Japanese, at the time of this study she said that she would not consider her language ability to be native-like. She was studying language intensively in Japan for a year prior to this study, and at the time of her participation in the present study, she had a “study buddy” with whom she practiced Japanese online once a week. Her specialization is in Japanese literature and she plans to work in higher education. She started teaching Japanese because it offered her career-relevant experience and funding for her graduate education. In addition to the initial teacher training and its follow-up class sessions, a total of ten one-on-one I.I. sessions were video recorded, along with three interviews audio recorded, over three semesters.

**Frank**

Frank self-identified as a native speaker of English. He was raised in a mid-western American city as a monolingual speaker of English, and spoke English with his family and friends. With his interest in Japanese *anime* ‘animated films,’ he started self-learning Japanese in high school along with some friends. He was initially studying
Arabic in graduate school, but that changed after encountering *Hōjōki*, ‘Record of a ten-foot square hut’ in English translation. He was fascinated by the Japanese language and started studying modern Japanese in his spare time, and ended up switching to the University’s M.A. program in Japanese. Although he feels comfortable using Japanese with his friends and in academic and media settings, he identifies himself as a nonnative speaker of Japanese; he says he is never quite 100% secure about his intuitions about usage and is thus always conscious of the fact that Japanese is his L2. He started teaching Japanese as a GTA in this program, and mentioned that he came to enjoy teaching, especially the lesson planning process, during the teacher training. In addition to the intensive teacher training and its follow-up sessions, over two semesters, a total of five one-on-one I.I. sessions were video recorded, and one audio-recorded interview was conducted. He left to study advanced language in Japan after the second semester of this study. Of the four focal subjects, Frank had spent the least time with Japanese, both in academic study and in Japan.

The above introductions profile the individual focal teachers tracked in this small and short longitudinal study. This study will describe how the ideal of a Japanese native speaker is constructed on a macro level in this language program, which may or may not affect the micro-level developmental processes of these focal teachers. Table 10 provides a summary of recording hours of observations and the types of interviews and the numbers of participants who took the surveys.
### Observations and Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Japanese teachers (N=4)</td>
<td>• Student Survey Questionnaire (N=569)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training (14 hours)</td>
<td>• Teacher Survey Questionnaire A (N=29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Follow-up sessions (3 hours)</td>
<td>• Teacher Survey Questionnaire B (N=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classroom teaching (10 hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One-on-one I.I. sessions (5 hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers (N=27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 57 sessions of classroom teaching (53 hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 42 sessions of one-on-one I.I. sessions (10 hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews (N=51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher interviews (9 hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student interviews (1 hour)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of teachers observed= 31</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total number of participants= 594</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total video-recording hours: 80</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total audio-recorded interview hours= 10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Summary of data collection
Chapter 4: Quantitative Results and Discussion

The aim of this chapter is to present findings from our data that appear related to the construction and effects of the iconized “native speaker” in the Japanese program in question. This chapter focuses its discussion on the analysis of quantititative data, in particular, the quantified definitions or characterizations of “native speaker” and participants’ preference for native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers. Specifically, using the frequency and mean index scores from descriptive statistics, I will document common trends found in participants’ characterizations of a native speaker, as well as their preferences for native or nonnative-speaking language teachers. Then outcomes from four multiple-regression models will be presented—one with the index score for defining “native speaker” as the dependent variable, and the other three with Preference index scores (i.e. Preference for native-speaking teachers, nonnative-speaking teachers, and No preference) as the dependent variable. They were compared against participants’ background characteristics as the independent variables, namely, their Status as a student or teacher, Language program (i.e. study subject), Gender, Age, Language

123 The nature of this study unavoidably prompts its participants to draw attention to their perception of native/nonnative status and related matters, even though their attention may be normally—day in and day out—seldom or little concerned about such. It is possible that they could be quite unaware of such matters, even as their experience is in part shaped by them. This study, including their answers to questions from the surveys and interviews, may help us to understand at least what they are aware of when asked, and through that, the lay of land in the program, in relation to these issues.

124 Technically, there was a total of 8 multiple regression models since another set of four multiple regressions was also conducted without including the teacher participants in the model.
level, Race, and Native language. In explaining the quantitative data, qualitative data obtained from survey, observations, and interview sessions will be introduced as needed.

4.1. Definitions of “native speaker”

According to the quantitative results obtained from the survey, many participants believe that native speakers are someone who has been using the language since birth or early childhood (82%). This is in line with our representative definition of “native speaker” (Cambridge Dictionaries, 2016; Merriam-Webster, 2016).

However, on top of this consensus characterization, there were other specific characteristics that respondents associated with “native speaker,” some of which were projected, even idealizing, in nature. For example, many participants associated native-speaker status with that person’s competency in a variety of subjects and situations (e.g., education, science, politics, and parenting, etc.) (77%), a reading and writing ability that fits a variety of contexts (73%), pronunciation without foreign accent (60%), and an ability to use grammatical patterns without mistakes regardless of factors such as stress and anxiety (55%). A few respondents also associated native-speaker status with the ability to teach their native language as a second language (30%), with having been educated in the target culture (26%), as well as with socioeconomic status (21%), as listed in Table 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characterizations</th>
<th>% 125</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Target language has been spoken since birth/early childhood</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Competence in a variety of subjects and situations</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Can act appropriately in target language communities</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can read and write in target language in a variety of contexts</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Can use idioms in a variety of contexts</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Familiarity with culture/tradition</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pronunciation without foreign accent</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Can use grammar without errors under stress and anxiety</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Target language is not influenced by another language</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Can teach their native language as a second language</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Educated in the target language education system</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Speakers of the standard language</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Monolingual speakers of the target language</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A person who holds the citizenship of the target</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Socially and economically affluent</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Target-language-like name</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Target-language-speaker-like appearance</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Sexually straight</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Male</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Characterizations of “the native speaker”

Among all participants, the mean index score for “Native-speaker” definition was 11.44 out of a maximum possible 19, indicating that, on average, participants agreed to include (or partially include) more than half of the 19 characterizations listed in Table 11. While many of the characterizations of the native speaker found in Table 11 may correspond with real-world facts, it is important to note that it is also possible that they do not correspond to such facts (except for the first item, which matches our representative dictionary definition). For instance, apropos of item #8, most, if not all, native speakers make grammatical mistakes under the influence of stress and anxiety (needless to say,

125 This number represents the percentage of participants answering “Yes” in the survey for each item.
social networks on the Internet provide ample evidence of grammatical mistakes made by native speakers). Further, not all native speakers learn to read and write in their native language, whether schooling is involved or not (some languages do not have a writing system) (#4), or effectively teach their native language as a second language without proper training (#10). These characterizations may be considered incidences of iconizations that lead to fractal recursivity, in that the opposition of the social status as native or nonnative speaker may be projected as other, analogous oppositions in different domains, such as linguistic competence vs. incompetence, ability vs. inability to teach, educated vs. uneducated, and rich vs. poor, etc. To some people, the term “nonnative” may be associated with many of the negative ends of such oppositions.

4.2. Criteria used to judge native-speaker status

It is interesting to note that one’s appearance (#17, 8%), and name (#16, 7%) were not commonly included in respondents’ “Native-speaker” definition, but qualitative data from the survey and interview sessions indicate that participants in fact frequently used these characteristics to judge whether someone is a native or nonnative speaker of the target language, along with traits such as their linguistic ability (e.g., pronunciation, fluency, etc.) and attitude as a teacher (e.g., being confident and comfortable). For instance, participants made judgments about a person’s identity as a native speaker of Japanese or Chinese with comments like those presented below. Note that some of the iconic native-speaker characteristics listed in the survey resurface in these comments,
such as “complete fluency,” “receiving education in the target language institution,” and “reading and writing ability.”  

- “(He) looks Japanese.” — Level 1 Japanese student
- “(She) looks Japanese and also her name is a Japanese name and has no accent (in Japanese).” — Level 1 Japanese student
- “Japanese name and sounds like perfect speaker” — Level 2 Japanese student
- “I know she is from Japan. She speaks English with an accent.” — Level 1 Japanese student
- “Born in China, speaks (Chinese) fluently/English still difficult.” — Level 1 Chinese student
- “Complete fluency, accent, and is Japanese.” — Level 2 Japanese student
- “Native speaker should be born in the nation, educated in native culture and tradition. If they satisfy these conditions, they are native speakers.” — Level 1 Japanese student
- “(She) went to Shanghai University for undergrad.” — Level 1 Chinese student
- “(She) seems foreign.” — Level 1 Chinese student
- “I was born and raised in Japan. I received education in Japanese up through secondary school.” — Japanese teacher
- “I was born and raised and spent my first 25 years in China. I speak Chinese (Mandarin and Cantonese) to my parents, friends and teachers. I am familiar with Chinese culture. I went to elementary, middle and high schools and college in China, where I got educated in Chinese education systems.” — Chinese teacher
- “I grew up speaking Chinese. I don't have accent in speaking the language and I am very good at telling different dialects and influences of dialect and foreign

126 Interestingly, a few Level 1 students considered every one of their teachers to be Japanese because, to these students, their teachers were “all ... very great teachers,” “extremely fluent” and considered to “have great knowledge in subject.” On the other hand, none of the students in the upper-level course thought of their white teachers as native speakers. Perhaps this is because these upper-level students have had time to learn of their teachers’ backgrounds and/or feel they have acquired the linguistic ability to tell the difference between native- and nonnative-speaking teachers.
language. I can read and write in all different contexts and acquire the necessary skills to read and write in a very short period of time even if in contexts that I am not familiar with. I think in Chinese and when I dream, I talk Chinese.”—Chinese teacher

Among iconic native-speaker characteristics, it is interesting to note that there were also somewhat negative, but iconic, characteristics associated with native-speaker status (e.g., “foreignness” and “accented English”). In fact, many students used their teacher’s quality of English to judge whether they were a native or nonnative speaker of the target language, Japanese and Chinese. Interestingly, teachers whose English quality was perceived to have problematic traits (e.g., “having an accent,” “having a difficult time explaining in English,” etc.) were more likely to be regarded by students as native speakers of the target language.

Aside from these iconic traits, another iconic characteristic of native speakers of Japanese that was brought up is particularly noteworthy. In one of the interview sessions, a group of Chinese students in a Level 2 Japanese class agreed in associating Japanese native-speaker status with apologetic behaviors. One of them said, “We learn some Japanese action(s) from TV, from movie(s), and they (Japanese people) say “a, sumimasen, sumimasen (‘Oh, excuse me, excuse me.’).” One of the same Chinese students explained that she thought one of her Japanese teachers was a native speaker of Japanese because she appeared nervous and apologized a lot in class, even though that student knew that particular teacher’s last name sounded Chinese. In this fashion, certain students considered their teachers to be native speakers of Japanese when the

---

127 Survey respondents were asked to come up with their own criteria to judge the native-speaker status of themselves or of their teachers in the survey. It is quite possible that survey respondents have more than
teacher’s actions or behaviors matched what they saw Japanese people doing in media. In other words, at least to some of these Chinese participants, the frequent enactment of apologetic behaviors indexed this particular teacher’s social identity as a native speaker of Japanese, much like the way typicality as an ethnically Japanese person was associated with the activity of eating rice in Doerr and Lee’s study (2009).

On the other hand, “nervousness,” i.e. the absence of self-confidence mentioned above, along with other iconic characteristics of a nonnative speaker, was what indexed a teacher’s “nonnative speaker” status for other students. Notable criteria that students used to judge their language instructors as a nonnative speaker of Japanese or Chinese are as follows:

- “I don't think X-sensei is a citizen/was born and raised in Japan.”—Level 3 Japanese student
- “She was nervous in class.”—Level 2 Japanese student
- “X-sensei has an American accent and appears white”—Level 2 Japanese student
- “No accent (in English)/white/American-born.”—Level 2 Japanese student
- “Still learning the language.”—Level 3 Japanese student
- “I almost couldn’t tell but her family name (in Chinese) gave it away.”—Level 1 Japanese student
- “I know she is Korean, this has an effect on her teaching.”—Level 1 Chinese student
- “When we ask cultural questions outside of textbook, she says “I’m not sure.””—Level 2 Japanese student

one criteria to judge native-speaker status, but only put one or two of their criteria in the survey, due to limited time given to complete the survey and also limited space provided for writing their responses in the survey. These factors make it difficult to pinpoint the exact number of survey respondents who used similar criteria in judging native-speaker status.
• “When we ask questions to him, he would sometimes say “I’m not sure, I will look it up.””—Level 2 Japanese student


• “He is Italian, has an accent, not Chinese.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “Mandarin wasn’t his first language.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “I don't think her name is Japanese. I don't think a native speaker must necessarily have a Japanese name but as Japan is a homogeneous country, I assume that someone without a Japanese name is not a native speaker until told otherwise.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “She’s totally Japanese but with Chinese last name”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “(She) speaks English very well.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “(I) heard (my teacher) talk Mandarin to students.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “She originally spoke Cantonese but learned Mandarin.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “I began learning Japanese when I was a senior in high school, so I would not define myself as a native speaker”—Japanese teacher

• “I began learning Japanese at the age of 17 and feel I have attained a high level of fluency, but do not consider myself a native speaker mainly because of my late age of starting and not having the linguistic range of a native speaker (i.e. someone educated in Japan from a young age, or who received daily input in Japanese from a young age).”—Japanese teacher

• “I was born in the US and did not start learning Chinese until I was 18. I consider English to be my native language. I will never be "fully" competent in Chinese, as a person who was born and raised with Chinese is.”—Chinese teacher

The list above shows characteristics for some respondents that indexed the identity “nonnative speaker” of Japanese/Chinese, such as “proficiency in language(s) other than Japanese/Chinese,” “unnatural use of target language,” “inability to answer
questions with regards to the target language and culture,” and “appearance,” “nationality,” or “name other than Japanese/Chinese.” Interestingly, one Chinese student identified the fact that the teacher’s first language was Cantonese as an index of her nonnative status as a Mandarin speaker.

Further, one student’s comment that Japan is a “homogeneous” country reveals how the diversity that exists in Japan is still not acknowledged by that particular individual. Similarly, students oftentimes viewed native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers as two homogeneous groups, and when language teachers were thought to possess traits that deviated from the iconic “native speaker,” some students disregarded such traits in judging a teacher to be a native speaker. For example, with regards to a teacher of Japanese whose ethnic traits were judged to be both “white” and “Japanese,” some students judged her a “nonnative speaker” because, to them, she appeared “white” and “American.” But other students perceived the same teacher to be a native speaker of Japanese because of her “mannerisms” and “Japanese heritage.” In this way, these students disregarded diverse traits that did not fit into the commonly assumed, homogeneous dichotomy. This is therefore an example of what Irvine and Gal (2000) have called “erasure,” the disregarding of deviations from an assumed characterization.

There are other students who did not make a judgment when some of their teachers displayed traits of both “native” and “nonnative” speaker of the target language because they could not simply tell. Here are some comments that students made when they “could not tell” whether some of their teachers were a native or nonnative speaker of the target language.
• “Excellent proficiency in both Japanese and English.”—Level 2 Japanese student

• “His English has no accent, but his Japanese sounds natural”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “He has an accent (in English), but seems Americanized.”—Level 2 Japanese student

• “Japanese origin/American born, style of class, best English.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “Half Japanese.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “I think she might have had a both Asian and American influence”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “I would say nonnative because she doesn't have appearance, but she speaks it well so I'm unsure.”—Level 1 Japanese

• “(She) seems to know language well but sometimes has trouble checking accent in class.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “She looks nonnative on the outside but essentially fluent & cultured on the inside.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “I know she is from Korea, slightly different pronunciation.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “(She) is sometimes confused but could be her personality.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “He is not Chinese but fluent.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “She speaks like Japanese, but her name seems to be Chinese.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “I am not really sure what I would consider myself…”—Japanese teacher

• “(I cannot tell) although I was raised speaking both English and Japanese…”—Japanese teacher
When their language teachers appeared to have an appearance, language ability, and/or behavior that deviates from the iconic image of a native or nonnative speaker of the target language, students made comments like these, of both teachers who self-identified as native speakers of the target language and those who self-identified as nonnative speakers. Table 12 provides a summary of the criteria that students used to judge their teacher’s identity as a native or nonnative speaker of the target language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native speaker</th>
<th>Cannot tell</th>
<th>Nonnative speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last name from target language</td>
<td>No sufficient knowledge about their teacher’s background</td>
<td>Non-target language last name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance as target native speaker (e.g., Japanese, Asian)</td>
<td>Having traits on both sides (e.g., Good Japanese + Good English or appearance as non-Japanese or not comfortable teaching, etc.)</td>
<td>Appearance as non-target language speaker (e.g., white)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency in target language</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluency in non-target language (e.g., English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency in the standard dialect</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluency in non-standard dialect (e.g., Cantonese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target language pronunciation not influenced by another language</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target language pronunciation influenced by another language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good cultural understanding in target language</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incomplete cultural understanding of the target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in target language</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learned target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accented English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unaccented English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not comfortable teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannerism associated with target culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not born and raised in target language country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing up in target language country</td>
<td></td>
<td>Growing up in non-target language countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High position in the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Notable criteria used by students in judging their teacher’s nativeness*

---

* Aside from just simply being told directly by their teachers.
4.3. Preference when selecting a language teacher

The quantitative results from the survey show that native-speaking teachers were preferred (all respondents, including teachers and students) in many more areas than nonnative-speaking teachers. For example, many respondents indicated that they wanted to (or, when teachers, thought their students seemed to want to) develop native-like pronunciation (92%), which seems to indicate a very high demand for language learners to develop native-like pronunciation. Besides pronunciation, native-speaking teachers were preferred in advanced-level speaking/listening classes (73%) and reading/writing classes (59%), as well as in the areas of teaching colloquial expressions (72%) and culture (64%). These findings seem to be in line with Ferguson’s findings for Spanish teachers on native- and nonnative-speaking teachers of Spanish in the U.S., though in my study, for beginning-level class, preference for native-speaking teachers was not as strong. Moreover, native-speaking teachers were thought of as those who set the linguistic standard (69%) and were generally preferred over their counterparts by more than half the participants (52%), even if they were not trained as language teachers (51%).

In contrast, for nonnative-speaking teachers, none of the survey items, even in those areas where they are typically considered to possess advantageous traits (such as being compassionate and being able to explain grammar) reached 50%. In comparison to native-speaking teachers, nonnative-speaking teachers were regarded as somewhat more compassionate language teachers (41% vs. 10% for native-speaking teachers), somewhat

129 Another reason behind this preference might simply be that native speakers are the kind of people most language students want to become able to talk with. Even beginners with no idea of what good pedagogy is will probably feel this way, more often than not—“A native-speaking teacher is best because that is who I want to be able to talk with.”
more preferred when it came to studying grammar (36% vs. 24% for native-speaking teachers), and were regarded as slightly more lenient graders (24% vs. 14% for native-speaking teachers). No scoring for any of the other characteristics exceeded that of the corresponding native speaker preference. This seems to indicate that the nonnative-speaking teachers of Japanese and Chinese characterized by respondents in this study were not as preferred as the nonnative-speaking teachers of Spanish in Ferguson’s study, since her findings showed that they were at least preferred in the areas of grammar and writing by more than half of her participants. In the present study, some portion of student respondents said they preferred having nonnative-speaking teachers in their beginning-level speaking/listening (16%) and reading/writing (17%) classes, but there were more students who either wanted native-speaking teachers or had No preference for beginning-level classes.

Among all respondents (students and teachers), the mean index score for Preference for native speakers was 7.82, No preference was 7.05, and Preference for nonnative speakers was 2.03. This indicates that participants on average showed a preference towards native-speaking teachers for about eight of the characterization items, versus about two such characterization items for nonnative-speaking teachers. Participants showed no preference for either group with seven of the items. The mean index score seems to indicate a communal preference towards native-speaking teachers in this particular language program, which is quite clear when a preference is indicated. Tables 13 provides a summary of students’ reasons for preferring native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers, and Table 14 provides the same summary, organized by item.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Native speaker</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Nonnative speaker</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Develop native-like pronunciation</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>More compassionate</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Advanced speaking/listening</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Studying grammar</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Learning colloquial expressions</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>More lenient grader</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Setting the linguistic standard</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Asking questions</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Learning about the target culture</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>Beginning reading/writing</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Advanced reading-writing</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>Beginning speaking/listening</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>When target language is only used in class</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>If the teacher is not trained</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>General preference</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>When target language is only used in class</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>If the teacher is not trained</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>More fun</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Beginning speaking/listening class</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Advanced reading/writing class</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Native teachers are more qualified</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Learning about the target culture</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Beginning reading/writing</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Learning colloquial expressions</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Asking questions</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Setting the linguistic standard</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Studying grammar</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>General preference</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>More fun</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Develop nonnative-like pronunciation</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>More lenient grader</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Nonnative teachers are more qualified</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>More compassionate</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Advanced speaking/listening</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Participants’ preference for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Native Rank</th>
<th>Non-native Rank</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beginning speaking/listening</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Advanced speaking/listening</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Beginning reading/writing</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Advanced reading/writing</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>General preference</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>If the teacher is not trained</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Develop pronunciation like</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>When target language is only used in class</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Studying grammar</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Learning colloquial expressions</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Learning about the target culture</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Asking questions</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>More compassionate</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>More lenient grader</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>More fun</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Setting the linguistic standard</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>More effective and qualified</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Participants’ preference for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers, by item

What is not illustrated in Tables 13 and 14 is items for which respondents did not show a strong preference, for either native or nonnative. In fact, the majority of participants did not consider one group to be more qualified (67%), more fun (74%), or a more lenient grader (62%), than the other. The estimated percentage of participants having No preference can be calculated by adding the percentages of Native-speaker preference and Nonnative-speaker preference, and subtracting the sum from 100. For instance, the estimated percentage of “No preference” for the item “More fun” was calculated by adding the Native-speaker preference (19%) and the Nonnative-speaker preference (5%), and subtracting the total (24) from 100, which thus came to 76%.

130 Again, participants’ collective response on their teacher’s qualification seems to be in line with Ferguson’s findings. This is because most of the participants did not judge their language teacher’s qualifications simply based on their social identity as a native speaker of the target language. Nevertheless, as
reported earlier, more than half the participants in this study displayed their general preference for native-speaking teachers even if they are not trained as language teachers.

Qualitative data from the survey indicated that participants’ opinions were ambivalent about how native- and nonnative-speaking teachers provided grading. Many participants did not note a difference between native- and nonnative-speaking teachers or felt that it was done fairly by both. Some felt native-speaking teachers graded harsher, especially in the areas of pronunciation, whereas others felt nonnative-speaking teachers graded harsher, because they had high expectations for their learners. Here is a list of some of the students’ comments:

- “It seems to be based on individual toughness.” — Level 1 Chinese student
- “I have not noticed as discernable difference related to whether or not they are a native speaker.” — Level 1 Japanese student
- “I think the teachers all adhere evenly to the grading rubric provided.” — Level 1 Chinese student
- “Grading is very fair, I’ve only noticed a difference b/w (between) whether or not the teacher was new or not.” — Level 1 Japanese student
- “I feel the grading is fair and they are very understanding of second language learners because they used to be a 2nd language learner, too.” — Level 1 Japanese student
- “I think it is fair but strict. The teacher being a native or nonnative doesn't matter much. It's mostly a reflection of your own effort.” — Level 1 Chinese student
- “Native speaker pay more attention to pronunciation and accent while nonnative teacher pay attention mostly to grammar.” — Level 1 Japanese

131 In the Chinese and Japanese programs in question, students are given a grade for their performance in each Act class, according to criteria that are described in some detail, in both online program descriptions and individual course syllabi. See Appendix D for details.
• “Native speakers might be more perceptive to oral mistakes and therefore be tougher with grading.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “Native teachers pick up problems with accent a lot more readily than nonnative teachers.”—Level 3 Japanese student

• “Native speakers tend to be stricter on pronunciation. Feels like we need to speak Japanese without our accents.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “Nonnative speakers tend to be more understanding in mistakes.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “I believe a nonnative may be more forgiving although it all depends on the person.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “Nonnative teachers are a little harsher in their grading. They seem to focus on everything (more nitpicky). Native teachers are a little more lenient because they understand that there may be words we can't say.”—Level 3 Japanese student

• “I feel as though a nonnative instructor grades more harshly, as they put a great deal of emphasis on pronunciation.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “Since a nonnative speaker wants everyone to do as well as s/he did, so grades harshly, while native speaker notices more process than shortcomings.”—Level 2 Japanese student

• “I think native speakers know the language; how it can be used while nonnatives go by the book. This means when I answer to a native speaker it can be interpreted as correct (doesn't have to be exact book-like speech).”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “I don't think there is much difference between native and nonnative teachers, since we have a very specific grading scale.”—Chinese teacher

• “I feel it is more to do with the level of training.”—Japanese teacher

• “There is a hypothetical possibility that I am somewhat stricter because I am a nonnative instructor and if the student is not performing as well as s/he should, I may feel that they simply did not do the work that a nonnative person is perfectly capable of doing reasonably well.”—Japanese teacher

• “A native teacher may be stricter when grading based on incorrect pronunciation or accent, because they can recognize such mistakes more easily than a nonnative
teacher. On the other hand, a nonnative teacher may be stricter about correcting grammatical errors because those are the things they can recognize more easily.”—Japanese teacher

- “Mostly I don't think being a native or nonnative teachers matters that much in giving grades, but I did notice several occasions when students had the wrong tone and a nonnative teacher failed to catch them.”—Chinese teacher

- “I think I'm more sensitive on pronunciation and grammar than most non-native teachers, though I won't set a too high standard for beginners.”—Chinese teacher

These comments exhibit ambivalence in the attitudes that students and teachers display towards associating identity as a native or nonnative speaker of the target language with grading patterns. Some felt that grading has nothing to do with the teacher’s identity as a native or nonnative speaker of the target language. Some felt that grading was fair because of the “grading rubric/scale”\(^\text{132}\) that was used in the language program. There were others who saw native-speaking teachers as “correctors” of pronunciation and accent errors, and saw nonnative-speaking teachers as more “understanding” and “forgiving.” Some perceived native-speaking teachers as “harsh” while others saw them as “lenient.” Similarly, some saw nonnative-speaking teachers as “harsh” while others saw them as “forgiving.” It seems that their perceptions of grading and whether or how it associates with native- and nonnative-speaking teachers depend, to a considerable extent, on individual factors, such as students’ experiences with their teachers and teachers’ preferences with regards to error corrections, etc.—in combination with the publicly posted criteria for grades in program and course documents.

---

\(^\text{132}\) The grading rubric used in this particular language program is found in Appendix D and will be reviewed in 5.5.
Besides grading quality, there were other aspects of language teachers that participants provided in their open-ended questions. In the following section, some of the notable characteristics that participants listed as pros and cons of having native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers will be presented.

4.4. Pros and cons of having native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers

In this section, pros and cons of having native-speaking language teachers that survey respondents identified will be presented and discussed first. Following this, the pros and cons that respondents associated with having nonnative-speaking language teachers will also be reviewed and discussed.

As pros of having native-speaking language teachers, participants identified characteristics that they expected their native-speaking teachers to have, many of which fit right in with the iconic, stereotypical native speaker. For example:

- “[Native-speaking teachers] can’t lead you wrong”—Level 1 Japanese student
- “[Native-speaking teachers are] from the country.”—Level 1 Chinese student
- “[Native-speaking teachers have been] exposed to language and culture throughout life.”—Level 2 Japanese student
- “[Native-speaking teachers] know the language automatically.”—Level 1 Japanese student
- “[Native-speaking teachers have been] fluent since birth.”—Level 1 Japanese student
- “[Native-speaking teachers’] language use is the standard of quality”—Level 3 Chinese student
- “Learning language from a native ensures we are learning modern language”—Level 2 Japanese student’
“[Native-speaking teachers speak an] authentic non textbook language”—Level 2 Chinese student

“The way [native-speaking teachers] speak is how one would hear other native [speakers] speak”—Level 2 Japanese student

“[Native-speaking teachers] know everything about the language”—Level 3 Japanese student

“[Native-speaking teachers] know dialects as well as the main language”—Level 1 Chinese student

“[Native-speaking teachers] have answers to any questions”—Level 2 Japanese student

“[With native-speaking teachers,] 100% correct pronunciation can be experienced”—Level 3 Japanese student

“[Native-speaking teachers have] true knowledge of what sounds right”—Level 3 Japanese student

“[Native-speaking teachers have] no difficulty teaching”—Level 1 Japanese student

“[Native-speaking teachers have] a perfect understanding of the language effective teaching”—Level 1 Japanese student

“[Native-speaking teachers are] able to correct all language mistakes”—Level 2 Japanese student

“[With native-speaking teachers], temptation to use English is less”—Level 3 Chinese student

“[Native-speaking teachers have] perfect pronunciation and grammar, access to native intuitions of naturalness”—Japanese teacher

“[Native-speaking teachers have] authority in pronunciation and culture.”—Chinese teacher

As these examples show, in addition to the desirable characteristic of having grown up in a target language community, some respondents attributed some idealized characteristics
to native-speaking language teachers. These characteristics include their innate linguistic ability (e.g., being “fluent since birth” [sic]), perfect language ability (e.g., “perfect pronunciation and grammar”), complete knowledge (e.g., “knowing everything about the language”), and teaching ability (e.g., “being able to correct all language mistakes”). Some participants regarded native-speaking teachers as authentic (e.g., “non textbook language”), standard (e.g., “their usage is the standard of quality”), homogeneous (e.g., “the way [native speakers] speak is how one will hear other native [speakers] speak”), and authoritative (e.g., “having authority in pronunciation and culture”). Idealized characteristics associated with teaching ability seem to suggest that native speakers are expected to have more idealized characteristics once they become a teacher of their native language.

On the other hand, there also were cons identified with having native-speaking language teachers, and these included negative characteristics stereotypically associated with native-speaking language teachers:

- “[Native-speaking teachers] can be difficult or intimidating to speak in English with”—Level 3 Japanese student
- “Sometimes [native-speaking teachers] don’t speak English well which makes FACT classes harder.”—Level 1 Chinese student
- “[Native-speaking teachers] can’t easily explain things in English due to accents”—Level 1 Chinese student
- “Less understanding of learning process or mistakes”—Level 1 Japanese student
- “They don’t always see or understand certain language specific struggles in learning.”—Level 1 Japanese student
- “[Native-speaking teachers] can be less patient.”—Level 1 Japanese student
• “[Native-speaking teachers] could be a harder grader”—Level 1 Chinese student
• “[Native-speaking teachers] might … not prepare well for class.”—Level 1 Japanese student
• “[Native-speaking teachers might have] difficulty explaining grammatical concepts/nuances that are intuitive”—Level 2 Japanese student
• “[Native-speaking teachers are] less diverse.”—Level 1 Japanese student
• “Insufficient foreign language ability for explaining complex points of the target language.”—Japanese teacher
• “[Native-speaking teachers] can be intimidating.”—Japanese teacher
• “Some native instructors might not have compassion for beginning level students.”—Chinese teacher

This sampling shows that some participants associated a teacher’s native-speaker status in the target language with potential flaws, such as his/her problems with his/her non-first language (e.g., “can’t easily explain things in English due to an accent”), problems with understanding the learning process and language mistakes (e.g., “less understanding of learning process or mistakes”), impatience (e.g., “can be less patient”), incomprehensibility in the target language (e.g., “speaks too quickly”), unpreparedness (e.g., “not prepare well for class”), and inapproachability (e.g., “intimidating”).

Interestingly, except for being hard to understand, none of “con” identifications questioned the quality of a native-speaking teacher’s language or their understanding of

133 Although this participant listed it as a con, being a hard grader could be considered positively depending on how the responding individual views language learning.
their culture. This seems to indicate that when native-speaking language teachers speak and present information about the target culture in class (though they may have a hard time explaining it in a nonnative language such as English), their idiolect and cultural understanding are regarded and received as something “correct” and “standard,” a view that no one seems to question. The native-speaker status seems to protect one from the quality of a teacher’s language being questioned, even though their language is not necessarily “complete” and they are not immune from making mistakes in their native language, as illustrated in 2.4. Inaccurate input or information received from native speakers in this manner can linger in language learners’ minds as something assumed to be correct, and may not be easily corrected if the language learner blindly trusts his/her teachers because of their status as a native speaker of that language.

As for nonnative-speaking teachers, participants similarly identified some iconic “nonnative” characteristics as pros of having them as language teachers:

- “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] are more likely to come from a similar language background”—Level 2 Japanese student
- “[Nonnative-speaking teachers have] no language barrier.”—Level 1 Japanese student
- “[Nonnative-speaking teachers are] better at explaining thing[s] to native English speakers.”—Level 1 Japanese student
- “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] actually had to learn the language so typically their knowledge of grammar is better. [They] also do not submit to dialects.—Level 1 Chinese student
- “[Nonnative-speaking teachers are] able to readily compare with American culture/English language”—Level 2 Chinese student

---

134 There was one student who listed native speakers’ knowledge of slang varieties as a pro, and their inappropriate use as a con.
• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] can communicate clearly in English”—Level 3 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] understand learning process coming from a different 1st language as well.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] may be able to translate what you mean in target language.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers are] easy to communicate with, [s/he] has been in your shoes.”—Level 3 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] understand my position/were once a student like me/ approachable.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] know the struggle of learning a foreign language and less intimidating.”—Level 2 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] translate the culture and ethics most easily.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] are aware of potential struggles of learning language and tend to speak slower.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] go slower and use more gestures/explain mistakes.”—Level 2 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers are] more understanding … lenient grading.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers are] more diverse.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] seem more compassionate about language mistakes.”—Level 2 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] had to learn it too so they may have [learning] tips.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] know all grammar errors.”—Level 1 Chinese student
“[Nonnative-speaking teachers] understand learner's situation; if the teacher is native English speaker, then s/he can better communicate concepts.”—Japanese teacher

“[Nonnative-speaking teachers] know more about student's common mistakes and can give reasonable answers to grammatical questions.”—Chinese teacher

Respondents commonly associated the nonnative-speaking teachers with characteristics such as their understanding of the learning process (e.g., “understanding the process of learning an East Asian language as a foreign language”), understanding of learning difficulty (e.g., “knowing the struggle of learning a foreign language”), approachability (e.g., “being less intimidating”), comprehensibility in the target language (e.g., “tending to speak slower, not ‘submitting’ [sic] to dialects”), compassionate (e.g., “being compassionate about language mistakes”), and expertise (e.g., “likely having learning tips, knowing all grammar errors”). Participants who listed English as their native language frequently associated the preferability of nonnative-speaking language teachers with their proficiency in English (e.g., “no language barrier, being able to readily compare the target culture/language with American culture/English language”), and their ability to clearly explain grammatical concepts (e.g., “having reasonable answers to grammatical questions”). This is because the majority of the nonnative-speaking language teachers were in fact native speakers of English.

On the other hand, some negative characteristics were associated with nonnative-speaking teachers as well. The following lists some of the negative characteristics that respondents identified.

“[Nonnative-speaking teachers’] pronunciation may not always be correct. Limited cultural knowledge.”—Level 2 Japanese student
• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] may not have perfect pronunciation or answers to every question.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers have] possibly imperfect pronunciation and cultural understanding.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers have/are] less perfect accent/usage model.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative speakers are] not usually at a native ability.’”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative speakers are] not standard”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative speakers are] may not have all the answers since they didn’t grow up in Japan.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] can never know all about the target language [such as] slangs [and] dialects.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] do not know how to speak casually,”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] might not know as many characters as a native.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] may have an accent or won't have complete fluency.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] make more mistakes than native speakers.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] may not know current speech patterns/speech can be outdated.”—Level 2 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] possibly doesn't know extensively beyond textbook material.”—Level 2 Chinese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] may not have as much flexibility with the language.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] are less likely to readily teach colloquial expressions/explain contextual nuances well.”—Level 2 Japanese student
• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] don't usually pick up on smaller mistakes or incorrect accents.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[If nonnative-speaking teachers teach, I may] develop bad speaking habits.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] tend to grade harder since they can speak so why can't you.”—Level 2 Japanese student

• “The nonnative teacher does not have an insider’s perspective and cannot adequately explain concepts and ideas that are completely foreign.”—Level 2 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] may over complicate some grammatical issues.”—Level 2 Japanese student

• “[Nonnative-speaking teachers] sometimes [provide] inaccurate info—Level 1 Japanese student

Contrary to the cons identified for native-speaking counterparts, many respondents associated the quality of nonnative-speaking teachers’ target language /knowledge with negative attributes. Specifically, their linguistic ability or knowledge of the target culture were regarded as imperfect (e.g., imperfect pronunciation), limited (e.g., not knowing as many characters), textbook-like (e.g., no flexibility; no colloquial expressions; not casual), non-standard, incomplete, i.e. partial and limited (e.g., not being able to answer questions), inaccurate, and outdated. Some respondents thought that attaining native-level competence and knowledge in the target language is impossible for nonnative-speaking teachers (e.g., not being able to have complete fluency; never being able to know “all about” the target language). Some questioned their teaching ability (e.g., not picking up on small mistakes). Further, nonnative-speaking teachers’ high expectations of learners and extensive knowledge about the target language/culture were not perceived positively
by all; some respondents associating these with grading harder (e.g., “grade harder since they can speak so why can’t you”) and/or “over-complicating some grammatical issues”.

Though some of the negative attributes cited are extreme examples, such associations are another source of the native speaker fallacy, and people who fit enough characteristics of the iconic nonnative speaker of the target language are at risk of being associated with these attributes, even if they actually native speakers (say, in their own and others’ eyes).

Finally, there were some participants who chose not to list any pros or cons because they thought that for teachers of a language they would learn, having the social identity of a native or nonnative speaker of the target language did not matter. As in the case with the majority of participants in Ferguson’s (2005) study for learning Spanish in the U.S., these participants seemed to focus more on the qualifications of their language teachers to teach.

- “If they can do the job who cares.”—Level 1 Japanese student
- “Honestly, the qualities depend on individual, not as much on group. I prefer teachers who truly care about students instead of efficiency or grading.”—Level 1 Japanese student
- “If they are experienced, I would be happy with my teachers regardless.”—Level 1 Chinese student
- “They are all excellent and equal.”—Level 1 Japanese student

4.5. Respondents’ views on team teaching

As mentioned briefly in 3.2.1, the language programs investigated use team-teaching language instruction, in which native- and nonnative-speaking teachers are assigned to teach a language course together. In advanced-level courses, fewer hours are
taught by nonnatives, but since the majority of this study’s participants were enrolled in beginning to intermediate-level courses, and those in advanced-level courses had had prior experience in such courses, almost all of the study’s participants had been taught at some point by a team of native- and nonnative-speaking teachers at the time of data collection.\footnote{One exception was a Chinese-native speaker who was enrolled in a Level 3 Chinese course, which was taught by a team of native-speaking teachers at the time of data collection. Besides her, everyone in the class had come from the lower level and had the experience of being taught by both native- and nonnative-speaking teachers.}

The survey results indicated that most participants (83\%)\footnote{590 participants responded.} liked the idea of having both native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers as a team, because they believed that they can have “best of both worlds” with each party giving “different perspectives on language.” Some of the participants’ comments are quoted below:

- “I think it is important to build a strong foundation when learning a language, so having a nonnative to answer and explain in English and a native to provide a model of fluency are both crucial.”—Level 2 Japanese student

- “Both have a distinct perspective on the language, some students may learn better from one of the other.”—Level 2 Japanese student

- “Having both a native and nonnative teacher allows students to have a more rounded, rich experience, pulling ideas from many areas and viewpoints.”—Level 2 Japanese student

- “Native and non-native speakers add valuable insider and outsider perspectives on certain topics.”—Level 2 Japanese student

- “Native teachers can provide very real contexts, while non-native teachers may be able to better relate and understand the difficulty of the language.”—Level 1 Japanese student
“Having both native and nonnative teachers allows the student to experience different teaching methods and offers diversity in listening practice.” — Level 2 Chinese student

“A team of native- and nonnative-speaking teachers] shows us the difference, and shows us that we can speak it too one day.” — Level 1 Japanese student

“I feel having both native and nonnative teacher increase the dynamic of my learning experience. I can compare and learn the difference and similarity of teaching for the same material to absorb the strength of both parts.” — Level 1 Japanese student

“Have a nonnative teacher that you feel more comfortable going to with questions; have a native teacher who is better for practicing things like pronunciation, accent, and colloquialisms” — Japanese teacher

“As a target native, I feel more secure if there is another base native instructor so that when I have difficulty explaining grammatical aspects I can ask them.” — Japanese teacher

“When students start learning, it would be better if they have a nonnative teacher explain grammatical problems for them as these teachers all experienced that stage when they were learning. Students also need a native teacher to teach them how to perform culture authentic[ally].” — Chinese teacher

“Best of both worlds. But too many teachers lessen intimacy of class. You tend to learn more in a more intimate environment where you can connect with the teacher(s).” — Level 1 Japanese student

The last comment from a Level 1 Japanese student is an interesting one. While this student likes the idea of team teaching, he feels that students and teachers may not be able to build sufficient rapport when there are too many teachers teaching the same course. This is especially true for the beginning-level courses. For instance, there were 6 different GTAs and a full-time supervising teacher assigned to teach 7 different sections (3 sections at 8:00, 2 sections at 10:20, and 2 sections at 11:30) in Level 1 Japanese in Autumn 2014. Each GTA was typically assigned to teach two to three days a week and
taught one, two, or three different section(s) for each assigned day (a total of 5 to 6 Act and/or Fact sessions a week), as shown in Table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Monday (Act)</th>
<th>Tuesday (Act)</th>
<th>Wednesday (Act)</th>
<th>Thursday (Fact)</th>
<th>Friday (Act)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 8:00</td>
<td>Tanaka</td>
<td>Kamiyama</td>
<td>Yamada</td>
<td>Kamiyama</td>
<td>Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 8:00</td>
<td>Kamiyama</td>
<td>Yoshida</td>
<td>Tanaka</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Kamiyama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 8:00</td>
<td>Yoshida</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Kamiyama</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Yamada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 10:20</td>
<td>Yamada</td>
<td>Yoshida</td>
<td>Kamiyama</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Tanaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 10:20</td>
<td>Yoshida</td>
<td>Kamiyama</td>
<td>Tanaka</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 11:30</td>
<td>Tanaka</td>
<td>Yoshida</td>
<td>Yamada</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Kamiyama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 11:30</td>
<td>Yoshida</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Kamiyama</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Yamada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. A sample of teaching assignments of Level 1 Japanese

This scheduling system allowed GTAs to use the same lesson plan when teaching multiple sections on the same day, and students to be exposed to different teachers. While it is certainly beneficial for students to get a variety of input from different teachers, too much rotating with too many teachers can leave learners feeling they do not know their teachers very well, with less sense of a focused community, with a common purpose.

Among the supporters of the idea of team teaching, some showed a stronger preference for native-speaking teachers as illustrated in their comments below.

- “I would like native speakers to teach everything except grammar.” — Level 2 Japanese student
- “I would prefer to have both as long as there are more native teachers than nonnative teachers.” — Level 1 Chinese student
- “I prefer a native speaker or someone who has lived for a while in China/Taiwan because they will learn what the important, applicable concepts one.” — Level 1 Chinese student

---

137 Names used in the schedule are pseudonyms.
• “[I] prefer speaking and talking class to be taught by native, but if nonnative teachers have enough skills and knowledge and stayed in Japan for some time, I think it will also be fine.” —Level 2 Japanese student

• “I guess no students would say ‘no’ to a native teacher.” —Chinese teacher

• “Maybe this is at the very beginning level, when it comes to the advanced level, I think only native speaker is enough.” —Chinese teacher

• “I feel more students might choose to have a native speaker as their language instructor if they can only have one. But having an access to people who have been through the language learning process and struggles as them is ideal. They might want to work with both types of instructors with different emphasis, such as pronunciation practice with native teachers, and problem consulting with non-native speakers.” —Chinese teacher

These comments represent a preference for native-speaking teachers in speaking/listening classes, especially in advanced-level classes.

Similarly, the few participants (3%) who did not support the idea of team teaching disliked the idea of team teaching mostly because they preferred native-speaking teachers over nonnative-speaking teachers regardless of instructional context and purpose.

• “Usually native language teachers have to know English pretty well. They were mostly born and raised speaking the language they are teaching. I feel this is mostly effective in learning.” —Level 1 Japanese student

• “Having a(n) English native/Japanese non-native is excellent for lower level courses, but can be a crutch at higher levels.” —Level 3 Japanese student

• “I personally enjoy from learning specifically from native speakers, as it helps dominantly with the cultural understanding underlying grammatical understanding.” —Level 1 Japanese student

• “At the beginning level when they are first developing pronunciation skills it is important that they are pronouncing it correctly and learning it correctly.” —Level 1 Chinese student
• “I prefer to have no nonnative teachers because it’s weird like a Chinese uses English to teach Japanese.”—Level 1 Japanese student (L1 Chinese)

Interestingly, the last comment listed above is from a student of Japanese who listed her native language as Chinese. She made this comment because, in that particular semester in her Level 1 Japanese class, all of the nonnative-speaking teachers assigned to teach Fact class sessions were native speakers of Chinese. Having a shared L1 with her teachers may seem like an advantage, but since Chinese was not used as a means to deliver instruction in class, this student thought it was “weird” to hear other Chinese speakers use English to teach her Japanese. Divergent nonnative-speaking teachers—in this case, native-speaking Chinese teaching Japanese Fact class in English—were not able to take advantage of the L1 that they shared with some of their students, because English was the medium of instruction in this particular setting. Some students said they heard them speaking Chinese to such students outside of class (in fact, that was how these students determined their teachers’ nonnative status as Japanese speakers), but the use of Chinese had to be limited to a minimum during class.

The remainder of the participant population (14 %) indicated that they did not mind whether they were taught by a team of native and nonnative language teachers or not. Some of their comments were as follows.

• “As long as the material is covered well, no preference.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “As long as they are qualified, then why not.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “As long as the instructor is knowledgeable, engaging, and well qualified, it doesn’t make a huge difference”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “It doesn’t matter as long as they are capable.”—Level 2 Japanese student
• “Either is fine as long as they are effective.”—Level 1 Chinese student

• “I don't mind having a nonnative teacher as long as they are fluent.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “Being in introductory, as long as the teacher knows more than me, I don't really care either way.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “It all depends on the teacher.”—Level 3 Chinese student

• “I've had excellent experiences with taking classes with both native and nonnative teachers available but also excellent experiences learning in classes with only one or the other.”—Level 1 Japanese student

• “In general, the preferences [that I indicated] above [in the survey] are minor. Knowledge of material and ability to communicate it are more important to me than nationality/background.”—Level 2 Japanese student

• “I would answer yes to [the idea of team teaching] …, but it may be my teacher training in [this program] suggesting that answer; I'm not sure what students think.”—Japanese teacher

• “Nationality means little to me, so long as my teacher is good at teaching. That is all I need.”—Level 2 Chinese student

Table 16, below, provides a compilation of stereotypical oppositions found in participants’ comments on the pros and cons of having native- or nonnative-speaking language teachers and on their opinions of team teaching. While these particular oppositions emerge in the survey responses, they do not necessarily predominate, the list is not exhaustive, and it unavoidably reflects some opinions of the majority (i.e. “American” students who are native speakers of English in the U.S.).

138 This particular student actually indicated that she supported the idea of team teaching, but also offered this as her comment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Nonnative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Native speaker of target language</td>
<td>Nonnative speaker of target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Foreign background, from the target country, Non-American, language acquirer, not diverse</td>
<td>Similar background, not from the target country, American, language learner, more diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Accented English, less temptation to use English in class, can’t explain in English</td>
<td>Perfect English, more temptation to use English in class, can explain clearly in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatability</td>
<td>Intimidating, hard to relate to, harsh grader, impatient, not understanding</td>
<td>Approachable, relatable, compassionate, patient, understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target language</td>
<td>Standard, up-to-date “non-textbook,” fluent (fast), difficult to understand, authentic</td>
<td>Non-standard, outdated “textbook,” disfluent (slow), easier to understand, inauthentic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about target language</td>
<td>Full, complete</td>
<td>Limited, incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target language Pronunciation</td>
<td>Accurate, clean, free of accent, correct, natural, perfect</td>
<td>Inaccurate, affected, accented, incorrect, unnatural, imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching ability</td>
<td>Can correct all mistakes, no difficulty teaching</td>
<td>Cannot correct all mistakes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Stereotypical oppositions between native and nonnative speakers, compiled

The assumptions summarized in Table 16 represent survey respondents’ collective perceptions of native- and nonnative-speaking teachers of their target language in the language program. The oppositions manifested may be useful when investigating how these local ideologies might affect focal participants. Needless to say, belief in these oppositions is not uniformly distributed in the survey population, and depending on how they position themselves socio-politically, individuals may display varying degrees of awareness of these local ideologies regarding native- and nonnative-speaking teachers of the target language, some of which will be explored in Chapter 5.
Before moving on to Chapter 5, however, a statistical analysis of participants’ identities according to social factors, namely, Status as student or teacher, Language program, Gender, Age, Language level in the target language course, Race and Native language, will be presented. These variables may or may not have an influence on how members in each sub-community in the language program perceive native and nonnative speakers of Japanese and Chinese, but let us see what they are.

4.6. Analysis by Selected Variables

This section presents participant background variables that were used in regression analysis to project their characterizations of native speakers and preference for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers of the target language. As mentioned, among all participants, the mean index score of “Native speaker” definition was 11.44, with a Preference for native speakers 7.82, a “No preference” was 7.05, and a Preference for nonnative speakers of 2.03. Figure 4 is a visual representation of the participants’ index scores for defining “native speaker,” along with index scores for Preference for native-speaking teachers, No preference, and Preference for nonnative-speaking teachers.139

---

139 The scale for “Native speaker” definition was 0-19 and for Preference index scores, 0-17. Although each utilized a different set of items, they are displayed on the same graph in attempt to show visual relationships between how participants characterized “native speaker” of the target language and their preference for native- or nonnative-speaking teachers.
Figure 4. Mean index scores for “Native-speaker” definition, Preference for native, No preference, and Preference for nonnative, among all respondents (N=593)

The overall mean index scores seem to indicate that respondents’ Preference for native-speaking language teachers was much stronger than for nonnative-speaking teachers. No preference for either native or nonnative teacher also outstrips the Preference for nonnative-speaking teachers.

The independent variables used for the multiple regression analysis were as follows:

---

140 The spacings between the different parts of the box indicate the degree of dispersion (spread) and skewedness in the data. The line in the middle of the rectangle represents a median, which is the middle value in the list of numbers, which may be close to, but different from the mean values. Finally, the dots represent outliers.
• Status (teacher and student),
• Language program (Japanese and Chinese),
• Gender (male and female),
• Age (18-24, 25-30, and 31-older),
• Language level (Level 1, 2, 3 or higher, teachers),
• Race (White, Black, Asian, mix race, and other race),
• Native language (English, Chinese, Korean, multilingual speakers, and other language speakers).

The R-square value of these variables for the “Native-speaker” definition index score is 0.30, indicating that about 30% of the variance is explained by these variables. Interestingly, when teachers are excluded from the data, the R-square value drops down to 0.07, indicating that only about 7% of the variance is explained by the variables. This seems to indicate that being a language teacher in this program has a great impact on one’s characterizations of “native speaker,” even though they are mostly GTAs who are new or who have been in the language teaching field for only a couple of years. As for the Preference indexes of (a) Preference for native-speaking teachers, (b) No preference, and (c) Preference for nonnative-speaking teachers, the R-square values of these variables ranged from 0.05 to 0.08, with or without the teachers. This indicates that only about 5 to 8% of the variance is explained by these variables. The low R-square values imply that there are many other factors that influence one’s characterizations of “native speaker” and Preference for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers. A summary of results from regression analysis with and without teacher participants will be provided at the end of this section, in Tables 15 and 16.

In the following section, analysis by different independent variables is presented in the order of Status, Language program, Gender, Age, Language level, Race, and Native language.
Status (Students vs. Teachers)

The first independent variable is participants’ Status, as student or teacher (mostly GTAs). Figure 5 shows a visual representation of the mean index scores among students in comparison to teachers: “Native-speaker” definition (S: 11.49 vs. T: 10.43), Preference for native speakers (S: 7.73 vs. T: 9.38), No preference (S: 7.20 vs. T: 4.07), and Preference for nonnative speakers (S: 1.96 vs. T: 3.41).

Figure 5. Mean index scores for “Native-speaker” definition, Preference for native, No preference, and Preference for nonnative, between students (N=564) and teachers (N=29)
As proposed in the hypothesis (1a), teachers’ lower mean index score for their characterization of “native speaker” seems to indicate that their characterization is less specific and idealized than that of students. Regression analysis supports this finding in that, on average, while holding other variables at their means, the teacher respondents’ index score for defining “native speaker” had a significant negative association with that of student respondents (coefficient= -1.92; \( p = 0.00 \)). This finding seems to indicate that the teacher participants, including new and inexperienced teachers, were more aware of the Relativeness of the Construct of “Native Speaker” and of its idealized characterizations which are not necessarily true.

On the other hand, when we compare teacher respondents with students for their mean index scores of (a) Preference for native-speaking teachers, (b) No preference, and (c) Preference for nonnative-speaking teachers, the differences seem to indicate that teachers in this study had a tendency to think that their students have higher preferences for native-speaking and nonnative-speaking language teachers, than their students actually do. In other words, the teacher participants seemed to expect their language students to show a higher preference for both native- and nonnative-speaking teachers (each preferred for its own reasons), while the student participants did not actually show as much preference for either. This does not support the hypothesis (1b) about teachers’ expectations for students to not prefer native-speaking teachers, but it does support the hypothesis (1c) that teachers would expect students to prefer nonnative-speaking teachers.

---

141 The coefficient for categorical variables in multiple regression is the difference between the referent group and the compared group in their dependent variable. In this instance, this coefficient indicates that the teachers’ index score for defining “native speaker,” while holding other variables constant, is on average 1.93 less than that of students.
(again, with each preferred for distinct reasons). But despite this gap in teacher vs.
student mean index scores, none of the differences in Preference index scores had
statistical significance, due to the limited number of teacher participants.

Interestingly, the coefficient values for all of the Preference index scores, though
not statistically significant yet, seem to trend in the opposite direction from those of mean
values. For instance, the teacher respondents’ expected Preference index score for native-
speaking teachers for their students had a negative association with that of students’
actual expectation (coefficient= -0.41; p=0.09). This seems to indicate that there was a
group of teachers who expected their students to show less preference for native-speaking
teachers. But this group’s Preference index score is not reflected in the overall mean
index scores because there were other teachers in the group, especially among those with
less teaching experience, who seemed to have thought their students to prefer native-
speaking teachers in many of the given criteria. In fact, one of the teachers actually chose
all 17 items for preferring native-speaking teachers. Needless to say, the teachers’ overall
mean index score on their expected Preference index score for native-speaking teachers
was greatly influenced by this subgroup of teacher respondents. This seems to indicate
that the amount of teaching experience plays a role in influencing whether and how much
language teachers expect their students to show preference for native-speaking teachers.

Language Program (Japanese vs. Chinese)

The second independent variable is the subjects’ target language, i.e. which one
they are studying or teaching, labeled as Language Program (Japanese or Chinese).
Figure 6 provides a visual representation of the mean index scores among Japanese language program participants (in comparison to Chinese language program participants):


![Box plot of mean index scores for different definitions and preferences between Japanese and Chinese participants.](image)

As proposed in the hypothesis (2a), no statistically significant difference was found between Japanese language program participants’ and Chinese language program
participants’ characterizations of native-speaking teachers. Without the teacher participants, however, a statistically significant difference, though the difference seemed small, was found. Students in Chinese courses, in comparison to those in Japanese courses, on average, while holding other variables constant, were found to have a slightly higher index score for “Native-speaker” definition (Japanese students=11.41 and Chinese student=11.63; coefficient=0.51; $p=0.04$). This indicates that learners in the Chinese program have a slightly more specified characterization of “native speaker” than students in the Japanese program.

Participants from Japanese and Chinese programs showed similar trends in their Preference index scores seems to support the hypotheses (2b) and (2c) as well, but Japanese program seems to have a higher preference for native-speaking teachers and a slightly lower preference for nonnative-speaking teachers. In fact, results obtained from multiple regression undercut the null hypothesis and found two statistically significant differences in their Preference index scores. Though the difference between the two groups is small in both cases, it is worth exploring to study the effects of the iconization of “native speaker” in both language programs. Interestingly, on average, while holding other variables constant, Chinese program respondents were found to have a slightly weaker preference for native-speaking language teachers (coefficient= -0.74; $p=0.02$). In the face of their more specified and idealized characterizations of “native speaker,” the fact that the Chinese program respondents showed a weaker preference for native-speaking language teachers is interesting. When teachers are excluded from the regression analysis, a slightly stronger preference for nonnative-speaking teachers among
Chinese students is also found (coefficient=0.44; \(p=0.02\)). To rephrase it from a different perspective, participants, particularly language students, from the Japanese program were found to have a slightly stronger preference for native-speaking teachers, and a slightly weaker preference for nonnative-speaking teachers. Together with the mean index scores for native-speaking teachers, results from multiple regression seem to indicate that effects of the native speaker fallacy may be slightly more visible in the Japanese program. The potential causes of this communal difference between the two groups will be explored qualitatively in Chapter 5.

In sum, students from the Japanese program, in comparison to students from the Chinese program, were found to have a slightly stronger preference for native-speaking teachers and slightly weaker preference for nonnative-speaking teachers, though their characterization of “native speaker” was found to be slightly less specific and idealized.

**Gender (Male vs. Female)**

The third independent variable is Gender. The mean index scores between male and female participants were as follows: “Native-speaker” definition (M: 11.43 vs. F: 11.41), Preference for native speakers (M: 7.65 vs. F: 8.00), No preference (M: 7.24 vs. F: 6.86), and Preference for nonnative speakers (M: 2.03 vs. F: 2.04) (Figure 7).
Figure 7. Mean index scores for “Native-speaker” definition, Preference for native, No preference, and Preference for nonnative, between male participants (N=302) and female participants (N=283)

The mean index score for the “Native-speaker” definition between male and female participants is about the same, which does not seem to support the hypothesis (3a). The mean index score of Preference for native-speaking teachers seems to indicate that the female participants had a somewhat stronger preference for native-speaking teachers. This seems to support the hypothesis (3b). On the other hand, the mean index score of Preference for nonnative-speaking teachers seems to be about the same, which does not seem to support the hypothesis (3c). Interestingly, neither the “Native speaker” definition index score nor the Preference index scores differed significantly by
participants’ Gender. Results from multiple regression indicate that one’s Gender does not have a statistically significant influence on one’s characterization and preference for native-speaking and nonnative-speaking language teachers. This finding is in line with Moussu’s (2006) finding.

In sum, no statistically significant association was found between participants’ Gender and their characterization of “native speaker” and preference for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers.

Age

The fourth analysis is by participants’ Age. Figure 8 displays a visual representation of the mean index scores among participants between the ages of 18-24, 25-30, and 31 or more: “Native-speaker” definition (18-24: 11.55 vs. 25-30: 10.80 vs. 31 or more: 10.54), Preference for native speakers (18-24: 7.75 vs. 25-30: 7.75 vs. 31 or more: 8.92), No preference (18-24: 7.12 vs. 25-30: 7.07 vs. 31 or more: 5.64), and Preference for nonnative speakers (18-24: 2.02 vs. 25-30: 2.10 vs. 31 or more: 2.24).
Figure 8. Mean index scores for “Native-speaker” definition, Preference for native, No preference, and Preference for nonnative, divided by participants’ Age: 18-24 (N=498), 25-31 (N=61), and 31 or more (N=25)

Figure 8 shows that the mean index score for “Native speaker” definition decreases with increase in students’ Age. This seems to support the hypothesis (4a). The result from the multiple regression seems to partially confirm this trend. In comparison to participants between the ages of 18 and 24, while holding other variables at their means, on average, participants between the ages of 25-30 were found to have a statistically negative association with their “Native speaker” definition index scores (coefficient= -0.64; p=0.05). From this result, it can be inferred that participants’ characterization of native speaker tends to become less specific or idealized/projected as they grow older.
However, despite the fact that a negative association is also found among participants who are 31 years old or older, the association is no longer significant (coefficient= -0.80; $p=0.11$) with this older group, possibly due to the limited number of participants. Further, when teachers are excluded from the analysis, though the negative association is still there, statistical significance is no longer found in either group. This is perhaps because the number of older participants was much fewer than those who were grouped between the ages of 18 and 24. More student participants who are older than 25 are needed to confirm this finding.

As for the Preference index scores, the mean index scores for participants between the ages of 18 and 24 and participants between the ages of 25 and 30 seem to be about the same, but participants who are older than 31 years old seem to have a stronger preference for native-speaking teachers. None of these seems to support the hypotheses (4b) and (4c). In fact, there was no significant difference found between the age of participants and their preference for native- or nonnative-speaking teachers. This indicates that Age does not have a statistically significant influence on one’s preference for native-speaking and nonnative-speaking language teachers.\textsuperscript{142}

In sum, older participants seemed to have less specific and less idealized characterizations of “native speaker,” but the finding is inconclusive and needs to be confirmed by collecting more data from older participants. Age did not seem to have any

\textsuperscript{142} Nevertheless, in comparison to participants between the ages of 18 and 24, participants whose age falls between 25 and 30 had a statistically positive association with the No preference index score on average, while holding other variables at their means (coefficient=1.18; $p=0.04$). The same phenomenon was found when teachers are excluded as well (coefficient=1.23; $p=0.05$). The increase in their No preference seems to imply decrease, though statistically not significant, in preferences for having native- and/or nonnative-speaking teachers.
statistically significance with participants’ preference for native- nor nonnative-speaking teachers.

*Language Level*

The fifth independent variable is participants’ Language level of target language. The mean index scores among students in Levels 1, 2, and 3 and higher, as well as teachers (T) were as follows: “Native-speaker” definition (Lv1: 11.55 vs. Lv2: 11.38 vs. Lv3: 11.37 vs. T: 10.43), Preference for native speakers (Lv1: 7.66 vs. Lv2: 7.49 vs. Lv3: 8.37 vs. T: 9.38), No preference (Lv1: 7.39 vs. Lv2: 7.29 vs. Lv3: 6.31 vs. T: 4.07), and Preference for nonnative speakers (Lv1: 1.84 vs. Lv2: 2.12 vs. Lv3: 2.22 vs. T: 3.41) (Figure 9).
Figure 9. Mean index scores for “Native-speaker” definition, Preference for native, No preference, and Preference for nonnative, among participants in Levels 1 (N=357), 2 (N=120), 3 or higher (N=87), and teachers (N=29)

As proposed in the hypothesis (5a), the mean index score for “Native-speaker” definition seems to decrease with an increase in participants’ level, but no statistical significance was found. This indicates that Language level does not have any statistical significance for participants’ characterization of “native speaker.”

As for the Preference index scores, the mean value seems to indicate that participants in Level 3 or higher and teachers seem to have a stronger preference for

---

143 No significant difference was observed between teachers and Level 1 students, because their difference is already accounted for by Status—another independent variable used in the same regression analysis. As discussed in the section titled Status above, teachers, in comparison to students, were found to have a statistically negative association in their “Native speaker” definition index score.
native-speaking teachers. This higher-level participants’ stronger preference for native-speaking teachers is in accordance with the hypothesis (5b), and students enrolled in Level 3 or higher-level classes, and especially the teacher participants, were found to have a statistically significant positive association. Specifically, in comparison to Level 1 students, while holding other variables constant, on average, students enrolled in Level 3 or higher-level classes and teachers were found to have statistically positive associations with a Preference index score for native-speaking teachers (Level 3 or higher: coefficient=0.94; \( p=0.03 \); \( T: \) coefficient=2.08; \( p=0.01 \)). Consequently, both groups have a decreased value in the index score for No preference, both of which are also found to have a statistically significant negative association.

Among the Preference index scores for nonnative-speaking teachers, teacher participants seem to have a higher index score in comparison to other groups. Participants from Level 3 or higher also have a slightly higher value as well, which is contrary to the hypothesis (5c). Interestingly, the only statistically significant association was found for teacher participants, namely a tendency for them to expect their students to prefer nonnative-speaking teachers, a belief that their students’ responses, in particular those of Level 1, do not confirm. Specifically, in comparison to Level 1 students, while holding other variables constant, teachers were found to have a statistically positive association on average (coefficient: 1.89; \( p=0.00 \)). A similar, but less pronounced, trend was found in Level 3 or higher students, but the association is not quite significant (coefficient=0.42; \( p=0.08 \)), even when teachers are excluded. Though the coefficient value is much lower than teachers’ and it is not statistically significant, this trend seems to indicate that
students do seem to develop an increased preference for nonnative-speaking teachers in accordance with their Language level, perhaps as the result of having spent more time with them. This finding seems to indirectly support Moussu’s finding that higher-level ESL students were found to be more satisfied with their nonnative-speaking teachers of English than their lower-level counterparts. More students in Level 3 or higher are needed to confirm this finding.

On the other hand, the mean value between Level 1 and Level 2 participants seems to be about the same for all Preference index scores, and there was no statistically significant difference found between Level 1 and Level 2 participants in any of the Preference index scores. This suggests that, beginning-level and lower-intermediate-level students have similar preferential trends, and are more likely to not care whether their teacher is a native- or nonnative-speaking teacher.

In sum, the Language level variable was found to have a statistically significant association with participants’ Preference index scores, but not with “Native speaker” definition. While no significant difference was found between participants in Levels 1 and 2, participants in Levels 3 and higher were found to have a stronger preference for native-speaking teachers. Teacher participants’ tendency to expect their students to prefer both native- and nonnative-speaking teachers was also in evidence.
Race

The sixth variable is participants’ Race. Figure 10 provides a visual representation of the mean index scores among students who are native speakers of English with different racial backgrounds, namely white (W), black (B), Asian (A), mix (M), and other race (O).\textsuperscript{144} Their mean index scores are as follows: “Native-speaker” definition (W: 11.20 vs. B: 10.99 vs. A: 11.43 vs. M: 10.73 vs. O: 11.00), Preference for native speakers (W: 7.62 vs. B: 8.29 vs. A: 6.10 vs. M: 8.03 vs. O: 9.00), No preference (W: 7.16 vs. B: 6.03 vs. A: 9.49 vs. M: 6.63 vs. O: 7.00), and Preference for nonnative speakers (W: 2.12 vs. B: 2.59 vs. A: 1.24 vs. M: 2.23 vs. O:1.00).

\textsuperscript{144} Though the multiple regression results are drawn from all participants, only native speakers of English are displayed in Figure 10. This is because, as will be discussed, native language speakers of Chinese and Korean were found to have a strong preference for native-speaking teachers, and the association between participants’ ethnicity and other dependent variables was difficult to see when other language speakers were included in the same figure’s layout.
Based on the mean index scores for “Native-speaker” definition among native speakers of English, respondents with an Asian background seem to hold the most idealized characterization of “native speaker,” while participants with multiracial backgrounds seem to have the least idealized characterization of “native speaker.” This seems to support the hypotheses (6a) and (6d), but actually no statistically significant

145 Similar trends are also found when other language speakers are included.
difference was found for any of the five groups. Ethnicity does not seem to significantly influence one’s characterization of “native speaker.”

As for the Preference index scores among native speakers of English, participants with an ethnically Asian background seem to have the lowest preference for native-speaking teachers and for nonnative-speaking teachers. While racially Asian participants’ preference for nonnative-speaking teachers being the lowest seems to confirm our hypothesis (6c), their low preference for native-speaking teachers is contrary to the hypothesis (6b). Interestingly, in comparison to ethnically white individuals, on average, while holding other variables constant, ethnically Asian individuals were found to have a negative association with the Preference index for native-speaking teachers (coefficient= -0.98; p=0.05) and nonnative-speaking teachers (coefficient= -0.76; p=0.01), and a positive association with the No preference index score (coefficient=1.67; p=0.00). This indicates that racially Asian native speakers of English have a tendency to not care about whether their Japanese or Chinese teachers are native speakers or not. This is perhaps because they have had more exposure to native speakers of Japanese and/or Chinese growing up, and might consequently perceive these languages as a second language as opposed to a foreign language. If so, perhaps their perceiving their target

---

146 Though Figure 10 only displays the mean index scores for respondents who are native speakers of English, statistical analysis involved all participants.

147 The same trend is found without the teacher participants as well.

148 This finding was difficult to perceive at first since the majority of racially Asian participants in the multiple regression was made up of native speakers of Chinese and Korean. As it will be discussed in the next part, native speakers of Chinese and Korean were found to have a strong preference for having native-speaking language teachers, and when they are included, the mean index score of Preference for native-speaking teachers for racially Asian group was actually 8.04, which was higher than that of the referent group (i.e. racially white participants).
language as a second language, as opposed to a foreign language, is similar to the case of language learners of Spanish in Meadows and Muramatsu’s (2007) study, who were assumed to perceive Spanish as a second language because there were many Spanish speakers in the region where the language program was.

Preference index scores of participants of native English speaker respondents with multiracial backgrounds seem to be the lowest for native-speaking teachers, which supports the hypothesis (6e). But their preference for nonnative-speaking teachers is about the same as that of racially white participants, which does not seem to support the hypothesis (6f). Nonetheless, no statistically significant associations were found among multiracial participants. This result indicates that those with multiracial backgrounds do not embrace diversity as expected, at least in their Preference index scores.

As for racially black participants, while no statistically significant associations were found among them, it bears pointing out that in comparison to racially white participants, they seemed to have more of a positive preference for nonnative-speaking teachers (coefficient=0.61; p=0.08) and a greater tendency to have no preference (coefficient= -1.25; p=0.07). More racially black participants are needed to confirm this trend.

Finally, as for participants with other ethnic backgrounds, despite the fact there were only 7 in the group, they were actually found to have a negative preference for nonnative-speaking teachers, which was statistically significant. Specifically, on average, while holding other variables constant, they were found to have a lower preference for nonnative-speaking teachers in comparison to racially white participants (coefficient= -
1.24; \( p=0.04 \). A similar trend was found when teachers are excluded as well. However, as mentioned, this group consists of only 7 participants and their racial backgrounds are too diverse (i.e. Arabic, Russian, Latin, Somali, and unspecified racial backgrounds) to draw any patterns. More participants in these racial minority groups are needed to further analyze this finding.

In sum, the variable Race did not seem to have a statistically significant association with participants’ characterization of “native speaker,” but interestingly, among L1 English participants, racially Asian participants were found to have lower preferences for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers than native speakers of English.

Native Languages

The final independent variable is participants’ Native language(s). Figure 11 provides a visual representation of the mean index scores among participants with different native language(s), namely English (E), Chinese (C), Korean (K), multilingual speakers—“mix” (M), and monolingual speakers of other languages—“other” (O). The corresponding index scores are as follows: “Native-speaker” definition (E: 11.15 vs. C: 12.20 vs. K: 13.35 vs. M: 11.64 vs. O: 11.60), Preference for native speakers (E: 7.50 vs. C: 8.89 vs. K: 10.9 vs. M: 7.63 vs. O: 7.33), No preference (E: 7.34 vs. C: 6.16 vs. K: 5.10 vs. M: 7.00 vs. O: 6.54), and Preference for nonnative speakers (E: 2.04 vs. C: 1.90 vs. K: 1.00 vs. M: 2.26 vs. O: 2.42).
The mean index scores seem to indicate that native speakers of Chinese and Korean have a more idealized characterization of “native speaker” and a stronger preference for native-speaking teachers, as well as lower preference for nonnative-speaking teachers in comparison to native speakers of English. This seems to be in line with the proposed hypotheses (7a), (7b), and (7c). While no statistical significance was found between native speakers of Chinese and Korean and a lower preference for nonnative-speaking teachers, they were found to have a statistically significant association of their characterization of “native speaker” with preference for native-
speaking teachers. Specifically, in comparison to those who listed English as their only native language, on average, while holding other variables constant, those who listed Chinese and Korean as their native language were found to have a statistically positive association with the “Native speaker” definition (Chinese: coefficient=1.17; \( p=0.00 \); Korean: coefficient=2.31; \( p=0.00 \)), a Preference index score for having a native-speaking language teacher (Chinese: coefficient=1.91; \( p=0.00 \); Korean: coefficient=4.12; \( p=0.00 \)), and consequently, a negative association for having No preference was also found (Chinese: coefficient=-2.31; \( p=0.00 \); Korean: coefficient=-3.74; \( p=0.01 \)).

This indicates that native speakers of Chinese and Korean participating in this study have a tendency to have a more specified and possibly idealized “Native-speaker” definition, and their tendency to prefer native-speaking language teachers is stronger. As for the Korean speakers, while it may seem that their characterization of “native speaker” is more idealized and that their preference for having native-speaking teachers is much stronger than that of native speakers of Chinese, it is important to note that the number of participants whose native language is Korean was only 10, as against 105 for native speakers of Chinese (See Table 5 in 3.1.1). Therefore, more Korean participants are needed to confirm this finding. However, it is still noteworthy that these Korean speakers studying in different language classes show such similarity in their preferences.

\[149\) Similar patterns were observed when teacher participants were excluded as well.

\[150\) This finding seems to explain the source of the slightly stronger preference for native-speaking teachers found among participants from Japanese courses, since the Japanese program had a large number of students whose native language is Chinese. But the same significant difference was found when Chinese and Korean participants were excluded from the multiple regression. Specifically, in comparison to Japanese class participants, on average, while holding other variables at their means, Chinese class participants were found to have a significantly negative association with the Preference index score for native-speaking teachers (coefficient= -0.68; \( p=0.05 \)), even without the L1 Chinese speakers.
characterizations of “native speaker” and in their strong preference for native-speaking teachers. The strong preference for native-speaking teachers that these Chinese and Korean speakers seem to hold might possibly help explain why Asian language speaking ESL students in Moussu’s report showed negative attitudes towards nonnative-speaking teachers.

As for multilingual speakers, based on the mean index score, their “Native speaker” definition index score and Preference index score for native-speaking teachers seem to be a little higher than that of native speakers of English, which is contrary to the hypotheses (7d) and (7e). However, no statistically significant association was found. As for their Preference index score for nonnative-speaking teachers, it seems to be slightly stronger than that of native speakers of English, which is in line with the hypothesis (7f). This was found to have a statistically significant positive association. Specifically, on average, while holding other variables constant, in comparison to native speakers of English, multilingual speakers were found to have a positive association with a Preference index score for nonnative-speaking teachers of the target language (coefficient=0.92; \( p=0.02 \)). A similar trend is found when teachers are excluded as well. Unlike the case with multiracial participants, multilingual speakers were found to have a stronger preference for nonnative-speaking teachers, which could indicate a predisposition to embrace diversity.

As for other language speakers, none of the index scores were found to have a statistically significant association, though their slightly stronger preference for nonnative-speaking teachers was close to being statistically significant when teachers are
included (coefficient=0.92; \(p=0.06\)). As with the case with other racial participants, this group consists of participants of too many different linguistic backgrounds (i.e. Spanish, Russian, German, Japanese, etc.) to draw any patterns. More participants hailing from these linguistically minority groups are needed for further analysis.

In sum, in comparison to native speakers of English, native speakers of Chinese and Korean were found to have a more specific and idealized characterization of “native speaker” and a stronger preference for having native-speaking teachers, and multilingual speakers were found to have a stronger preference for nonnative-speaking teachers.

A summary of multiple regression results is displayed in Table 17 (with teachers) and in Table 18 (without teachers). Independent variables that were found to have a statistically significant association with participants’ characterization of “native speaker” were their Status as a teacher or student, Age, and their Native language (Chinese and Korean in particular). For Preference index scores, respondents’ Language program, Language level, Race (Asian in particular), and Native language (Chinese, Korean, and multilingual speakers, in particular) were found to have a statistically significant influence.
## Table 17. Summary of regression analysis results, teachers included

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Native pref</th>
<th>No pref</th>
<th>Nonnative pref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coef.</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>coef.</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>-1.92*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang Prog (Jap)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (male)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (18-24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or older</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level (Level 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (white)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native lang (Eng)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other language</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Square</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 567

* *p<.05

151 Reference group is in the parentheses for each independent variable.

152 This analysis excluded 22 student participants and 4 teacher participants who did not respond to all of the survey items by leaving out some of their background characteristics and/or survey items unanswered.
### Table 18. Summary of regression results, teachers excluded

4.7. Summary

In summary, quantitative data from the survey questionnaires (N=593) indicated that many participants associated native-speaker status with a variety of abilities, such as competency in a variety of subjects and situations (77%), reading and writing ability (73%), pronunciation without foreign accent (60%), and an ability to use grammatical patterns without mistakes (55%), as well as the ability to teach their native language as a second language (30%). Student participants (in comparison to teacher participants), younger participants (though inconclusive without including teacher participants), and
native speakers of Chinese and Korean (in comparison to native speakers of English) were found to associate native speaker with more specific, and perhaps idealized, characteristics.

Survey results showed that native-speaking language teachers were preferred in many areas, including pronunciation (92%), advanced-level speaking/listening classes (73%) and reading/writing classes (59%). Many believed that native speakers embody the linguistic standard for the target language (64%). None of the index criteria reached 50% for preferring nonnative-speaking language teachers, though some participants regarded them as compassionate (41%) and preferred them when studying grammar (36%). Overall, native-speaking teachers were more preferred than nonnative-speaking teachers.

Qualitative data showed that participants judged someone’s identity as a native or nonnative speaker of the target language by criteria such as their appearance, name, and linguistic ability. Table 16 provided the list of iconic characteristics of native- and nonnative-speaking teachers collected from participants’ comments on the pros and cons of having native or nonnative-speaking teachers and their opinions of team teaching. The list illustrates the incidence of fractal recursivity in that the opposition of native vs. nonnative speaker is projected onto other domains such as foreign vs. similar, non-American vs. American, intimidating vs. approachable, standard vs. non-standard, full vs. limited, and natural vs. unnatural, etc.

Students enrolled in Level 3 or higher classes (as opposed to Level 1 students), as well as Chinese and Korean speakers (in comparison to native speakers of English),
showed a stronger preference for native-speaking teachers. Similarly, teacher participants, in comparison to Level 1 students, expected their students to prefer native-speaking teachers as well. Interestingly, this tendency was not observed among other racially Asian participants whose native language is English. In fact, this particular group of racially Asian, L1 English-speaking participants were found to not care, as much as racially white participants did, about the identity of their language teacher as a native or nonnative speaker of the target language. Further, multilingual speakers, in comparison to monolingual native speakers of English, were found to have a stronger preference for nonnative-speaking teachers. Likewise, teacher participants, in comparison to L1 students, also expected their students to prefer nonnative-speaking teachers.

Finally, while participants from the Japanese and Chinese programs showed similar preference trends for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers, statistical analysis revealed that participants from the Japanese program had a slightly stronger preference for native-speaking teachers, and a slightly lower preference for nonnative-speaking teachers (when teacher participants were excluded). This may indicate that effects of the native speaker fallacy are more present in the Japanese language program. As part of the qualitative analysis of the development of language teachers of Japanese and Chinese in the language program in the next chapter, relevant communal differences between these Japanese and Chinese language programs that might explain the statistical findings will be noted.
Chapter 5: Qualitative Analysis and Discussion

The previous chapter reported quantitative findings with regards to the characterization of “native speaker” of the target language and preferential trends concerning native- and nonnative-speaking teachers, in this study’s survey of students and teachers in the Japanese and Chinese language programs of a university in the American midwest. Participants’ characterizations of “native speaker” and trends in their preferences were analyzed with selected variables using multiple regression. As part of the chapter, the criteria that participants used to judge someone’s (non)native-speaker status, or to determine pros and cons of having native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers, and participants’ views on team teaching were discussed as well. While survey participants from both the Japanese and Chinese programs showed similar attitudes towards native- and nonnative-speaking teachers, participants from the Japanese program were found to have a more pronounced preference for native-speaking teachers, and slightly less preference for nonnative-speaking teachers.

This chapter provides a qualitative analysis, specifically, by closely looking at the construct of the iconized native speaker and its effects on teachers, mostly new GTAs, in the language programs being studied. To do so, relevant hiring experiences of language teachers in the language programs will be reviewed first. Then descriptions of “native speaker” that are used as a model in the language program will be reviewed, followed by
a discussion of how teachers were grouped in the Japanese and Chinese language programs as target and base natives with respective default specialties as Act and Fact teachers. Then more information about the language programs will be provided, specifically, its Performed Culture Approach to language pedagogy (“PCA”) and how it was initially introduced to language teachers new to the program in an intensive week-long teacher-training practicum. The programs’ grading system will be briefly introduced and reviewed as well. Some of the relevant communal differences between the Japanese and Chinese programs will be noted. Finally, I will describe some relevant language socialization experiences of four participants in this study who were new to the language program, namely: Harumi, Regina, Suzan, and Frank. To explore possible sources of the apparent communal differences between the Japanese and Chinese language programs, relevant experiences of other teachers of Japanese and Chinese in the program will be referenced as needed.

5.1. The hiring process

As laid out in Table 5 in 3.1.1 and Tables 7 and 8 in 3.2.2, there was a good mix of self-identified native and nonnative speakers of Japanese and Chinese hired as language teachers in the language programs investigated. Unlike language programs that open their teaching positions for only to native speakers of the target language, teaching positions (whether lectureships or GTAships) in this program are offered to nonnative speakers as well as divergent native speakers of the target language. Thus, the assessment of what is thought to qualify them as candidate focal teachers is of interest.
Before discussing their relevant experiences, it must be noted that much of the ambivalence and sense of insecurity that will be discussed in this section and throughout this chapter may in fact be associated with the relative inexperience of GTAs who may be novice language teachers, as well as their shortcomings in proficiency in the target language, in the cases of nonnative GTAs.\textsuperscript{153} Such anxiety is inevitable and, though participants in this study were directly prompted to talk about their anxiety in relation to their identity as native or nonnative speakers of the target language, it must be noted that it is difficult to pinpoint a single source of anxiety.

Further, to put the experiences of GTAs being “hired” as language teachers in the language program into better perspective, it is important to look at the “hiring” or appointment process from the perspective of making these awards. One of the Japanese faculty members, who is in charge of interviewing and assessing the target language ability of candidates for GTA positions, listed the following foci:

(1) Japanese proficiency. She said that she interviews each candidate in Japanese and assesses his/her spoken skill. She said that candidates who have passed the JLPT (Japanese Language Proficiency Test) N1 level are preferred.\textsuperscript{154} She tries to

\textsuperscript{153} Although all of the nonnative-speaking teacher participants were deemed to be qualified to teach in the language program at some point, their proficiency in the target language was not officially evaluated during this study.

\textsuperscript{154} Japanese Language Proficiency Test is “a test to measure and certify the Japanese-language proficiency of those whose native language is not Japanese” (http://www.jlpt.jp/e/about/message.html). It does this by testing examinees’ reading and listening ability. The JLPT has five levels: N1 (the most difficult), N2, N3, N4, and N5 (the easiest). Linguistic competence required for N1 is “the ability to understand Japanese used in a variety of circumstances.” For measuring reading ability, examinees’ ability to read and comprehend the structures and contents of logically complex and/or abstract writings on a variety of topics, such as newspaper editorials and critics, is tested. For measuring listening ability, examinees’ ability to understand, comprehend, and follow the ideas in orally presented materials is tested. This portion covers a broad range of settings such as coherent conversations, news reports, and lectures (spoken at natural speed). See the website for complete descriptions.
get some idea of the candidate’s reading ability by asking what s/he reads in Japanese. She hesitates to recommend the candidate to the Graduate Committee if the candidate has strong accent or persistent grammar errors, even if s/he has passed N1.

(2) Teaching experience. She said that she asks about the candidates’ teaching experience, whether or not it is teaching Japanese or teaching at the college level, to see if the candidate can reflect on and learn from his/her teaching experience.

(3) Enthusiasm. She makes note of whether the candidate is “full of energy” and has a positive attitude toward teaching, since GTAs need to be “engaging” as they work with their students, other GTAs, and lecturers/faculty members.

(4) Organization. She assesses the candidate’s ability to provide relevant information efficiently and in an organized manner, since good GTAs need to be efficient and organized.

(5) Research plan. She asks about the candidates’ research plans because she would like him/her to succeed not only as a teacher but as a researcher, too.

Another faculty member from the Japanese program noted that while the ease with which the new GTA’s use the target language is certainly a concern (for conducting class in the target language), there are other factors that come into play when hiring new GTAs. For instance, graduate students receive a scholarship that covers their tuition when they receive a GTA position in the language program. Since GTAs need to maintain a good academic record in order to keep their GTAship, the department has to take care of each GTA by assigning a job that s/he is able to handle without interfering with their
academic work. That idea, informed in large part by the proficiency level of the individuals, along with their overall GPA and GRE scores, are first considerations in deciding whether to offer a GTA position. Whether a GTAship is awarded may in turn become a decisive factor in some admitted applicants’ decision to enroll in the department. Almost annually, some admitted graduate students are awarded another scholarship (a one-year University Fellowship) for their first year, on the basis of criteria that have nothing to do with their language proficiency. If their academic performance is good, there is sometimes no other support to offer them for their second year and beyond except a GTAship. According to this faculty member, some such students have little interest in teaching language professionally. To expand on her comment, their research and teaching interests may center on linguistics or literature, for example. For them, a GTAship is a valuable means of support that makes graduate school possible, but since almost all the department’s GTAships are dedicated to its language programs, in accepting a GTAship, it is very likely that such students will be teaching language. The same professor commented that she would not be surprised if some of these GTAs might feel uncomfortable or even victimized when their pronunciation and/or teaching behavior is corrected by their teacher trainers. Finally, it would be remiss not to add that there have been more than a few MAs and PhDs from this program who combined language teaching with a minor in language pedagogy, as they majored in an area outside of language pedagogy.

As highlighted by this faculty member’s comments about differences that exist among different GTAs in the language program, it is important to be aware of the
heterogeneity that exists among different language teachers discussed in this chapter.

When students are also teachers, student/teacher may be a nice clean dichotomy, but it is a rather simplistic dichotomy—just as simplistic as the dichotomy between native and nonnative teachers that this dissertation has critiqued. Some were experienced and motivated language teachers, while others were quite inexperienced and/or less unmotivated.

Although the hiring process itself was not directly observed as part of this study, some of the teacher participants, lecturer and GTA, shared information from their experience of being evaluated prior to being hired, particularly as it related to their identity as a native or nonnative speaker of the target language. Among the four focal participants, it is interesting to point out that the only one who, without prompting, commented on the experience of the hiring process was Harumi, who self-identified as a native speaker of Japanese. She was actually describing her experience at a different teacher-training program, where she started her teaching career, but she said she felt “unqualified,” because, though she could not remember the details, she “did not do well during the first interview, and especially [during] the teaching demo[nstration].” The other three participants (likewise GTAs) did not go out of their way to comment on their hiring process because they had been in the graduate program for at least a year prior to being hired as GTAs, and they were offered this position because their language ability had been informally assessed in face-to-face interaction in Japanese in their graduate courses. Similarly, other teachers participating in this study who had been in the program prior to being hired as GTA language teachers did not recall having an interview either.
However, there were other teachers, who self-identified as nonnative speakers of the target language, who reported having an interview with a “language evaluator” in the program, prior to being offered a position. For example, Katrina, who identified herself as a nonnative speaker of Japanese, said she felt somewhat “unqualified” when she met with the language program director for the position. Specifically, she recalled being told by the program director at the time that they had actually wanted a native speaker of Japanese, since the number of native-speaking teachers in the program was scarce in that particular year. She reported feeling unqualified because she was not the native speaker that they wanted. But at the same time, she reports, she felt satisfied that she had been considered a candidate for the position. Though she is not sure whether her level of Japanese was being evaluated at the time of the meeting, she managed to interact with the program director in Japanese during the meeting and felt that she somehow proved herself worthy of being hired for the position. This is an interesting case to note because despite the fact that native speakers were needed by the program, and perhaps because there were no other native-speaking teacher candidates, Katrina was chosen for a position in which she was required to teach both Act and Fact classes as a full-time lecturer.\textsuperscript{155}

Unlike the school principal in Kubota’s study (2009), the program director at the time did not seem to focus on the interviewee’s status as a (non)native speaker of Japanese.

Another study participant, Andrew, who self-identified as a nonnative speaker of Japanese, also talked about how his language assessment interview "left (him) feeling inadequate." It must be noted that, though this comment was his direct response to the

\textsuperscript{155} Katrina had been in the program before and had already received her teacher training prior to being hired for the lecturer position.
question about the hiring experience, Andrew’s feeling of inadequacy may have come from his limited experience with the Japanese language, since he did not have any work or teaching experience in Japanese prior to becoming a GTA in this language program. This feeling of inadequacy may also have been fueled by his own sense of iconized superiority of native speaking teachers of Japanese as well.\footnote{In the Teacher Questionnaire A, he expected his students to prefer native-speaking teachers for 11 items, which exceeds the teachers’ average of 9.38. As in the cases with other teacher participants, his proficiency in Japanese was not evaluated during this study, and since the interviews were conducted in English with Andrew, the only data we have of Andrew speaking Japanese is from his Act sessions, which will be discussed in Section 5.3.} He considered himself a nonnative speaker of Japanese because he “started learning Japanese as an adult and never had long-term exposure to the language.” Though the results of his interview determined that he was qualified to teach Japanese, he was and is not satisfied with his performance in Japanese because he has very “high standards” regarding himself as far as language is concerned, and he feels he never quite measures up to his own standards as a language learner. Andrew’s dissatisfaction with his Japanese is reminiscent of Xia’s dissatisfaction with her English in Park’s study (2007) in that, as nonnative speakers of the target language, both report feeling that the quality of their target language does not meet their own “standards.”

Shane and Samantha’s cases provide a different perspective. Shane considered himself a nonnative speaker of Japanese, because he, too, learned the language later in his life. But despite being nervous beforehand, he said that “the [hiring] interview was actually a breeze in terms of its linguistic demands.” He explained that his confidence came from the fact that he had worked in Japan for more than three years, often dealing with phone conversations with complete strangers. Samantha, another participant from
the Chinese program, identified herself as a nonnative speaker of Chinese because she learned Chinese later in her life as well. Her interview was done both in English and Chinese since English was not her first language either. As with Shane, Samantha was actually confident about her Chinese because she majored in Chinese in college in Korea, and had spent 1.5 years in Beijing. Further, she had studied Chinese linguistics for her Master’s degree and she worked as a Chinese language instructor in Korea for one year. These experiences seem to have contributed to her confidence in her Chinese language ability. Interestingly, what she was worried about was her English ability, because she did not have as much experience with English as she did with Chinese. In fact, she said she was surprised when she learned that she had gotten the teaching associateship because she thought her English was not good enough to teach “American students.” Shane and Samantha’s cases illustrate that nonnative-speaking teachers do not necessarily feel insecure about their language ability in the target language, if they have gained confidence through extensive experience in target language communities. Samantha’s experience illustrates another source of insecurity that nonnative-speaking teachers have, namely when their first language does not match the language used in the country and institution where they teach.

157 This study focused on the issue of native and nonnative speakers of Japanese and Chinese as the target languages, but the English ability of international students, like Samantha, is an interesting aspect that needs to be investigated as well, since most of the native speakers of Japanese and Chinese in this study are in fact international students, whose English ability was tested as part of the hiring practice. One faculty member said that “this is a more high-stake test that is required of all international students applying for GTA-ship.”

158 Samantha said she was assigned to teach Act classes only, so that she would not need to use English in class.
Such generalizations as can be made here must be based on only a small number of reported cases of teachers’ experiences in being hired and starting out as teachers, but what might they be? While some nonnative-speaking participants, Katrina and Andrew, associated their “unqualified” feelings with this or that aspect of their nonnative life experience (e.g. status as learners of Japanese, proficiency level in Japanese, and limited work and teaching experience in Japanese language, etc.), there were other nonnative-speaking teachers, Shane and Samantha, who did not express feelings of being “unqualified,” in large part, it seems, thanks to their confidence in using the target language. Harumi’s case, discussed briefly at the beginning of this section, reminds us that even native-speaking teachers do not necessarily have confidence when their ability to teach the standard version of their native language is evaluated.

In the next section, specific characterizations of “native speaker” of the relevant target language that are referred to as a model in these language programs will be documented.

5.2. Iconization of “the native speaker”

In the first hour of the intensive teacher training observed in Autumn Semester of 2014,\(^{159}\) the teacher-training supervisor first explained the long-term objectives of the

---

\(^{159}\) The intensive teacher training refers to the one conducted weekday afternoons by the department, specifically for language teachers of Japanese, Chinese, and Korean (though there were no Korean teacher trainees in Autumn 2014). It was the department’s afternoon sequel to a multi-departmental language teacher training session held every morning of the teacher training week, which daily consisted of new GTAs teaching their language of assignment in small peer groups in sessions of increasing duration, followed (also daily) by lectures or demonstrations related to the next morning’s teaching. The participating departments choose how their GTAs spend their afternoons. The departmental teacher training that was observed for this study was held every afternoon, after the multi-departmental morning sessions and a lunch break.
language program, as well as how “culture” is perceived in the program, along with what kind of “native speaker” they use as a model to help their students understand and pursue their long-term objectives. Prior to explaining these things, he handed out a set of documents for the new teacher trainees to read and follow. Among other things, the long-term objectives as well as the grading criteria used in the language program were printed on these documents. The grading criteria are found in Appendix D and will be discussed in 5.5.

The teacher-training supervisor quoted one of the primary long-term objectives of language students in the language program as “the ability to be somebody, someone who moves easily, and effectively—in the culture and society [they] are studying by means of the language [they] are studying.” He explained that, by culture here, he did not mean commonly associated cultural artifacts such as music and literature (though these things too constitute culture), but defined it, for the purposes of foreign language pedagogy, as “tradition” or “ways of doing things together.” He said that, in the process of growing up and becoming socialized in the culture, people come to develop tacit expectations for interacting with other people in their culture. Such tacit knowledge includes agreed-upon ways of interacting—knowing rules like who speaks first, who waits in silence or provides verbal and nonverbal feedback, and what kind of things are said by what kinds of people in given contexts. Language, for the purposes of “our teaching,” is regarded as part of such culture. He quoted another long-term objective for language students in the program as “developing friendships and lasting associations with people who live in that culture and language.” To do so, he emphasized that students should subordinate their
mindset of wanting to learn to “say what they want to say,” to wanting to learn first “what is appropriate to say in the target culture, when, where, by and to whom, for which ends.” In this manner, he emphasized the importance of a notion of culture that encompasses language, and advised his teacher trainees to guide their students to pay attention to both explicit (i.e. stated rules such as taking the shoes off before entering someone’s house, etc.) and implicit (i.e. tacit rules such agreed upon ways of interacting mentioned above, etc.) conventions that people in target language communities follow.

To achieve these pedagogical purposes, the teacher-training supervisor explained that “native speaker” is defined in the program as follows: “For our purposes, a native speaker is someone from the target culture who is not familiar with foreigners and foreign language.” This characterization assumes native speakers of the target language to have limited or no access to interacting with “foreign language speakers” and, thus, little chance of developing “foreigner-friendly” habits in Japanese—which learners might come to depend on. This kind of native speaker may actually apply to the majority of the target language community populations. It should be noted that the statement does not mean that all native speakers lack such experience of interacting with foreigners. Rather, it says that these are the kind of native speakers imagined when designing their learners’ pedagogical regimen. He was explicitly referring to a subset of native speakers, even if it is a generalized group, and noted that there is a pedagogical reason for advising their learners that this subset should be their imagined audience going forward, which will be explained shortly.
On top of this characterization, other specific characterizations of “native speaker” are referenced in each language program, in different contexts. In the Japanese program, according to the descriptions provided in the introductory-level textbook used (Jorden & Noda, 1987, p. 1), which teacher trainees were advised to read, the standard dialect of Japanese spoken by educated natives of Tokyo is used as the variety of Japanese being targeted by the material. On the other hand, in the Chinese program, Mandarin is used as the model dialect. According to their introductory-level textbook (Walker & Lang, 2004), Mandarin is an official language of China used in education and public activities. It is one of the seven mutually unintelligible “dialects” of Chinese spoken by approximately 70% of Chinese speakers. While Mandarin has several varieties that appear to be clearly different from one another, Pūtōnghuà ‘standard Chinese’ is used in the text. China is described as a linguistically complex country and readers of the textbook are informed that they are likely to find themselves in a bilingual environment in the country. In sum, both the Japanese and Chinese language program assume their “native speakers” to lack communicative ability in other foreign languages, but there seems to be more rooms for other non-standard dialects to be incorporated in the Chinese program.161

Many participating teachers expressed a strong desire to have the pronunciation of the standard dialect. Participating teachers’ responses to a question in the Teacher

160 Historically, this meant the upland or Yamanote parts of Tokyo, where upper class people lived when the parameters of standard Japanese were first worked out, during the Meiji period (1868-1912).
161 It is important to point out that the very acknowledgement of a standard language entails the existence of greater variety behind it, and it does not exist without the recognition of non-homogeneous linguistic state. While some of the regional varieties of Chinese are mutually so unintelligible that they are considered to be different “languages,” the regional differences in Japanese are still safely considered to be dialect, and so is the relation of those languages/dialects to the language considered to be standard. The textbook used in the Japanese program does not claim that the standard dialect is the only one spoken in Japan, but it has little to say about the other languages or dialects of Japan, per se.
Questionnaire Part B will illustrate this point. As part of the questionnaire, they were asked to say, if they could choose any pronunciation, including their own, what kind of Japanese or Chinese pronunciation they would most like to have. While some chose their own pronunciation because they valued their “regional identity” with their own dialect, many teachers either perceived their own pronunciation as the standard variety or chose the standard variety as shown in the comments below:

- “Standard Japanese (because it is) widely accepted.”—Japanese teacher
- “Probably standard Tokyo pronunciation. Simply because it is considered a standard against which nonnatives’ Japanese pronunciation is measured.”—Japanese teacher
- “I would like to have a standard Tokyo accent, because that would be the most useful example I could provide for my students. But if I wasn’t teaching, I would like to have a Kansai accent because that’s where I lived when I was in Japan, so it’s the part of the country that has the most meaning to me.”—Japanese teacher
- “Just the standard Tokyo dialect of Japanese, since this is the most widely taught as well as the one associated with formal/news/academic settings.”—Japanese teacher
- “I would like to have a Tokyo accent because it is usually considered the standard accent.”—Japanese teacher
- “I want to master standard Japanese just for teaching Japanese in a formal classroom, but I also like my own dialect and want to study more about my own dialect as well.”—Japanese teacher
- “North eastern accent. It’s very clear and easy to understand. Also considered very “standard” in the field.”—Chinese teacher
- “I like a standard Chinese accent that has some features of the Beijing accent.”—Chinese teacher
- “Maybe I will choose Beijing accent, because it is usually considered as the “standard” and “prestigious” dialect.”—Chinese teacher
• “I will still choose the one that I have now. I will categorize it as “accent free, pleasant to hear.””—Chinese teacher

• “Standard Mandarin, i.e. Putonghua. It is THE standard, used in news broadcasting, education system, etc.”—Chinese teacher

Those who grew up speaking the standard dialect said that they were comfortable with their pronunciation in the standard dialect.

Interestingly, some Chinese teachers attributed their confidence in the standard dialect with their performance on the national exam as illustrated in the following comments:

• “I started to speak and practice Mandarin since I was seven. I also took a Mandarin test in China and the grade is quite good.”—Chinese teacher

• “Because I’m native speaker and I have a National Mandarin Level 2 Grade A certification (the highest level is Level 1 Grade A).”—Chinese teacher.

• “Because I accepted [sic] test before and the result was positive.”—Chinese teacher

In contrast, those who did not grow up speaking the standard dialects or spent a long time outside of the target language communities had mixed opinions about their pronunciation, some comfortable, others somewhat uncomfortable, such as those illustrated in the comments below, which were given in response to the same question:

• “… People in Japan sometimes comment that my Japanese is a little un-native like. I’m not very articulate in pronunciation. Students with good ears would be able to compare with audio materials spoken by native Japanese speakers. Students might lose confidence with my teaching as far as pronunciation goes.”—Japanese teacher

• “[I feel comfortable with my pronunciation] most of [the] time, but some accents, no. I have learned that there are some words or sentences that I do not say with proper accents described in the textbook.”—Japanese teacher
“Overall, I feel comfortable, as I have never encountered major difficulties in making myself understood, even by native speakers who do not regularly converse with foreigners, and do not speak English.”—Japanese teacher

“More or less, yes [I feel comfortable]. I rarely have to re-state myself, and when I do it’s because I have to talk around some vocabulary item I don’t have. If people are able to understand what I’m saying, and don’t show furrowed brows when I’m speaking, I guess from this that I sound acceptably good.”—Japanese teacher

“More or less comfortable. I do not think I am making glaring mistakes in pronunciation when speaking Japanese. Accent I am fine with, as long as I am able to express myself in literary [sic] Japanese and convey my thought in its entirety exactly as I tend to. Frankly this (the ability to formulate my thought on any subject) has been more of a concern to me than pronunciation.”—Japanese teacher

“I think I have a slight foreigner’s accent… my pitch accent can be a bit off… I have been told that, ironically, when I’m concentrating and speaking slowly, my pitch accent is more off than when I am not concentrating and speaking faster. This may be a reflection, however, of the tendency of pitch accent to be de-emphasized when speaking faster and longer sentences. I have the roughest time when I have to switch back and forth between English and Japanese. In those cases, I notice that I think I use the English stress-accent system on top of my Japanese.”—Japanese teacher

“I am almost always comfortable with my pronunciation. I have worked hard at it, possibly more than any other aspect of my Japanese, since I first began studying… After years of using Japanese I am finally content with my own pronunciation. There are some extremely fluent foreigners that show up on Japanese TV as “tarento,” whom I do admire (in a linguistic sense only) to an extent, but at this point I wouldn’t say that I want to sound like them.”—Japanese teacher

“It depends. It if it just talking to friends, I feel comfortable as long as I can make my Japanese comprehensible. But when I teach, I always have to be more careful because if I pronounce words wrong, students might imitate my errors.”—Japanese teacher

“Pretty comfortable for the most part.” Whatever nonnative accent I may have, I feel like it’s something I can improve on but not something I need to feel embarrassed about.”—Japanese teacher
• “I think I sound a lot like a native speaker.”—Chinese teacher

• “It’s how I sound. Could people still understand me? That’s probably the only concern for me. Obviously for my students. I’d want to make sure they weren’t modeling their accent on me though.”—Chinese teacher

It is interesting to point that it was common for nonnative-speaking teachers to attribute their source of confidence in their pronunciation to their ability to communicate with people in the target language communities. Few of them seemed to feel that they have acquired a native-speaker-like pronunciation in the standard dialect of the target language. However, while most teachers seemed comfortable with their pronunciation, some Japanese teachers, including native speakers of Japanese, indicated some concerns with regards to their pronunciation as language teachers. They seemed to feel that their pronunciation deviated from the standard dialect presented in the teaching materials, and seemed somewhat insecure about themselves modeling some of the pitch-accent patterns for students. In other words, they did not seem confident as language teachers about having their own dialect or native language influencing their standard dialect in the target language. Native-speaking teachers of Chinese, on the other hand, did not seem so concerned with their pronunciation, even though some of them grew up speaking a non-standard dialect while using the standard dialect in school. From a sociopolitical perspective, it seems that non-standard dialect-speaking teachers of Japanese are more affected by the iconization of “native speaker” than are native standard-dialect speakers. In all of this, the unique characteristics of non-standard dialect speakers as well as those of speakers of other language(s) seem to be disregarded. These can be regarded as instances of Irvine and Gal’s erasure.
This discrepancy in responses on this issue across the Chinese and Japanese programs may be due to different degrees of standardization manifested in each language community. The fact that only 70% of Chinese speakers speak the standard dialect seems to indicate that the standardization in China is not as thorough as that of Japan, which leaves some room for non-standard dialects of Chinese to be used in everyday communication. It is possible that native-speaking teachers of Chinese felt okay to have their non-standard dialect influencing their standard dialect because they are more used to using both to communicate in Chinese communities. It may be that pressure to use the standard dialect in Japanese is relatively stronger than in Chinese. In fact, the degree of reinforcement or encouragement to use the standard dialect in each language program seemed to be manifested differently. As will be discussed in 5.4, adherence to the standard Japanese dialect seemed a little stricter, which may be a cause for some speakers of non-standard dialects of Japanese to feel “guilty” or “embarrassed” for not having “perfect” standard Japanese pronunciation or pitch-accent patterns. Interestingly, dialect speakers of Chinese in the program, such as speakers of Shanghai dialect, Hong Kong dialect, and Cantonese, did not seem to feel the same sense of “guilt” at not measuring up. One Cantonese dialect speaker in the program said that, while she used “her” Mandarin to teach her class, she did not feel pressure to use “perfect” Mandarin in the program. She felt okay using “her” Mandarin, which she feels is influenced by her Cantonese. She attributed this to the fact that the teacher trainer in the Chinese program was a nonnative speaker who seemed to be okay with the Cantonese influence in her standard speech, as long as the standard language was used in class. She also explained that native-speaker
faculty members in the Chinese program that she worked with were Cantonese dialect speakers, and she did not feel pressure to use “perfect” standard dialect from them either. Her comments seem to illustrate that Chinese teachers in the language program receive relatively less pressure to strictly adhere to the standard dialect pronunciation.

Though adherence to the standard dialect seemed to be manifested differently in each program, the teachers of Japanese and Chinese new to the program were instructed to use the standard dialect, since this was the language presented in all their students’ materials. They were also advised not to speak English in Act class, though brief written cues in English were not discouraged. Under this “No spoken English” rule, they were encouraged to communicate in the target language with their learners as well as between teachers outside of Act class, to the extent possible. After touching on the kind of native speakers of the target language who would be the learners’ target audience, the supervising teacher trainer advised against the notion that teachers of Chinese and Japanese should simply provide students with opportunities to “say what they want to say,” and noted that “what is said” in this or that situation is also a matter of preferred local precedent, and in this context emphasized the importance of using the target cultures and languages as models:

We (as language teachers) need to [guide our students in] do[ing] things in their way … in ways they are used to… We deal in some detail—turn taking in conversation, grammatical structure, and semantic development, and with phonology—but what we are trying to do is to make the learners come to

\[162\] She did, however, talk about how she felt pressured to use standard Mandarin when she was interviewing for a job elsewhere. This illustrates the fact that there are those who strictly adhere to the standard dialect in Chinese programs as well, and also the advantage and usefulness of the standard dialect in formal settings.
understand phonology, grammar, and vocabulary as things they perform, and when they perform them, they do it [according to] their local customs.

While acknowledging and describing the effects of the construct of “the native speaker” from a sociopolitical perspective are important, it must be noted that some kind of consistent characterization of “native speaker” seems to be quite useful from a pedagogical perspective, i.e. in providing effective language pedagogy. The uniformity of the standard dialect gives learners a specific range of targets for the behaviors they will begin to learn to perform. The standard dialects used as their performance models are used in much public communication across different media, and are the most widely understood variants of Chinese and Japanese. If we were to resist the standardization process by not incorporating the standard dialect as language teachers, then what other dialects should we start the language program with? Perhaps, it would be possible to start out teaching language learners fragments of two or three dialects. Indeed, learning another regional dialect is possible, even desirable when the learner knows s/he will be living in that region. But more language learners should find it more useful and have a better chance to be more successful if they develop advanced skill in the standard dialect. This is because a standard dialect like Japan’s hyōjungo and China’s Pǔtōnghuà is a lingua franca which provides a useful common ground on first meeting for speakers of different dialects who are strangers. Further, it can be quite useful to use the standard dialect as a lingua franca when learning a non-standard dialect. In other words, learning the standard dialect can provide a legitimate first step in learning to communicate in Japan, which, far from shutting any doors, sets learners up to extend their abilities into other dialects, according to their needs and interests.
To summarize this section, the stated long-term objectives of the Japanese and Chinese programs are to help their language learners to develop the ability to be somebody who can move in the target society effectively and easily, as well as to help them develop lasting associations with people in the target culture. To achieve these pedagogical purposes, target native speakers in the Japanese and Chinese programs were described as standard dialect speakers with limited experience using foreign languages. Many language teachers expressed that they had, or desired to have, the standard dialect pronunciation, and different levels of confidence were expressed regarding their ability to model in the standard dialect. Some negative effects of the standardization were seen in some of the Japanese teachers who felt “guilty” if their pronunciation deviated from the standard dialect. On the other hand, the usefulness of teaching a standard dialect has been discussed from a pedagogical perspective, which allows for a single performance target, and sets up language learners to be able to communicate with a wide variety of people in the target culture, as well as to use it as a lingua franca to learn local dialects.

The next section will discuss how the language program divided instructional time in line with differences in language teachers’ backgrounds, quite apart from the “native” vs. “nonnative” dichotomy.

5.3. Act and Fact/Target- and Base natives

As briefly mentioned in 3.2.1, the language programs in question use Act and Fact sessions to provide language instruction (Christensen & Warnick, 2006). A simplistic explanation of the difference between the two is the language used to direct and conduct
class. In Act class, both teachers and students are expected to speak only the target language, so the first target language incorporated in class is classroom instructions such as *eego o tukawanai de kudasai*, ‘Please don’t use English,’ and *hon o minai de kudasai*, ‘Please don’t look at the textbook’ (see 5.3). In Fact class, both Japanese and English are used to discuss grammar, pragmatics, and communicative culture. Though it varied from course to course, the ratio of Act and Fact sessions in the language class observed was usually about 4:1, so there were considerably more Act classes than Fact classes.

According to the teacher-training instructors, the Act class focuses on students' performance in the target culture by providing them opportunities to use target structural patterns, phrases and words appropriately, in culturally realistic situations that their teacher devises. To provide such situations for students, the teachers in training were trained to prepare visual aids or other means to help define a set of contexts with five specified elements, which together constitute a “performance” in the target culture. These elements are (1) a specified place of occurrence, (2) a specified time of occurrence, (3) a specified script, (4) a specified roles of occurrence, and (5) a specified audience (Carlson, 1996). All these elements must be specified in combinations that provide a realistic context that language students are likely to encounter in a target language community, and the teacher trainees of Japanese and Chinese were advised to stick with

---

163 Performance is regarded as “the enactment of scripts or behaviors situated at a specified time and place with roles and audiences specified… Performances are communicative events. In a foreign language class a performance consists of a pedagogical sample of language in a cultural context.” (Walker & Noda, 2010, p. 35).

164 The set is adapted for language pedagogy by Walker (2010, p. 8), from Carlson’s parameters of performance.
the “No spoken English” rule when providing these contexts. What is said and/or done (the “script”) is part of the context as well, even if some of it is only latent at the outset.

Further, the trainees were told that a long-term aim of Act class instruction is for learners to form memories of such target-culture performances, through experiencing variations of a large number of them over time. A remembered performance is characterized as a “story,”165 a bundle of mutually implicated components in memory.166 “Stories” are the memories that enable one’s participation in the target culture and language. Teachers are urged to keep this in mind as they plan the contexts and tasks that they will engage their students in; the idea is to come up with a coherent “story” that, in part or as a variation, students are likely to experience in the future, so that they can access what they remember when they encounter similar “stories” in the future (Walker & Noda, 2010). They refer to this approach in language instruction as “PCA” or Performed Culture Approach (Christensen & Warnick, 2006).

Act-class teacher training, as modeled, explained and discussed in this program’s intensive teacher-training practicum, focused on how to involve students in tasks (situations to negotiate in the target language) that require communication and are more or less topically driven and structured—talking about one and then other aspects of the task to be accomplished, such as when ordering food, relaying a phone message, planning a trip, etc. In this manner, students must choose and deploy the language that they have

165 Story is “the personal memory of having experienced a performance… Underlying the ability to participate in a culture is a memory for that culture, and that memory… consists of stories.” (Walker & Noda, 2010, p. 39).

166 Walker’s adaptation here recalls Bateson’s (1978, p. 13) characterization of a “story” as “a knot of relevance.”
previously encountered in assigned conversations and drills (using the textbook and its media) and live interaction (in class). Drills here are the mini-conversational exchanges of the response drills in these students’ materials, which are not topically driven or structured; rather, they provide modeling and practice of conversational moves and the situated use of particular lexical and grammatical items, in reduced contexts. A carefully selected variety of such drills can help ready a learner for more open-ended task negotiation in class, provided that interaction too is selectively designed.

Teachers were basically trained to come up with ways for their students to apply their language skills in class, by providing novel situations for them to perform in. The teacher trainees are advised to tell their students not to be looking at the textbook during Act class to make sure that students (1) come to class prepared, (2) engage thoroughly in the communicative activities at hand, (3) and observe their classmates’ performances. Trainees are also told to discourage students from note-taking in Act class. One explanation for this advice was that people in the target language communities are unlikely to take notes while communicating verbally in the kinds of everyday situations students will learn to negotiate. Based on the Japanese teacher trainer’s belief about what behaviors are considered culturally appropriate in Japanese school settings, other classroom rules for Act class were also given, such as not allowing students to cross their legs, or have their hands in their pockets when speaking in role, or wear hats, chew gum, drink beverages (unless due to illness), or eat food.167

167 In the training sessions that I observed, these guidelines were emphasized by the Japanese teacher trainer, and not as much by the Chinese teacher trainer.
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During the intensive teacher training, the language teachers new to the program were told to assume that students come to class prepared to perform the assigned materials. This expected preparation for students includes having practiced and become able to smoothly perform their assigned conversation(s), response drills, and application exercises (which unlike drills, are somewhat open-ended, with variable parts, goals, and response patterns), in various novel situations in the target language that their teacher provides in class. In other words, in advance of any Act class, students are assigned a set of rehearsal tasks, among them one or more conversation(s) to perform from memory (models available in print, audio, and video\textsuperscript{168}), as well as several response drills, available in print and audio. The length and complexity of assigned conversation(s) vary, but they are usually longer and more complex in the higher-level courses. Each of the assigned drills consists of 5-8 items, and each item takes the form of a conversational exchange of (a) an initiating utterance and (b) a (the student’s) response. The exchanges might comprise question and answer, suggestion and agreement, assertion and question (or correction), and so on. Thus, each drill item also constitutes a moment in a tacit larger interaction. If an Act class task is well designed, the tasks or situations-for-negotiation presented in class will create communicative contexts and needs that prompt students to employ moves, structures and vocabulary that they already know, whether from before the present lesson or from having rehearsed them in the conversation(s) and/or drills assigned for a given Act hour. Language students are encouraged to practice their target language with audio and video outside of class, so that they can maximize their target

\textsuperscript{168} Though one of the interactants in assigned conversation(s) is supposed to be a nonnative speaker, s/he is portrayed by a native speaker in the audio and video files.
language input. In this way, most language practice is expected to take place with audio and video outside of class, and not in class. In essence, this arrangement, in which students prepare assigned materials, is like what is commonly referred to as a flipped classroom model (e.g., Alvarez, 2011; Crouch & Mazur, 2001, etc.). The responsibility of learning new materials—learning new vocabulary items and grammatical patterns, as well as preparing to perform the assigned materials—is put on students prior to coming to class. It is incumbent on their teachers to ensure that Act class abounds in culturally realistic opportunities to utilize them in communicating.

Since skill acquisition requires more time, the Act component is given the majority of instruction time in the language courses. Because of this arrangement, and perhaps because it is rather difficult to learn to conduct an effective Act session, Act was more emphasized over Fact during the teacher training. In fact, demonstrations and practicum sessions taught by the trainees were conducted only in the context of introductory-level Act class in a classroom setting. To facilitate communication among students in Act classes, students typically sit in a semi-circle as shown in Figure 12.

---

169 The intensive training has occasionally, in the past, included a Fact component, but due to a shortened program, owing to a change in the University’s academic schedule, the Fact practicum was again cut out, although the trainees were encouraged to include Fact classes among those that they observed and reported on. Fact class teaching in Japanese is routinely assigned to more experienced teachers (faculty or GTAs), who are more familiar with the textbook. In addition, there is a graduate course that provides pedagogical training for teaching Fact class, for each language (Chinese, Japanese, and Korean) in the program.
Teachers who speak the target language as their native language and have been trained properly as language teachers are considered to be the best candidates for teaching Act class. In one of the reading assignments that the teacher trainees were assigned, target natives are described as “living examples of the target language and culture” who can provide “the perfect [or just right] linguistic and cultural model” for students to observe closely and to interact with (Jorden & Walton, 1987, pp. 121-122). Recall that the target natives identified as the learners’ assumed audience in this program are educated Tokyo dialect native speakers who are not used to communicating with people from other languages and cultures. To teach an Act class, all teachers, including dialect native speakers and nonnative speakers, have to play the role of educated monolingual speakers.
of the Tokyo dialect, even if they are not comfortable with the Tokyo dialect or lack
certain experiences, such as being educated in the Japanese education system.\footnote{170}

It may be uncomfortable for divergent native speakers of Japanese to play the role
of Act teacher if they are missing too many of the elements that “native speakers” are
expected to have. For example, Andrew’s dissatisfaction with his own language ability,
along with his adherence to the standards set by the language program, seemed to inform
his hesitations to “go beyond the textbook” in his classroom teaching. In fact, Andrew’s
Act sessions seemed to only involve having students perform the assigned dialogues and
engaging them in doing the response drills just as presented in the textbook. He continued
with other drills until the end of the class hours that I observed. In contrast to other
teachers’ Act sessions that I observed, he did not “modify” the materials assigned to
students for pre-class practice. Other teachers often reworded the moves and structures
that students had rehearsed in drills, and incorporated previously used vocabulary items
and structural patterns in their Act classes, which often required their students to be
creative, in appropriately applying previously learned material in novel situations, in
conjunction with newly introduced material. Andrew, at least in the Act sessions that I
observed, used only the same cues (= initiating utterances) as in the assigned drills. His
visual cues relied on written English accompanied by a picture of an item in discussion,
but besides the specified scripts and their roles as “A-san” and “B-san” as presented in

\footnote{170} Acknowledging and allowing divergent language teachers to use their non-standard dialect in their
teaching may be helpful for such teachers, but as discussed in 5.2, there are many pedagogical benefits to
using the standard dialect as a teaching/learning model that are otherwise difficult to obtain. Moreover,
there are numerous potential problems that may arise when incorporating non-standard dialects as a
teaching/learning model. These potential problems will be discussed later in this section.

193
the textbook, his contexts were most often set without specifying place of occurrence, time of occurrence, roles of occurrence, and audience (Figure 13).

![Figure 13. Andrew’s visual aid for an Act class](image)

In this way, Andrew seemed to be able to keep control over the language, helping to retain, perhaps, his authority as a teacher. He was fulfilling his responsibility as a language teacher by covering the assigned materials as exactly as presented in the book, but he did not seem to trust his language ability to provide any “modifications” or allow the creativity of determining what to say to respond to a situational exigency. Providing students situated opportunities to actively choose what to say in response to this or that moment in a larger activity is to provide them with chances to be creative, which are also chances to accomplish a local objective, and in doing so experience real communicative success. Conversely, not providing them with such opportunities seems to

---

171 See Miller’s (1984: 157ff) discussion of the notion of exigence, roughly something in an ongoing discourse that invites or prompts a rhetorical response.
ensure “reduced creativity,” which has been identified as a consequence of anxiety about using the foreign language (Horwitz, 1996).

The Fact mode allows students and teachers to use the language used in the educational institution of the language program (i.e. English), which is the base language of all but foreign students. The purpose of Fact class is to provide detailed linguistic and cultural analysis, along with pedagogical guidance in techniques that are meaningful to and useful for foreign language learners. Students are assigned analytic and explanatory material to be read prior to their Fact classes, where the teacher’s questions and occasional quizzes assess their preparation. Fact classes teach students how to read and understand the explanations in their textbook, and over time aim for a sense of how Japanese hangs together as a system of expressive options, so that on future encounters with new language, they are ready to discern how something fits in structurally, functionally, and socially. In relation to the Act classes, Fact classes play a support role. There are no special seat arrangements for Fact classes and they are usually held in a traditional classroom set-up, as shown in Figure 14.
Trained base natives, or those who speak the same base language as their students and have been trained properly as language teachers, are assumed to be the best candidates for teaching Fact class (Jorden & Walton, 1987). Jorden and Walton explain that this is because they have followed “the exact route that learners will follow” and “know what it is to be a foreigner in the target culture” (p. 121-122). In the Japanese program of this study, Fact classes are taught by faculty and the more experienced GTAs, who often but not always are base natives who have also had coursework in teaching Fact.

At first, it seems more empowering to refer those who learned the target language as “base natives” rather than “nonnatives.” When referred to as “base natives” instead of “nonnatives,” there is a reminder that the referents started out from the same base, or first culture and language, as the students, and have learned the foreign language from the outside in, as their students will. The term “base native” also focuses on a positive aspect
of their identity—what they “are,” as opposed to what they are not, i.e. what they lack. It certainly is a supportive term for the majority of teachers and students whose first language is the same as their students’—English in this language program. But this “base native” label neglects other language teachers who also diverge from the “native” icon but do not share their first language with the students. Note also that there are also language learners who do not share a base language with any of their teachers. Though these divergent language teachers and students (will) know “what it is to be a foreigner in the target culture,” their learning route is not exactly the same as that which students who are native speakers of English will follow. Further, there are individual differences in learning styles even among those who have a shared base language.

Jorden and Walton argue that the ideal foreign language program uses a team of instructors in which target natives and base natives complement each other's work (p. 121). Both types of teachers need to be thoroughly trained in order to uniquely and effectively fulfill their roles, which cannot be filled equally well by the other. Nevertheless, the ideal arrangement of having target natives exclusively teaching Act class and having base natives exclusively teaching Fact class is not always possible. As mentioned, in this program there are many more Act classes than Fact classes, and not surprisingly, most base natives in the Japanese and Chinese programs were assigned to teach Act classes. On the other hand, interestingly, one communal difference between the Japanese and Chinese programs was found in the teaching assignments of target natives. In the Japanese program, most, target natives of Japanese were only assigned to teach Act, whereas the Chinese program sometimes let target natives teach Fact class. This may well
have been more a matter of available personnel than anything else, but it may also have been one factor contributing to the Japanese course participants’ tendency to prefer native-speaking teachers and not prefer nonnative-speaking teachers. In contrast, Chinese course students have had more opportunities to see the drawbacks of having target native-speaking teachers teach Fact class, such as their struggles in clearly explaining in English certain grammatical patterns and constraints on usage. Japanese course students, on the other hand, have opportunities only to see the drawbacks of having nonnative-speaking teachers teaching Act class, as some of them struggle to model the standard dialect. Only having seen the pros of having native-speaking teachers, Japanese students may develop a false sense that native-speaking teachers are capable of teaching anything. If students are accustomed to seeing native-speaking teachers teaching Act classes very well and nonnative-speaking teachers teaching Act class not as well, they may project this opposition of teaching ability in Act classes onto Fact-class teaching abilities. In other words, students of Japanese may expect native-speaking teachers to be able to teach Fact, just because they are good Act teachers. This is only a speculation, but the survey-documentation preference of Japanese language students and differences in teaching distribution across programs are real, and it seems at least possible.

While having only trained target natives teach Act and trained base natives only teach Fact may seem to benefit language students, it may not be the case for this program’s language teachers in the long run, if it results in their being accustomed to teaching in only one mode. This could put them (e.g., graduating GTAs) at a

\[172\] As mentioned earlier, by far the majority of students’ practice time is expected to be spent with audio and video media, not in class, which is a major reason that base native teachers need not be a liability.
disadvantage if they take a position in another program, where they are likely to need teaching skills for both Act and Fact modes. In one of the follow-up meetings for language teachers new to the program, held in October 2014, the training coordinator talked about the difficulty and importance of being able to teach both Act and Fact as both target and base natives, and cited Katrina’s experience as an example. He said:

Katrina, when she was a (fulltime) lecturer, she had to prepare three or four Act lessons a day. I don’t think she slept much in her first year. Because you have to be very careful—and she is a base native. But after the first year, she had a good set of lesson plans. She could build on that and revise. Just ask her. She’d be happy to tell you. … So it can be done. But it’s going to cost. And it costs for both sides. But it can be done. And I think as far as your career plan goes, you want to keep one foot in each to the extent that you can. Why should somebody like me try to become a better Act teacher all the time? Or why should … someone like you guys (indicating two white teachers) have part of your long-term goal be constantly improving as an Act teacher. Or why should you guys (gesturing toward Asian participants) be interested in becoming better at explaining things in the learners’ base language? What are the advantages of that?

To reiterate Katrina’s example, but from a target native’s perspective, it would be difficult for them to prepare a Fact class lesson plan because they do not have the experience of having learned the language through analysis and deliberate practice, and may have a difficult time explaining something that has always simply been intuitive to them. In response to the quote above, Harumi talked about how difficult it was for her to explain certain grammatical items, specifically the sentence-final particles *yo* and *ne*, to one of her students. She talked about how she was not able to provide an explanation about these particles when her student came to ask her about them. But luckily, another Japanese teacher was nearby and she was able to have him provide an explanation for the student. Harumi said, “It’s just easy for me to ask another native speaker of English and

173 That is, whether it’s base natives teaching Act or target natives teaching Fact.
he answered it very well. I understand the concept of yo and ne well, but I don’t think I can explain it that well. I knew the concept but I can’t explain.” She seemed to rely on other teachers when such incidents occurred, and unlike some target native speakers of Chinese, who were sometimes assigned to teach Fact class, Harumi seemed to have limited opportunity to “become better at explaining things in the learner’s base language,” because as a target native speaker of Japanese, she was only assigned to teach Act class.

While allowances for such instances of students asking questions of their teachers in English were to be made outside of Act class settings, the language teachers in training were specifically told not to mix Act and Fact during Act class, because keeping the two separate allows “a distinct class culture” to develop in which, by default, Japanese or Chinese is used to communicate, and students are expected to follow what is being communicated in the target language in class, so as to successfully perform, in the target language, their assigned tasks. In particular, it was explained that it allows learners to develop a shared common sense of “We operate in Japanese/Chinese” in Act class, thereby maximizing the amount of immersion learners can get in limited class hours.\(^\text{174}\)

The rule to keep spoken English out of Act class is indeed an effective way to provide

---

\(^{174}\) Jorden and Walton (1987, p. 122) discuss the danger of mixing the target and base language in class as follows:

… Individuals frequently identified as bilingual and bicultural are in fact among our most skilled language instructors, markedly superior to the less qualified among the team teachers. The danger is that as they become increasingly identified with and able to relate to the base culture, they tend to become less authentic models of the target culture—a fact often not recognized by their students. In some cases, their long experience with students has made them tolerant of a variety of the language that would actually be unintelligible to the average target-native. This is most apt to happen when one instructor vacillates between target and base… If they use both base and target languages in their teaching… they counteract the benefits derived from encouraging students automatically to use the target language exclusively in interacting with a target-native instructor.
more time spent in the target language for students, but perhaps more important is the
effect that regular, extended interaction in Japanese has on learners: it builds confidence
in interacting in Japanese.

That said, by selecting a certain dialect—a standard language—to be used in class
as in the learning materials, the use of other dialects seemed to be banned from the
language classroom. This creates the illusion that people in target language communities
only use so-called the standard dialect, even though there are many incidents of “bi or
multilingual experience” that students may frequently encounter in target language
communities. However, this issue is not simple, and incorporating different dialects may
actually create more issues, especially for beginning-level classes. There are plenty of
reasons why other dialects are difficult to incorporate. First, it is difficult to determine
which of the many non-standard dialects to choose from, and why. What is the objective
of incorporating a non-standard dialect if no students are headed to the region where the
selected non-standard dialect is used? Second, if a dialect is added, then who is going to
make the materials and record the audio and video files? Who is going to model and
teach it? If getting comfortable with, say, the pitch accent system of the ubiquitous
standard Japanese is a challenge for speakers of (nonstandard) Dialect A, teaching classes
in (nonstandard and non-ubiquitous) Dialect Z can only be more so. Third, doing two
dialects in tandem from the beginning slows progress in both, since the amount of time
for each decreases with the introduction of the other. Finally, how effective is it
pedagogically to burden L2/FL (foreign language) learners with two variants at a point in
their development where they lack a foundation in either? Incorporating non-standard
dialects in a language curriculum may question the construct of the standard dialect and may empower particular dialect speakers, but those who plan to do so need to face many issues, such as deciding which dialect to teach, dealing with lack of teaching materials, and the possibility of slowing down the language learners’ learning process.

In sum, the language programs employ Act and Fact class sessions taught by teams of “target” and “base” natives, and the amount of practice in the target language in Act classes was maximized with the “No spoken English” rule. While it certainly is a beneficial concept for the majority of language teachers and students who fit the typical iconization of “target” and “base” native speakers, those who have deviant characteristics are expected to conform to this dichotomy and may have a difficult time representing the icon at each end of the dichotomy. With regards to teaching assignments, the Chinese program differed from the Japanese program in that some native-speaking teachers were assigned to teach both Act and Fact, which has been identified as a potential source of the Japanese class participants’ stronger preference for native-speaking teachers. Incorporating other non-standard dialect(s) into a language curriculum may question the authority of the standard dialect and may empower particular dialect speakers, but at the same time, there are many potential issues, such as determining which dialect to use, lack of teaching materials, and the possibility of slowing down the language students’ learning process.

In the next section, the Japanese teacher trainer’s demonstration of teaching the very first day of Act class in the introductory-level Japanese course will be documented. In her demonstration, she establishes some of the Act rules discussed in this section and
provides a variety of contexts for students to perform in Japanese. She manages to provide all of her demonstration in the target language with minimal use of short, written English cues and a small set of “classroom instructions” in Japanese.

5.4. Japanese teacher trainer demonstration—Establishing Act class rules

On the first day of the intensive teacher training held prior to Autumn Semester of 2014, the Japanese teacher trainer wrote “No English” on the board before she started her demonstration. As usual in this course, teachers of Chinese in training played the role of Japanese language students for the demonstration during the practicum teaching sessions for the Japanese trainees. As this was a demonstration of an Act class, students were seated in a semi-circle so that they could all see their teacher as well as one other. It was assumed to be the very first day of Act class in the introductory-level Japanese class, yet the trainer used only Japanese spoken cues from the very beginning. Specifically, she used phrases from that students had been assigned to become familiar with. These are called “classroom instructions,” and are introduced in the Introduction chapter of the textbook, such as itte kudadai ‘Please say it’, kiite kudasai ‘Please listen’, eego o tukawanai de kudasai, ‘Please don’t use English,’ and hon o minai de kudasai, ‘Please don’t look at the textbook,’ among others. As needed, she clarified the meaning of these messages by eliciting student actions or non-actions by pointing at the written instructions on the board (“No English”) and using iconic “charade’ gestures.

After establishing these classroom rules, the Japanese trainer started her class by saying konnitiwa ‘Good afternoon,’ since the demonstration was held in the afternoon.
Then she provided a context by pointing at a piece of paper posted on the board. On it, the situation was described in simple English as “Japanese 1101” with a specified time to perform greetings, “8:00 am” on a post-it note. The visual aid is shown in Figure 15. Then she signaled her students to greet each other by calling on them by name as in Excerpt (1).

Figure 15. A visual aid used to provide context during the Japanese teacher trainer’s demonstration

(1) (First day of teacher training, August, 2014) Participants: Japanese teacher trainer, S1, S2

T (While looking at S1)
zyaa, S1-san
(Directing her to greet S2 by extending her arm towards S2)

S1 (While looking at S2)
ohayo.

S2 ohayo.

‘Well, S1-san.’
‘Good morning.’

175 Only the language on the left was spoken, not the English equivalents on the right.
176 The initial letter of the Japanese utterances will not be capitalized, since capitalized letters will be used to represent high pitch in later transcriptions dealing with the modeling and practice of pitch-accent patterns.
After seeing that both S1 and S2 had failed to correctly pronounce the long vowel that ends *ohayoo*, she stepped back to the center in front of the class to provide the following model, in Excerpt (2).

(2) (First day of teacher training, August, 2014) Participants: Japanese teacher trainer, S1, S2, S3, S4

T *kiite kudasai.*
(while mimicking lengthening by pulling apart her hands as if she were stretching something)
*yoo yoo.*
(clapping hands twice to signal the two moras *yo* and *o*)
*ohayoo, kiite kudasai, ohayoo, ohayoo, ohayoo.*
(stepping forward and while looking at S1),
*itte kudasai, ohayoo.*
(extend her arm towards S2)
S1 (while looking at S2)
*ohayoo.*
S2 *ohayoo.*
T (while looking at S3, directs S3 to greet S4 by moving her arm towards S4)
S3 *ohayoo.*
S4 *ohayoo.*

After seeing her students successfully greet each other with the proper vowel lengthening, she held up a card labeled with “instructor” to show the class, then placed it on S3’s desk to indicate that his role is now that of instructor. Then she stepped back to hold up another card labeled “student,” to indicate that she was going to play the role of student as in Excerpt (3):

(3) (First day of teacher training, August, 2014) Participants: Japanese teacher trainer, S1, S3, S4

T (stepping towards S3)
*zyaa, ohayoo itte kudasai.*
‘O.k., please say

---

177 English translation will not be provided if the utterance is an instance of either modeling or repeating.
In this short exchange, the Japanese teacher trainer helped the students (Chinese teacher trainees playing the role of students of Japanese) to understand the social difference between *ohayoo* and *ohayoo gozaimasu* accompanied by appropriate body language (i.e. deep bow). She did not use any spoken English cues to accomplish this. For the rest of her 15-minute demonstration, she provided different specified time settings for greetings,
with “1:00 pm” and “5:00 pm” written on post-its, to practice other phrases useful in Japanese settings, such as sayoonara ‘Good bye,’ and oyasuminasai ‘Good night.’ She provided extensive corrections when she perceived students’ pronunciation mistakes (i.e. *sayoonada as opposed to sayoonara, accent mistakes (e.g., *oHAYoo as opposed to oHAYOO),\(^{178}\) and lack of vowel lengthening (e.g., *sayonara as opposed to sayoonara), as well as mistakes of pronouncing two moras as one (e.g., *o.ya.su.mi.na.sai as opposed to o.ya.su.mi.na.sa.i).

During the teacher training, it was emphasized that individual error corrections are preferred over choral repetitions because it allows teachers to tell who is making mistakes. For instance, when Frank incorporated pair work in his third practicum, he was told not to do so because it did not allow him to catch all the mistakes.\(^{179}\) Other aspects of teaching were discussed during the intensive teacher training as well, such as voice projection, teacher positioning for different parts of an Act hour, how to call on students, how to react to errors, when to make error corrections, and how to take notes as a teacher, visual aid quality, controlling for vocabulary and grammar, and creating various contexts.

In response to the Japanese teacher trainer’s extensive corrections of pronunciation, one of the teacher trainees in the Chinese program who played the role as a student during the demonstration commented “There’s a lot of attention on

\(^{178}\) The capitalized letters indicate high pitch and the lower letters indicate low pitch. This distinction will be made only when error corrections for pitch-accent patterns are provided.

\(^{179}\) While aware of this drawback, Katrina tried to incorporate pair-work with her Level 3 students by having each pair ask and answer questions about their favorite season as a warm-up to class. She then had each pair individually report what they had discussed to make sure that they were using appropriate expressions. It was a large class and having each pair report took some time, but she said she wanted to try it since it seemed natural for students to engage in such small talk with each other.
pronunciation and I liked it.” The supervising instructor backed his comment by explaining that students learn when corrections are provided because they see the need to listen carefully to the audio materials in order to prepare better for next time. Upon her turn to comment, the Japanese teacher trainer added, “We provide corrections until it’s fixed because we can fix it. Why correct it if we don’t think we can correct it?” The supervising teacher explained that, by guiding their students to an accurate pronunciation with the emphasis on pronunciation, language teachers can help prevent their learners from forming “bad habits.” He further explained that the most effective and efficient time to do so is from the very beginning because language learners have not yet developed such “bad habits” in their pronunciation yet. This kind of advice seems to be consistent in this training course from year to year, so it may be no accident that many Japanese language teachers commented in their survey response that they felt that one of their jobs is to correct “pronunciation” and “(pitch) accent” in class.

On the other hand, according to the survey responses, this emphasis on pronunciation in the language program made some teacher participants from both Japanese and Chinese a little uncomfortable. Their comments seemed to show their level of foreign language anxiety being heightened as they felt that they were somehow expected to possess native-like ability to catch subtle pronunciation “errors” (such as pitch accent differences) and correct them. Here are some comments from the nonnative-speaking teacher participants from previous offerings of the same training programs:

- “Somehow, it was assumed that instructors-in-training possessed either native or near-native language ability.”—Japanese teacher
“I sometimes felt as if my language ability was not good enough in comparison to the native teachers and this made me nervous while I was … teaching.”—Chinese teacher

Some Japanese teacher participants in this study, including both native- and nonnative-speaking teachers, said they struggled to provide such corrections at first. They said it is because they were not aware of subtle pronunciation distinctions. In particular, it was not unusual for Japanese teacher participants to comment that pitch-accent errors are difficult to perceive, and consequently difficult to correct as well as to model. The following comment by Katrina illustrates her agony or “guilt” of not having the “perfect accent”:

My negative experiences were from not having any sort of knack for teaching Act and at first not being able to hear pitch accent. For a while, I was actually accent-deaf and that was incredibly stressful, because I would get comments back about how I should correct the students’ accent or that my accent was off. In particular, one of the short teacher-training assignments was just doing one drill with first-year students. My accent was off and the whole class imitated my accent. The trainers did not emphasize this, but they did not have to. I still carry around this kind of “My accent isn’t always perfect” guilt a little bit, but I have learned to live with it and I do not correct a student’s accent unless I have it perfectly memorized.

Although Katrina did not participate in the teacher-training program observed in 2014, an experience of hers in the same teacher-training program of an earlier year is worthy of note. Katrina shared this experience with me in the interview format, when she

180 Some of those who self-identified as nonnative speakers of Japanese mentioned that their prior language program(s) did not put much emphasis on such phonological distinctions and they did not even know their pronunciation patterns had errors.

181 The Japanese teacher trainer and the teacher-trainer supervisor encouraged trainees to familiarize themselves with the pitch-accent patterns found in the assigned materials they will teach, particularly by consulting JSL (Jorden & Noda, 1987). As opposed to many other textbooks, which either omit any marking of pitch accent or use it only selectively, all conversations and drill items used in JSL are accompanied by detailed representations of pronunciation, intonation, and pitch-accent patterns used in spoken language.
recalled that her pronunciation was corrected with what she felt was unnecessarily frequency in front of others by another new teacher participant, Yoshiko, whom she identified as a target native.\(^{182}\) This seemed to heighten the level of foreign language anxiety that Katrina experienced. While there were other target native trainees in the practicum, Yoshiko was the only one who openly played the role of “standard enforcer”. For example, in one of the feedback sessions after Katrina’s practicum teaching session for an Act class, Yoshiko reportedly dominated the discussion by repeatedly pointing out how Katrina’s pitch accent of the word *hyaku* 'hundred' was inconsistent. Katrina described this experience as a discouraging one because that was the extent of all the comments she remembered receiving during that feedback session. This is a case of subteaching (cf. Mokkonen, 2012) by Yoshiko, in which the open feedback sessions provided an opportunity for her to exercise her “authority” as a target native speaker, to enforce the standard with reference to Katrina’s pitch accent. It would not be surprising if experiences like these did not contribute what Katrina and others have described as high foreign language anxiety when teaching Act classes, and sense of self-described “guilt” at not having the perfect pitch accent as a language teacher in the language program.\(^{183}\)

\(^{182}\) A similar incident was reported in my preliminary study conducted in 2012 in the same language program. The only participant from this study was a nonnative-speaking teacher of Japanese who shared his experience of getting his Japanese pronunciation corrected by his colleague in the lounge room for GTAs. He said he strategically stopped using Japanese around this particular colleague because he felt embarrassed to be corrected in front of other people. He seemed to have a very high foreign language anxiety and said he would spend 8 hours on average for a single Act class lesson plan. He said he was afraid of providing incorrect pronunciation models in class, so he would write down every single pitch-accent mark on his lesson by hand, as well as typing up his lesson plan with pitch-accent patterns “just to make sure.”

\(^{183}\) Interestingly, Katrina talked about how some of the behaviors that Yoshiko displayed as a teacher seemed Americanized during the teacher practicum. She could not remember the specifics of her behavior, but she remembered not feeling able to point it out because she did not feel legitimate enough as a nonnative speaker of Japanese to boldly point out what seemed inappropriate in the actions of a native
Though she was discouraged at first, Katrina was committed to modeling the standard pitch accent and persistently worked at improving her own use of it. Unlike some other teachers who seemed to not care about pitch accent, she was persistent and eventually gained confidence as a teacher. She is sometimes reminded of her foreignness when other Japanese people try to rephrase her Japanese or when her students point out that her pitch accent is different from the textbook’s. But she is open to such suggestions provided that they are well-intended. After having taught Japanese for some time and studied the pitch-accent patterns extensively, she feels more comfortable about her pitch accent, but she still feels the need to have a native speaker check her pitch accent now and then.

Again, it is important to note that neither Katrina nor her target-native colleagues are the sole or primary model for students’ listening and imitation in acquiring pitch accent. It is the textbook (whose transcriptions are marked for pitch accent) and its accompanying media, specifically its audio component, which students are instructed to use extensively. They are expected to receive most of the language input they receive from the media that they carefully listen to and extensively rehearse with—assigned conversations for performance from memory, and the multiple drills assigned for every Act hour, each containing 6-8 items. This is an important part of the larger picture within which issues like Katrina’s need to be understood and appreciated.

Katrina’s case also illustrates how GTAs are in a challenging position, which naturally leaves them feeling vulnerable in several regards—they are still learners of

---

speaker. In contrast, none of the nonnative-speaking teachers of Chinese reported being overly criticized about their pronunciation by their peers, and they seemed to be more comfortable with their pronunciation. Interestingly, none of them commented on feeling “guilt” at not having the perfect pronunciation in Chinese.
Japanese (albeit advanced ones), yet they are responsible to the program for their learners, and responsible to those learners as their teachers. To top it all off, their learners expect them to be experts on what they are teaching. In a situation like theirs, some anxiety is to be expected, and they may need some support in helping them channel the anxiety productively.

Despite having some challenging experiences like Katrina’s, those respondents who participated in the pre-semester teacher training found their training experience useful and consider their teacher trainers their role models. For instance, many teachers found the variety of culturally authentic situations and error correction techniques provided by the Japanese teacher trainer inspiring. For nonnative-speaking teachers, they found it inspiring to see nonnative-speaking teacher trainers speak the language fluently and provide error corrections extensively. Some of the teachers’ comments are listed below:

- “[The teacher training] was useful because it showed me what to expect, what methodology the department espoused and was using, and generally, how to do it.”—Japanese teacher

- “The native teacher who impacted me the most has a lot of experience of teaching Japanese. Therefore, she is always very good at making effective lesson plans. I also learned a lot from her about how to make correction efficiently in class.”—Japanese teacher

- “[The nonnative Chinese teacher trainer] and [another nonnative Chinese teacher trainer in the program] were both incredibly helpful and positive role models. They encouraged me and shared many helpful teaching tips.”—Chinese teacher

- “[The supervising nonnative-speaking teacher of Japanese] was the first non-native speaker who I met in real life who could speak really well and was just so knowledgeable about the language. I was so inspired by him and encouraged that there were non-native speakers who could speak well … It’s really inspiring and encouraging when I can see a non-native doing that well in the language, because
for some reason there seems to be this image that non-natives can only reach a certain level but not beyond. I like level-breakers.”—Japanese teacher

With regards to nonnative-speaking teacher trainers being role models, it is interesting to point out that there were more nonnative-speaking teachers who were involved in the teacher-training program for Chinese teachers in the larger graduate program in language pedagogy. Among full-time Japanese faculty who engage in language teacher training, native-speaking faculty outnumber the lone nonnative, while in the Chinese program, nonnative training faculty outnumber native-speakers.” Native-speaking Chinese faculty members in the department seemed to play a peripheral role in the teacher-training program and did not seem so committed to strongly enforcing the standard dialect on their Chinese teacher-trainees. This may be one of the reasons that none of the nonnative-speaking teachers from the Chinese program reported their pronunciation being extensively corrected or developing a sense of “guilt” of not having a perfect pronunciation.184

On the other hand, it is important to point out that what I would judge to be overcorrection of pronunciation was not evident in the Chinese or Japanese classes that I observed during the teacher training in 2014. One possible explanation is the fact that none of the teacher trainees of Japanese seemed comfortable enforcing the standard dialect on other teacher’s pitch accent as Yoshiko did. This is admittedly speculation, but the above observations remind us that community members who make up the teacher-training program each year are different, and that this difference is likely to have an

184 Of course, there are many other individual factors, such as the level of proficiency and prior teaching and work experience that could potentially explain why Chinese teachers seemed more comfortable with their pronunciation. It may also be that Japanese faculty share a higher concern with keeping to a standard.
influence on the trainees’ teacher-training experience. What seems to have been the source of a “guilt” feeling about one’s pronunciation is a “standard enforcer” who decides to openly provide corrections in front of other people. Nevertheless, “guilt” at having a pronunciation that is sometimes off the mark in terms of pitch accent was expressed by several respondents (including a Japanese national), but Katrina was the only participant in this study who singled out a specific triggering incident.

Finally, in addition to the corrections of pronunciation errors, there were many other specific instructions given to teacher trainees during the intensive teacher-training week. While it is impossible to document all of them in this section, the following three aspects seem noteworthy, specifically, instructions for Act class about (1) limiting the use of written English context cues (such as that illustrated in Figure 15), (2) limiting the use of unfamiliar vocabulary, and (3) avoiding teacher-like responses when playing a role in a student’s performance. The level of adherence to these guidelines seemed a little stricter in the Japanese program. It must be noted that the three differences are discussed below are not absolutely mutually exclusive between the Japanese and Chinese programs; some Japanese teachers seemed to follow some of the approaches demonstrated by the Chinese teacher trainer, whereas some Chinese teachers seemed to follow what was demonstrated by the Japanese teacher trainer in their teaching.

First, the extensive use of written English was discouraged as participants were told to keep the use of written English at a minimum level in Act class. The training coordinator made the following remark with regards to this rule about the use of written English:
Keep the English limited. If you can use one word, use one word. If you have to use two words, okay. We don’t want a lot of sentences … If you have to use a sentence, start thinking about clarifying the context without presenting a sentence. It can usually be done. It just takes a little thinking.

This rule seemed to be more strictly adhered to in the Japanese program in that, in general, the use of English words by Japanese teachers in their visual aids seemed to be more limited than that of Chinese teachers. Figure 16 illustrates the limited use of written English by a Japanese teacher in her PowerPoint slide, in contrast with that of a Chinese instructor who used written English to provide a context. Both of them were teaching Level 1 students.

Figure 16. Use of written English in the visual aid by a Japanese teacher (Left) and a Chinese teacher (Right)

The Japanese teacher in Figure 16 is verbally explaining the situation in simple Japanese, for students to consult as they make expressive choices, whereas the Chinese teacher in Figure 16 avoids speaking English by simply pointing at the written instruction. The
written instructions used by Chinese teachers were often followed by a group of pictures used to elicit new expressions in the given situation, as in Figure 17.

![Figure 17. A set of pictures used by a Chinese teacher to elicit new vocabulary items to use in a given situations](image)

The use of written English in the visual aids made it much easier for Chinese teachers to share their lesson plans (and visual aids), in that the explicit written cues (in English) make it clear how to respond to the visual aids. In fact, it was more common for Chinese teachers in general to share and use other Chinese teacher’s visual aids, which may help them save time in lesson planning. Some Japanese teachers also shared their lesson plans with others, but it was less common for them to use another teacher’s visual aids in their lessons. They seemed to prefer to use other teacher’s lesson plans as a reference for brainstorming ideas for situations to incorporate target expressions, but individual teachers generally came up with their own performance scenarios for students to engage with in their Act classes. For example, Japanese teachers’ visual aids in PowerPoint slides often only provided a background picture for where and/or when each
scenario takes place, but for more specific cues, they tended to use more physical props, such as printed/drawn pictures as well as realia (e.g., dictionaries with a price tag attached as shown in Figure 18).

Figure 18. Use of realia props by a Japanese teacher

It seems more difficult to follow another teacher’s performance scenarios through their several stages when there are no written instructions in English in the PowerPoint slides on what is to be done, and when there are multiple physical props involved in the lesson.

Second, the new language teacher trainees were advised not to use unfamiliar vocabulary items, i.e. words that students have not been introduced to yet. For example, Suzan used soo desu ne ‘That’s right’ in her first teaching practicum, but she was told not to use it yet because neither the nominal soo ‘so’ nor the copula desu ‘it is’ had been introduced at that point in the materials (including the Classroom Instructions). While it is not uncommon to have students in the introductory Japanese course with some Japanese backgrounds who might understand such words, it was explained that this rule
is meant to make it fair for everyone, including those who have never been exposed to Japanese before. The supervisor said the following with regards to this issue during one of the post-practicum follow-up meetings.

We have to be careful with the exposure that we create with our students because, at the beginning level in particular … When you get to the advanced level, we don’t have to worry so much about controlling vocabulary and grammar, right? But at the elementary level, the closer we get to the elementary level, the more we have to control the pedagogical dialect, right?

Meanwhile, it seemed that the Chinese teacher trainer put less emphasis on controlling the use of unfamiliar vocabulary items in class. While most of the phrases that the Chinese teacher trainer used in his demonstration were introduced in the textbook from the beginning and he repeatedly and emphatically urged the new Chinese language teacher trainees to use the classroom instructions exactly as introduced in the text, there were a few instances in his demonstration where he used Chinese phrases that were not introduced yet in the textbook. For example, he used *qing lai* ‘Come here’ with an invitation gesture to invite students to come up front. He explained that such directives are okay as long as they are clear to the students.185 While most Chinese teachers seemed to use unfamiliar vocabulary with discretion, a few seemed to introduce them frequently in their Act classes by writing them down on the board, as shown in Figure 19.

185 They are also functionally quite useful as classroom instructions, and for that reason likely to be used repeatedly—which helps ensure that students will learn to respond to them.
Third, the Japanese and Chinese teacher trainers seemed to have a different approach when it came to responding to language students’ performances. The Japanese teacher trainer emphasized the importance, when in conversant-role, of responding realistically as a real-life conversant. To do so, she positioned herself appropriately (typically, away from her “teacher spot,” closer to and facing the student), and used natural nonverbal responses such as a light nod with *un*, ‘Yes,’ or *hai*, ‘Yes,’ with a smile. When needed, she tilted her head or gave a poker-faced look to indicate confusion. She cautioned the trainees multiple times against giving evaluative comments when “in role.” Specifically, she discouraged the new trainees from reacting to utterances by immediately providing comments such as *i i desu ne*, ‘Good,’ or *yoku nai desu ne*, ‘Not right,’ without first giving some indication of having stepped back into teacher-role, for example by stepping back to the usual teacher spot and changing demeanor. Her point was that while the teacher is still positioned for conversant-role, such teacher-like
comments are unnatural intrusions into the simulated real-life situation. She indicated that students quickly learn to follow such framing and re-framing, if it is done consistently.

On the other hand, while the Chinese teacher trainer avoided teacher-like comments when he was playing a conversant-role, he played the role of evaluator more frequently. As an evaluator, he provided positive evaluative feedback in Chinese such as *hen hao*, ‘Very good,’ *keyi*, ‘OK,’ *dui*, ‘Correct,’ and *fei cheng hao*, ‘Very good.’ These evaluative feedback utterances were sometimes accompanied with a thumbs-up gesture. Similarly, negative evaluative feedbacks such as *bu dui*, ‘Not correct’ were also used by the Chinese teacher trainer. It seemed very natural for both Japanese and Chinese teachers to provide such evaluative comments as language teachers, so long as s/he explicitly re-frames his or her stance as that of teacher.186

In sum, the teachers of Japanese and Chinese new to the program were instructed to avoid spoken English entirely, and to limit their use of written English in cuing up situations and tasks, their use of unfamiliar vocabulary, and to avoid responding to student’s utterances as a teacher, when in conversant-role. As explained before, following these three guidelines strictly seemed to be more strongly encouraged in the Japanese program and less so in the Chinese program, without this difference being mutually exclusive between the two programs.

---

186 However, there are times when language teachers, especially native speakers of the target language, give feedback that seems to be “extra-positive,” in degree, frequency, or both—which can all too easily bleach any truly evaluative force from the feedback. For instance, the Japanese tendency to say (*nihongo ga*) *ozyoozu desu nee* ‘(Your Japanese) is very good,’ is sometimes mocked by foreigners who feel that such statements are empty compliments. Such culturally inbred tendencies in target-native teachers needs to be replaced, through training, with more useful response instincts.
This section documented the Japanese teacher trainer’s demonstration given on the first day of teacher-training program held prior to Autumn Semester in 2014. Using the survey data obtained from teacher participants who had previously participated in the intensive teacher-training practicum, some of their relevant reactions to the teacher-training curriculum were supplied. Both the Japanese and Chinese programs used a standard dialect as a model, but the degree of adherence to the standard dialect and other guidelines (e.g., limiting the use of written English cues and unfamiliar vocabulary, and avoiding teacher-like reactions when in conversant-role) seemed stricter in the Japanese program. While no instances of overt error corrections of new teacher’s pronunciation mistakes were observed during the observation, Katrina reported receiving such public criticism of her pitch accent by Yoshiko during her intensive practicum training. The presence of such “standard enforcers” in the Japanese program is what seemed to trigger some of them to develop a sense of “guilt” about not having the “perfect” pitch accent.

The next section will briefly discuss the language programs’ expectations of grading students’ performance, daily and otherwise.

5.5. Grading

“We talk about grading – because that will sensitize us more … help us become a more sensitive observer.”—Training Coordinator

To encourage students to self-study effectively outside of class, the language program makes use of daily grades to help motivate students to prepare for class. The Chinese teacher trainer explained that daily grades help establish the classroom baseline or “common sense,” which is “If you don’t come prepared, you get a bad grade.” Based
on this expectation, the teacher trainees were told to “expect their students to do well, and be surprised when they don’t.” The following is an excerpt from the rubric that the program uses to explain daily grades to students:

Solid preparation is evident and performance is fully culturally coherent, that is, speaking, writing, and responding to speech in ways in which natives of the target culture expect people to speak, write, and respond. It would present no difficulty, discomfort, or misunderstanding for a native. Repair (restating) is self-managed.187

Perhaps motivated by the grading system, it was common for students in observed classes to practice the assigned conversations, drills, as well as application exercises on their own or with their classmates in the time before class started.188 Students were expected to do more than just recite the assigned conversation(s) in order to be considered culturally coherent. The following excerpt from Jorden and Walton’s article (1987, p. 70-71) illustrates this point:

With culture and performance as part of a framework for teaching East Asian languages, learning becomes more than memorizing vocabulary and grammar patterns, reciting dialogues, and reading aloud passages in the target orthography; it becomes an exercise in learning how to behave as a native of the target culture. It not only involves self-expression and interpretation of native intentions, but also includes the social function and reaction to language artifacts that require one to act upon that information as a native would. Our learners cannot become natives. However, it is possible and desirable for them to interact with target natives according to the conventions of the target culture in a way that will not cause any discomfort or embarrassment… Students of a foreign language are not trying to become foreigners. They are studying language in order to be able to

---

187 The description is that of a full, or maximum, score. The rest of grading criteria used in the language program is found in Appendix D.

188 While daily grading can be considered a motivating factor for students to prepare for class, some students seem to hesitate to volunteer using the target language out of fear of making mistakes and receiving a lower grade in class (Luft, 2007). Interestingly, Luft, in a study of Japanese language students’ risk-taking behavior in PCA, found a significant negative correlation between daily grades and the amount of time students self-reported preparation time for class. Luft suggested that it may be due to the lower language learning aptitude of the lower performing students, or their tendency to not make effective or efficient use of time in preparing.
communicate with members of a foreign culture through the spoken and/or written target language.

According to Jorden and Walton, students are not expected to “become natives” or “foreigners,” but the presence of the “native speaker” of target culture used as the standard for measuring students’ performance remains. They are expected to express themselves in ways that utilize the language modeled in their textbook and its accompanying media—language that is, as explained earlier in Section 5.2, regarded as hyōjungo ‘standard Japanese.’

To provide practice for the teacher trainees in giving appropriate daily grades for students, observers of the trainees’ “demo teaching” sessions during the intensive practicum were instructed to provide daily grades for the performances of those who were playing the roles of language students. Specific feedback on their Act class performance was said to help learners become more astute observers and mimics of communication in the target language, and the teacher trainees were told that they should not give grades unless they can give reasons for their grades. The daily grades were collected and displayed after each demo teaching session, in front of everyone, to discuss the reasoning behind the given scores. It was emphasized that even if we cannot be purely objective in assigning these scores, we need to be consistent with one another.

In this manner, the iconized native speaker of the standard language was at the center of the criteria used to evaluate students’ performances in class, so as to help them conform to the standard acknowledged by in the language’s target language communities. The teacher trainers provided guidance on criteria for assigning different grades to students (details in Appendix D).
So far in this chapter, the construct of the icon of “native speaker” in the language program has been reviewed. The following sections will document some of the effects of the icon of “native speaker” on the focal participants, Harumi, Regina, Suzan, and Frank, by looking at their relevant language socialization experiences with a focus on their (non)assimilation of recommended accent error correction techniques. As it will be discussed, some participants felt “guilt” at not having perfect pitch accent, while others did not, which seemed to be one of the significant factors that influenced these participants’ development as language teachers.

5.6. Harumi

“I must teach standard Japanese, but I am not a standard native.”—Harumi

Although Harumi self-identified as a native speaker of Japanese, she expressed “guilt” at not having perfect pitch accent. Upon observing the Japanese teacher trainer’s demonstration and having finished a couple of teaching demo sessions, Harumi commented in English that she felt she “needed to correct more pronunciation as well as intonation.” In response, the Japanese teacher trainer advised Harumi to study the Introduction chapter of the textbook, to study Japanese pronunciation from an English-speaking beginner’s perspective, and listen to the audio. This chapter introduces the vowels, consonants, moraic structure, pitch accent and intonation of standard Japanese, along with the textbook’s ways of representing them. She explained that by doing so,
Harumi can learn to model the pronunciation patterns as described in the textbook.\textsuperscript{189}

Harumi started to make an effort to become able to speak in class in ways more consistent with the language of the students’ textbook and media models.

Despite her efforts in acquiring the “correct” pronunciation, at the beginning of her first semester, Harumi felt insecure about her standard Japanese, especially in the area of pitch accent. While the majority of her students perceived her as a native speaker of Japanese, there were some students who thought otherwise because they saw her insecurities with regards to her pitch accent as a language teacher. For instance, there were a few instances where she had to pause in the middle of class to make sure she was modeling the correct pronunciation. In Excerpt (4), she tries to make sure that her pitch-accent pattern of a sentence, *yokatta desu nee* ‘That’s good,’ is correct.\textsuperscript{190}

(4) (September 2014) Participants: Harumi, S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S1</th>
<th><em>dekimasita ka?</em></th>
<th>‘(Is it) completed?’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td><em>hai, dekimasita yo.</em></td>
<td>‘Yes, (it is) completed.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td><em>yokatta desu nee.</em></td>
<td>‘That’s good.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Harumi     | *kiite kudasai. YOka
tta desu nee. itte kudasai. YOka
tta desu nee.* | ‘Please listen. *Yokatta desu nee.* Please say it. *Yokatta
tta desu nee.*’ |
| Students   | *YOKatta desu nee.* | ‘*Yokatta desu nee.*’ |

\textsuperscript{189}Interestingly, the Japanese teacher trainer explained in one of the follow-up interviews (not audio recorded) that she is not a Tokyo native but she prioritizes the Japanese language used in the textbook and its media as the most appropriate for her teaching. In fact, she indicated that in the past she was told by some of her students that her pronunciation was different from the book. She developed the habits of listening to the audio and adjusting her pronunciation so as not to confuse her students. Her concern is that her speech match what is in the textbook and its media.

\textsuperscript{190}As mentioned, JSL romanization is used in the transcriptions for spoken language to represent sounds consistently, with this difference: capitalizations are used when accent needs indicating, as when we focus on accent errors. Japanese utterances are inserted in the English translation when no meaningful communication is taking place, such as when teachers are providing a model and students are just repeating.
In this excerpt, she manages to provide the correct pitch-accent model, but she unintentionally gives positive feedback to the accent mistake by Student 7 that she was trying to correct. In the follow-up interview after class, she said the following:

I was trying to demonstrate (the accent pattern of yokatta) with my hand, but I couldn’t. I focused only on the ka sound, well, it is the case that ka has the accent, right? The accent gets down at ta, right? Because I was focusing on that part (katta) only, I got confused (smile). So, my students kept saying yoKAtta.

This comment illustrates her confusion about the accent pattern. While she correctly perceives yoKAtta as an erroneous pattern and provided the correct accent pattern in class (i.e. initial mora high, remainder low), specifically, she is mistaken in her analysis of the pitch-accent pattern of yokatta since the accent actually falls after yo (becoming low from ka).
As the potential source of her difficulty, Harumi explained that her dialect does not match the Tokyo standard dialect’s accent patterns in differentiating meaning. For example, she said that Tokyo dialect differentiates homonyms by different pitch accent such as *Ame* ‘rain’ (HL) and *aME* ‘candy’ (LH), but these words have the same pitch-accent patterns in her dialect. She said that since her dialect relies only on contextual cues to determine the meaning of homonyms like these, she had a difficult time hearing the difference when she started teaching Japanese. She had to learn to tell the difference through practice. She also talked about how her teacher trainer from her previous teacher-training program shared the same difficulty because he was also from Okinawa. Harumi said “I can hear the difference (and) I think that’s a native speaker’s advantage. But I cannot analyze it and I think that is a native speaker’s disadvantage.” In this comment, interestingly, she is associating native-speaker status with the ability to hear the pitch-accent difference, even though she had just explained that she had to learn to hear the standard dialect’s pitch-accent patterns through practice. Another assumption about her “native speaker” is that s/he lacks the ability to analyze the pitch-accent patterns. It seems that her characterization of “native speaker” is changing with her own ability.

As a remedy to her difficulty with demonstrating and analyzing Tokyo dialect pitch-accent patterns, Harumi said she usually copied pitch-accent marks from the textbook on her lesson plan. But since she was getting the hang of it and was able to do it without writing them down the last time, she said that she neglected doing it for this lesson and, according to her, “it didn’t go so well.”
However, in the same lesson there was also a sign of Harumi’s improvement in hearing and correcting the deviating accent patterns. In Excerpt (5) from the same lesson, she has a hard time differentiating the correct accent pattern of oMOSIROkatta\textsuperscript{191} from the deviating accent pattern, oMOSIROKatta, and unintentionally gives positive feedback. But she recognizes her mistake and provides correction.

(5) (September 2014) Participants: Harumi, S1, S2, S3, all students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>oMOSIROKatta desu ka?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>maamaa desu nee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harumi</td>
<td>anoo kiite kudasai. oMOSIROkatta desu ka? oMOSIROkatta desu ka? (humming the accent pattern) sumimasen. oMOSIROkatta desu ka? Itte kudasai. oMOSIROkatta desu ka?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>oMOSIROkatta desu ka?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harumi</td>
<td>un. oMOSIROkatta desu ka? (Pointing to Student 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>oMOSIROKatta desu ka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harumi</td>
<td>un! oMOSIROkatta desu ka? (Pointing to student 3 again)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>oMOSIROKatta desu ka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harumi</td>
<td>are, oMOSIRO...katta.  (smiles) oMOSIROkatta desu ka? Hai, itte kudasai. oMOSIROkatta desu ka?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>oMOSIROkatta desu ka?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second semester of observation in Spring Semester in 2015, Harumi seemed to have gotten the hang of correcting errors, but incidents of accent error corrections were also much fewer. She seemed busy correcting other types of errors that were causing longer conversations to break down (e.g., not being able to smoothly say

\textsuperscript{191} or oMOSIrokatta.
one’s intended words out and carry out the conversation, odd word order, appropriate conversational style, and particle mistakes, etc.). She also appeared more confident in class, as she did not seem to hesitate when correcting these types of errors. This shift in the types of error correction was seen with other Japanese teachers, who were teaching the intermediate- and advanced-level courses. They also seemed to focus more on communication and less on accentual mistakes.

Though the incidents of accent error corrections were fewer, she provided corrections for three vocabulary items, doko ‘where,’ kissaten ‘café,’ and tika ‘basement,’ which were used in the assigned conversation assigned for performance in class.192 She was able to provide a model for the accent patterns of these words at the word level quite confidently without hesitation, perhaps because modeling the word’s accent pattern is simpler than modeling the word’s accent pattern when it is said in a larger sequence of words, i.e. at the sentence level, as in Excerpts (4) and (5), which showed Harumi’s struggle to model sentence-level pitch-accent patterns. However, she faced an interesting dilemma with the accent pattern of tika when she was providing a pitch-accent model at the sentence level. In Excerpt (6), while she manages to model the textbook accent pattern of the word tiKA at the word level, she slips back to her own accent pattern of the same word, TiKα,193 when re-embedding it in its sentence level.

(6) (February, 2015) Participants: Harumi, S1, S2, all students

---

192 As part of their assigned preparation/rehearsal for Act hours, students must learn a basic conversation for performance from memory in class.

193 Though the only accent pattern provided in the textbook is tiKA, as is the case with an older dictionary of Japanese accent (Hirayama, 1960), both accent patterns are listed in recent accent dictionaries by other publishers (Kindaichi & Akinaga, 2001; NHK, 2000).
Harumi tyotto purakutisu simasu yo. Anoo itte kudasai, ti ti ti ti, TIka, a sumimasen, (moving her finger in an upward motion) tiKA, tiKA, tiKA.

Students tiKA, tiKA, tiKA

Harumi … TIka no atarasii kissaten de (Pointing to S1)

S1 TIka no atarasii kissaten de.

Harumi ti (moving the finger in an upward motion)

S1 tiKA no atarasii kissaten de.

Harumi Un, ii desu ne. TIka no atarasii kissaten de. (Point to Shen-san)

S2-san

S2 TIka no atarasii kissaten de.

Harumi un, ii desu ne.

‘O.k., we’re going to practice. Umm, please say it. ti ti ti, tika, ah excuse me, tika tika tika’

‘TIka tika tika’

‘TIka no atarasii kissaten de’

‘ti, tika, tika no atarasii kissaten de’

‘TIka no atarasii kissaten de.’

‘Yeah, that’s good. TIka no atarasii kissaten de, S2-san.’

‘TIka no atarasii kissaten de’

‘Yeah, that’s good.’

Harumi’s attempt to provide the textbook accent pattern of the word tika shows her mistrust of her own accent pattern and her dependence on the textbook. But at the sentence level, she unconsciously slips back to her own dialect’s pitch accent.

Harumi moved up with the same groups of students to Level 2 in Autumn 2015.

At this point, she did not seem to be so concerned about her accent any more, for the following reasons. First, as observed later in the previous semester, by this time, the conversations assigned for student performance in class were much longer and complex and her focus on error correction seemed to have more to do with the smoothness of her students’ performances. Since pointing out every detail of their mistakes would take up too much of the class time, students’ errors that did not affect the communication seemed to be purposefully ignored. This is a shift that may be observed regardless of the level of
anxiety that language teachers may feel about their non-standard dialect or nonnativeness. While she provided occasional error corrections on pitch accent, they were no longer the primary focus of her error corrections, as other factors became more pressing as the students’ proficiency level increased. Along with this shift in error corrections came, it seemed, a reduction in her awareness of “guilt” at not having the perfect pitch accent.

Second, having taught the same groups of students for a full semester, she seemed to have built a good rapport with them and started to show more playfulness in class. For example, she introduced the word *hanakin* ‘Thank goodness it’s Friday!’ to her students, which was an innovative expression that she grew up with. This one-word deviation from the textbook and the language program’s rule to refrain from introducing unfamiliar vocabulary seemed to show a little bit of validation she felt she could give to her own Japanese. She no longer exhibited the same kind of nervousness that she displayed in the beginning of her first semester. Third, she had a noteworthy accomplishment that helped her feel that her ability in the standard dialect was validated, which was having been able to obtain the highest level on the ACTFL OPI\textsuperscript{194} as part of becoming a certified OPI Japanese proficiency rater. To accomplish this, she worked on improving her standard dialect by downloading an application on her smartphone that allowed her to listen to the news from NHK.\textsuperscript{195} As in the case with native-speaking teachers of Chinese mentioned in 5.2, passing a widely recognized standardized exam seemed to help Harumi feel that her proficiency in the standard dialect had been validated.

\textsuperscript{194} American Council of Teachers of Foreign Language Oral Proficiency Interview.

\textsuperscript{195} Nippon Hōsō Kyōkai (Japanese national public broadcasting organization).
Harumi’s background as a dialect speaker of Japanese is not captured in the dichotomy of target native and base native speakers, because target native speakers of Japanese are iconized as speakers of the standard Tokyo dialect. This makes Harumi a divergent language teacher. Since none of the other teachers of Japanese spoke her dialect, there was no using her dialect in code-switching with her colleagues. She was limited to the standard dialect that her students were learning, as presented in the textbook and its media, and did not seem to resist or attempt to alter power relations in the language program. In fact, she mistrusted her own accent and relied on the standard accent pattern described in the textbook without realizing the fact that some of the accent information in the textbook was outdated. Though she was not confident at first, she made an effort to model the “standard” dialect by trying to follow the “native speakers” speech modeled in the students’ video and audio and transcribed in the textbook, which students were assigned to study and practice with. She struggled to perceive and correct deviating accent patterns at first, and was motivated by the need for her language in class to more closely match the models that her students rehearsed with daily. Her “guilt” at not having the perfect pitch accent to match these models further motivated her, and she worked at improving her standard dialect pitch accent by writing down the pitch-accent patterns in her lesson plan according to the textbook’s transcriptions. She also listened to radio news reports in the standard Tokyo dialect. She did not resist the “standard” set by the program per se, since she strove to work on the pitch accent of the standard dialect, but her focus on error corrections eventually shifted to other types of errors that seemed more crucial to attend to. By the time she had made this shift in her error corrections, she
seems to have gained more confidence as a teacher. She feels her standard dialect is more validated than before, now that she was able to attain the highest level on a widely accepted proficiency language interview test. But the OPI does not specifically test the ability to produce the correct pitch accent, and the extent of her “improvement” in incorporating the pitch accent of the standard dialect into her teaching is difficult to see without, for example, seeing her interact in Japanese in class, or provide error corrections for pitch accent, perhaps again in the introductory-level course. In any case, while incorporating the standard dialect as the model used in language program is quite useful from a pedagogical standpoint, from a socio-political perspective, Harumi’s case illustrates how it can be difficult for dialect speakers to model the pitch accent of so-called standard Japanese, when the pitch accent of the standard language differs from that of their dialect.

5.7. Regina

Training coordinator (TC): …There are different kinds of target natives and, … Regina, wouldn’t you agree?

Regina (Smiles) Yeah. I’m a little confused.

Regina had an uncertain feeling about being a native speaker of Japanese because of her limited experience in Japan and upbringing and informal education in Japanese. Although Regina considers herself a native speaker of Japanese, she was hesitant about it because she grew up in the U.S., speaking only Japanese with her mother and grandmother at home. Her experience in Japan was limited to having short visits to her mother’s family and extended families during the summertime when her schooling in the
U.S. was on break. The only means by which she received her education in Japanese was *Kodomo Charenji* ‘Kid’s Challenge,’ a set of monthly correspondence course materials sent from her mother's family. She said she lost interest in working on the materials by the time she was around 12, so she stopped working on it afterwards. Because of her limited access to education in Japanese, she took some Japanese courses as a college student in the U.S. to test her Japanese ability prior to becoming a Japanese language teacher.

Regina also had uncertain feelings about being a native speaker of English. Her father is racially white and speaks English, so she grew up speaking English with him at home, though he was not around as much as her mother. Since she grew up in the U.S., she received all her formal education in the U.S. Because of these factors, she also considered herself a native speaker of English. However, her identity as a native speaker of English was sometimes challenged in her childhood when others perceived her English pronunciation being influenced by Japanese. Specifically, she mentioned during the interview that she had trouble differentiating /l/ and /r/ in English in her childhood, just as typical speakers of Japanese do. She suspected that it was probably due to having Japanese as her first language. These factors made it difficult for her to fit into the dichotomy of iconicized native and nonnative speakers, as well as the dichotomy of target and base native speakers.

The following excerpt (7) from one of the follow-up teacher-training meetings illustrates her uncertain feelings about her identity, as well as how she is perceived by others, her Training Coordinator and Harumi in particular. In this interaction, it is
interesting to see that she is viewed as both target and base native by her training coordinator.

(7) (September, 2014) Participants: Training Coordinator, Regina, and Harumi

TC And there are different kinds of base natives and different kinds of experiences, right? In Regina’s case, you didn’t grow up in Japan, except in the summers?
Regina (Smiles) Yeah, only the summers.
Harumi Summer target native, summer native.
(Laughs)
TC Yeah, and as far as your, your experience as a base native, um, you did grow up in the U.S., right, most of the years, so you got some of those elements … let’s not assume that there’s one type of base native and one type of target native. There’s a range of experiences in each of them.

Just as Regina and other teachers had uncertainty about her identity, her students expressed mixed opinions about Regina’s identity as well, in their response on the survey and interviews. For instance, many students could not tell whether she is a native or nonnative speaker of Japanese since she seemed to speak both Japanese and English very well. Some responded in the survey that she is a native speaker of Japanese for various reasons, such as her mannerisms and knowledge displayed in class, linguistic ability (i.e. no foreign accent in her Japanese), and certain facts they knew about her, such as being born in Japan and reading about her being described as a native speaker on a webpage. Some assumed that she lived in Japan for a long time. Interestingly, one student said she is a native speaker of Japanese because her English sounded “ambiguously accented.” On the other hand, there were some students who thought of her as a nonnative speaker of Japanese. Some said she did not look Japanese. They perceived her as a white American who grew up speaking English with Japanese as her second language. Others said her
first and last names, which appeared in the syllabus, did not sound Japanese. Some suspected she was new to teaching because she seemed to struggle as a teacher sometimes. Despite all these different impressions, and some misgivings, expressed by herself and others, Regina’s development as a Japanese language teacher took the course of that of a target native.

Unlike Harumi, Regina had no prior teaching experience before the teacher training, but she did not think she has much of a “non-Japanese accent” and did not carry the same “guilt” that Harumi had with regards to her pitch accent. This is because she said she grew up speaking the standard Tokyo dialect with her mother, and with her family in Japan, and she was told by other native speakers of Japanese that she did not have a “non-Japanese accent.” Having these backgrounds, she seemed more comfortable providing error corrections on pitch accent from the beginning, along with other pronunciation mistakes during the intensive teacher training. She said the following with regards to her accent:

I usually feel comfortable. I would say that I am much more concerned with the grammatical structure and if I am being polite enough when speaking Japanese than my pronunciation. At times though, I would say that I do not always have the accent marks correct if it is a word I have never heard of and I am simply reading it. I believe that I have a Tokyo dialect pronunciation. But I’m sure that I could always improve it.

As pointed out in this comment, Regina occasionally had different accent patterns for certain words that she was less familiar with. Her different accent patterns were manifested with words that she seemed to not have encountered enough times before, such as certain loanwords (i.e. *koNSARUTAnto as opposed to koNSArutanto

---

196 Regina has a Japanese middle-name but it was not listed in the syllabus.
‘consultant,’ and *yuNIF(U)Oomu as opposed to YUnif(u)oomu ‘uniform’) and names of people (i.e. *suGIURA as opposed to suGlura and *niSIDA as opposed to NiSida). In Excerpt (8), Regina has a different accent pattern of the name Nishida in the beginning, but later provides the pattern transcribed in the textbook and spoken in the media materials.

(8) (February 2015) Participants: Regina, S1

Regina (Pointing at the PowerPoint slide) tuuduu risuto desu. mina-san wa honda no sutaffu desu. toyota no nakamura san to toyota no niSIDA SAN NO SAin ga irimasu. S1-san bizitaa onegai simasu. Honda no sutaffu desu. (invites student 1 to come forward) a, kite kudasai. ima ranti taimu, ranti bureeku desu.

S1 sumimasen. nakaMUra san irassyai, irassyaimasu ka?

Regina ima tyotto orimasen ga.

S1 zyaa aa niSIda san wa?

Regina a niSIDA DESu ka? niSIDA WA SANGAI NI ORIMAsu ga. (Switches back to a role as a teacher) hai, ee, ato, ee, akusento desu ne. naKAMURA-SAN IRASSYAIMASU ka.

S1 naKAMURA-SAN IRASSYAIMASU ka.

Regina un, intoneesyon, intoneesyon desu ne. ato, zyaa, NiSida-san wa?

S1 niSIda-san wa.

Regina un, NiSida-san wa. Hai.

‘(It) is a to-do list. You guys are staff from Honda. You need signatures from Mr. Nakamura and Mr. Nishida from Toyota. S1, please (do the role as) a visitor. (I) am a staff from Honda. Please come. Now is lunch time, lunch break.

‘Excuse me. Is Mr. Nakamura there?’

‘(He) is not here at this moment.’

‘Then how about Mr. Nishida.’

‘Oh Mr. Nishida? He is on the third floor.’

‘Well, (it)’s accent. Nakamura-san irassyaimasu ka.’

‘nankamura-san irassyaimasu ka.’

‘yes, it’s (actually) the intonation. And how about nisida-san wa?’

‘nisida-san wa?’

‘Yes, nisida-san wa. OK.’

At the end of the pre-semester training period, Regina was initially assigned to teach in the I.I. track for the first semester, and then was assigned to teach in the
classroom track for the second semester. In the I.I. track, Regina met with her students in a one-on-one setting and was assigned to teach Act, with Fact sessions only upon request. I.I. track is different from the classroom track in that the instructors are provided with a set of premade lesson plans for Act sessions, and Fact sessions are only held when students request one, to ask questions in English. Needless to say, I.I. teachers taught mainly Act sessions, and unfortunately none of Regina’s Fact sessions was observed during this study. Along with other teachers who were assigned to teach I.I. sessions, Regina had her own weekly schedule and met with students who were taking Level 1 (at the traditional pace, “First Year”) and the first semester of the Level 2 Japanese courses. Unlike classroom track students, students in I.I. track are free to choose their instructors for their Act sessions, based on instructor availability and any other student preferences, so it was typical for I.I. instructors like Regina not to have a regular set of students for their sessions, unless those students chose to sign up for one instructor consistently.

As with Harumi, there were more varieties of student errors in the non-introductory-level classes observed, and consequently, the accent error corrections seemed to be less prioritized when students were failing to communicate due to other problems that led more directly to communication breakdown. For instance, she provided support or error corrections when her students were not able to smoothly perform the assigned conversations, mispronounced certain vocabulary items, used verb forms that were socially inappropriate for the referent, and omitted particles, etc.\textsuperscript{197} In Excerpt (9),

\textsuperscript{197} These errors do happen in the introductory-level course, too, especially when students do not come to class prepared to perform, but in subsequent semesters, there are increasingly more items in the inventory, and thus ways for things to go wrong.
the segmental issue for pronunciation with regards to pitch accent (i.e. *saTOO-SEnsee*) is not corrected, as Regina tries to focus her error corrections on other mistakes that her student makes. Specifically, she corrects a consonant mistake (*nigai* for *nikai*) and an instance of inappropriate use of a humble verb form (*orimasu*) that her student incorrectly used in reference to a superior’s action. She further moves on to correct the inappropriate omission of a particle (*ni*), while still not correcting the accentual mistake.

(8) (September, 2014) Participants: Regina, S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regina</th>
<th>S</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>zyaa, SAtoo-sensee wa?</em></td>
<td><em>saTOO-SEnsei desu ka? ima, sangai... orima... aa, orimasu, orimasu yo.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>a, hontoo desu ka?</em></td>
<td><em>(pointing at the visual aid)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>a, sumimasen. aa, SAtoo-sensee, saTOO-SEnsee desu ka? ima, aa, nigai.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Demonstrating correct pronunciation)</em></td>
<td><em>(Demonstrating correct verb form)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nikai.</em></td>
<td><em>irassyaimasu yo.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(demonstrating correct verb form again)</em></td>
<td><em>(demonstrating correct verb form again)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>irassyaimasu yo.</em></td>
<td><em>(demonstrating correct particle)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(demonstrating correct particle)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nikai ni.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Well, how about Mr. Sato?’
‘Mr. Sato? Now, (he) is on the third floor.’
‘Oh, is that true?’
‘Oh, sorry. Mr. Sato, Mr. Sato, right? Now on the second floor.’
‘Nikai’
‘The second floor, oh, it is.’
‘Irassyaimasu yo’
‘(Mr. Sato) is there. He is there.’
‘OK. Irassyaimasu yo’
‘(Mr. Sato) is there but ...’
‘Irassyaimasu yo’
‘Oh, I’m sorry. (Mr. Sato) is there.’
‘Well, please do it again. Well, how about Mr. Sato?’
‘Oh, Mr. Sato? Now, (he) is, um, on the second floor.’
‘Nikai ni.’
Regina’s error correction pattern in Excerpt (8) does not seem to concentrate especially on her student’s pitch accent patterns.

Regina maintained the “No spoken English” rule in her Act classes. For instance, she communicated only in Japanese even when a student came unprepared and made comments in English such as “I studied other parts so hard” and “I can’t remember when I try to use it.” By making these comments, this student seemed to show resistance towards the “No spoken English” rule in the language program. In Excerpt (9), so as to help her student sustain her performance in Japanese, Regina gives a hint by saying the new vocabulary that her student seemed to have a hard time coming up with.

198 In both Japanese and Chinese programs, there were a few students who seemed to show resistance towards the “No spoken English” rule like this or simply did not seem to care about the rule and slipped comments in English in Act class.
(9) (September, 2014) Participants: Regina, S

Regina  asita wa kotira ni irassyanai n desu ne?  ‘You are coming here tomorrow, right?’
S  …  …
Regina  syuttyo…  ‘Business trip…’
S  Yeah, that word.  ‘Yeah, that word.’
Regina  …  …

However, Regina resorts to using English briefly when the same student continued to be confused and performed poorly in the following situations. In Excerpt (10), Regina quickly explains the situation by saying “was on the phone,” then quickly switches back to speaking Japanese by rephrasing it in Japanese by saying bizii desita ‘(It) was busy.’

(10) (September, 2014) Participants: Regina, S

Regina  morimoto san ni denwa site kudasai.  ‘Please call Mr. Morimoto.’
S  (Pretending to dial the number)
Regina  (Imitating the sound of the phone indicating that the person that her student is trying to call is on the phone with another student)
puu puu puu.  ‘Ring ring ring’
(Switching back to her original role)
demasita ka?  ‘Did he answer?’
S  …?  ‘…?’
Regina  Was on the phone, bizii desita.  ‘Was on the phone, (he) was busy.’
S  I studied so hard. How does it start? doomo hen… what?
Regina  … denwa tyuu.  ‘In the middle of talking on the phone.’
S  … I don’t know why I would say that.  ‘I don’t know why I would say that.’

Interestingly, under the “No spoken English” rule, Regina used a loanword bizii ‘busy’ (of phone lines) as a substitute for a word that she assumed her student to not
This was occasionally done by other Japanese teachers as well. For instance, words like *hatuon* ‘pronunciation’ and *syukudai* ‘homework’ were often substituted as loanwords from English, respectively, as *puronansieesyon* ‘pronunciation’ and *hoomuwaaku* ‘homework’ when these words had not yet been introduced in the textbook. Words like *puronansieesyon* ‘pronunciation,’ *akusento* ‘accent,’ *paatikuru* ‘particle’ often accompanied error corrections to let students know what kind of errors were being corrected. Similarly, grammatical terms such as *toransitibu* ‘transitive’ and *intoransitibu* ‘intransitive’ were used in Act class as part of an explanation, since their Japanese equivalents, the words *tadoosi* and *zidoosi*, had not been introduced.

By using a loanword as a substitute and not responding in English to her student’s use of English, Regina tried to adhere to the “No spoken English” rule with all of her students, but the maintenance of this rule may also have kept Regina from building a good rapport with her students. Perhaps this is just her personality or she did not want the observer to see the “No spoken English” rule broken, but she seemed somewhat uncomfortable interacting with her students before and after class during the observation sessions. For example, before teaching a group of classroom students, she kept her distance by sitting in the corner where the computer was, as she prepared to teach her class by pulling up her PowerPoint slides and looking at her lesson plan. None of the

---

199 At this point, the Japanese equivalent *isogasii* ‘busy’ had actually been introduced already. Another possible reason that she used *bizii* instead of *isogasii* is because *isogasii* sounds somewhat odd in reference to the phone line.

200 For instance, when students struggled to use transitive and intransitive verbs in Act class, one Japanese teacher provided the following explanation to his students in Japanese: “… *toransitibu to intoransitibu wa nakanaka muzakasii desu. Wakarimasu yo ... motto ooganaizu site kudasai ne.* ‘Transitives and intransitives are quite difficult. I understand (your struggle). Please organize your vocabulary items better.’
students went to ask her a question before or after class. One potential cause of Regina not seeming to build much of a rapport with her students was her transition to the classroom track from the I.I. track. Some classroom students who took the survey could not remember her because she only taught the classroom track for one semester and she was teaching them with four other teachers, including Harumi, who had been teaching them from the previous semester. As one of the Level 1 Japanese students said earlier, the student experience in this course was one of having so many teachers that it seemed to “lessen [the] intimacy of class.”

Though this is conjecture, another reason that she kept her distance from her classroom students may have anxiety about being able to answer questions that her students might ask in English. One classroom student contrasted Regina and Harumi in the interview and said that she thought Regina was a nonnative speaker because she could not answer a specific question about Japanese culture whereas Harumi was able to do so. Such incidents might have made her aware of the limits of her declarative knowledge about Japanese language and culture. Further, in one of the follow-up meetings for teachers new to the program that took place in Autumn 2014, Regina said that she felt like she couldn’t “explain it the best” when her students asked questions about Japanese language and culture in English.

---

201 There were five different sections and different teachers were assigned to teach from day to day. Due to the difficulty of assigning all teachers to teach all sections equally, she taught some sections fewer times than others.

202 A similar case was seen with a teacher who was assigned to teach in three different settings. She appeared to lack confidence in class, perhaps because she did not have enough time with her students to connect well.
In contrast to Regina, Adam, who grew up speaking Japanese with his mother in the U.S., was more than willing to speak English with his students outside of Act sessions. In fact, he said he would often save the last five minutes of the Act session for students to ask questions about the materials covered in class. For example, in his Level 1 Japanese class, after finishing an Act session that included a situation regarding arranged marriages in Japan, he used the last five minutes to provide some additional explanations in English about how his grandmother in Japan entered into an arranged marriage. Interestingly, despite his Japanese lineage, unlike Regina, Adam viewed himself as a nonnative speaker of Japanese and aligned himself with his students. In the following explanation about a newly introduced expression soo desu ‘(That) is so,’ Adam went on to explain after talking about the arranged marriage, Adam uses ‘we’ to align himself with the learners and uses ‘they’ to refer to Japanese people (the italics marking these words do not indicate emphasis): “Isn’t it awkward when we translate it (soo desu) into English? Because we just don’t use ‘Is that so’ at all in natural English speech… But you have to get used to the fact in Japanese, they use variants of soo desu… very very commonly.” His tendency to align himself with students seemed to help him build a good rapport with many of his students. In fact, his office hours were almost always filled with students who wanted to hear his explanations in English.

Interestingly, though not encouraged by the “No spoken English” rule, many teachers of the Japanese and Chinese programs, including the teacher trainers themselves, sometimes used the last portion of Act class to provide some explanations in English. It seemed that, by so doing, they appeared less intimidating to students by showing them
that they could actually communicate in English and it was okay to ask questions in English outside of Act class. That said, the use of English during Act class was not encouraged by the teacher trainers, and they visited the new teachers’ classes to make sure that they were not mixing up the language during Act class, and Regina followed the rule in all of the observation sessions.  

Regina’s case is different from Harumi’s, but her background as a heritage speaker of Japanese makes her a divergent language teacher as well. Her identity is not captured in the dichotomy of target native and base native speakers, but she saw herself as a target native teacher, and limited her interaction with students in English to a minimum. She seemed to be comfortable with the standard Tokyo dialect, although her pitch accent patterns of some loanwords and names of people were different from those of the standard dialect. This is perhaps because she had not encountered these words in her experience in Japanese communities, which was limited compared to those who grew up in Japan. What she seemed not comfortable doing was explaining Japanese culture or grammatical concepts to her students in English, which, along with her limited experience teaching classroom track students (having spent her first semester teaching I.I.), seemed to prevent her from developing a good rapport with her students. While other teachers, such as Adam, took advantage of their English ability to build rapport

---

203 Interestingly, in the Chinese program, some students used the phrase X zhongwen zenma shuo ‘How do you say X in Chinese,’ which was introduced from the very beginning, to request information about English words. When the requested information or concept is difficult to explain in introductory-level Chinese, some Chinese teachers resorted to using English during Act class, perhaps thinking that it could help build a good rapport with their students by responding to students’ requests. Since many Chinese teachers were assigned to teach both Act and Fact, some of them had a tendency to mix the languages during Act class. There was one native-speaking Chinese teacher who frequently switched between English and Chinese during his Act class. Instead of enforcing the no English rule in Act class, he frequently supplied English comments and explanations.
with their students, primarily outside Act class hours, Rachel was especially observant of the “No spoken English” rule with her students, even outside Act class time, perhaps to avoid having to speak as a teacher about Japanese language and culture, an area in which she lacked confidence.

5.8. Suzan

“I found myself a little under-represented I have to admit… it’s kind of like where do I fit in. I mean, I’m closer to the base native than the target native.”—Suzan

As an L1 German speaker, Suzan felt underrepresented by the term “base native” because she did not share her L1 with any of her students. However, she spoke English well and was able to fit in as a base native. In fact, none of her colleagues questioned her identity as a base native speaker of English, perhaps because of her fluency in English and appearance as a white person. Similarly, the majority of students thought (correctly) that Suzan was a nonnative speaker of Japanese as well. Many based their assumptions on her appearance and pronunciation that is different from their image of “native speakers” of Japanese, and guessed that she learned Japanese as a second language. Interestingly, a few beginning-level students considered her a native speaker of Japanese because of her proficiency and fluency in the language.²⁰⁴ Like Suzan, there were other nonnative-speaking teachers whose L1 was not English, but besides Samantha (discussed in 5.1), most of them seemed comfortable with their English ability and they seemed fine playing the role of a base native in the language program. The fact that they all got

---

²⁰⁴ As explained in the footnote 126 found in 4.2, these beginning-level students listed all of their teachers as native speakers of Japanese.
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accepted to a graduate program in a major American university seems to confirm their proficiency in the English language as well.

Suzan was assigned to teach the I.I. sessions and continued to teach in the I.I. setting from Autumn 2014 to Autumn 2015. In the beginning, Suzan corrected a variety of errors such as conjugation mistakes and particle misusage (e.g., *sumimasen desu ka? as opposed to sumimasen desita ‘I’m sorry,’ and *moosiwake gozaimasu as opposed to moosiwake gozaimasen desita ‘I’m really sorry’), as well as inappropriate behavioral errors (e.g., students’ not bowing and not handing over documents properly, etc.). But when it came to subtle pronunciation errors (e.g., *arigatoo gozaimasuta as opposed to arigatoo gozaimasita ‘Thank you’ and *sumimasyen desita as opposed to sumimasen desita ‘I’m sorry’), she did not provide error corrections, perhaps because she did not notice them or she thought these subtle errors did not affect communication. Further, she did not make any corrections of pitch accent errors during the teacher-training week nor during the observation sessions in the first semester. This is perhaps because, despite her fluency in Japanese, Suzan’s pitch accent patterns sometimes differed from the standard dialect of the textbook. For instance, she seemed to transfer English accentuation patterns in Japanese when she pronounced certain proper names (e.g., *suZuki as opposed to suZUKI ‘Mr./s. Suzuki’ and *yoSIda as opposed to yoSIDA ‘Mr./s. Yoshida), loanwords (e.g., *piAno as opposed to piANO ‘piano’ and *hoTERu as opposed to HOteru ‘hotel’), as well as other words (e.g., *teGAmi as opposed to teGAMI ‘letter’, *RYOozikan as opposed to ryoOZikan ‘consulate’ and *yoKAtta desu as opposed to YOkatta desu ‘It was good’). In Excerpt (11) from Level 1 Japanese, Suzan corrects her student’s omission of
the particle *ka* (i.e. saying *desyoo* instead of *desyoo ka*), but her pitch accent of the deictic demonstrative *are* ‘that’ in the beginning and *ryokan* ‘Japanese inn’ throughout the excerpt is inconsistent with standard dialect in the textbook and media.

(11) (September, 2014) Participants: Suzan, S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suzan</th>
<th><em>aRE wa RYOkan desyoo ka nee.</em></th>
<th>‘I wonder if that’s a Japanese inn.’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td><em>saa, doo desyoo ka nee. yappari ryokan desu nee.</em></td>
<td>‘Hmm, I’m not sure. After all that is a Japanese inn.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzan</td>
<td><em>(signals to switch roles)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td><em>aRE WA RYOkan desyoo nee.</em></td>
<td>‘I wonder if that’s a Japanese inn.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzan</td>
<td><em>desyoo…</em></td>
<td>‘desyoo.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td><em>desyoo ka nee.</em></td>
<td>‘desyoo ka nee.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzan</td>
<td><em>saa, RYOkan desyoo ka nee. yappari RYOkan desu nee.</em></td>
<td>‘Hmm, I’m not sure. After all that is a Japanese inn.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though some of Suzan’s pitch accent patterns were different from the standard language’s, they were not corrected by others during the teacher-training week. However, Suzan said in the interview that the Japanese teacher trainer met with her and provided corrections on her pitch accent privately. By so doing, the Japanese teacher trainer helped Suzan adhere to the standard privately without embarrassing Suzan, in contrast to Katrina’s case with Yoshiko discussed in 5.4. The following comment Suzan made with regards to her pronunciation in the survey shows that she was aware of her pronunciation “problems”:

> My phonetic production overall does not seem to diverge majorly from that of a Japanese native speaker (or at least I am unable to discern any major differences, myself); however, when putting the separate sounds into morphemes/words and phrases, I sometimes notice myself not maintaining proper vowel length, and my accent and intonation slip on occasion.
With her acknowledged awareness of her pronunciation “problems,” Suzan personally sought ways to improve her language ability, and as the result, her accent patterns became more consistent with the standard dialect later on. For instance, she mentioned having a weekly Skype session with a Japanese speaker. The Japanese speaker did not correct her pronunciation in the meeting unless it interfered with their communication, but the Skype sessions provided opportunities for Suzan to further practice speaking Japanese outside of the teaching context. In addition, she mentioned going and observing more experienced teachers, and that seemed to have an impact on her teaching. Suzan said in the interview that she tried to incorporate some of the teaching strategies she observed, such as guiding students to self-correct their mistakes. As she gained more experience as a teacher, she started to provide models for subtle pronunciation patterns for long vowels (i.e. boosi ‘hat’), double consonants (i.e. itte ‘go’), as well as some corrections on pitch accent. In Excerpt (12), she successfully provides a pitch accent model for the word koohii ‘coffee,’ which is a loanword with two long vowels. Note that the accent pattern of her deictic demonstrative kono is consistent as well.

(12) (March, 2014) Participants: Suzan, S

| S | nomimasen ka? | ‘Would you like to drink (it)?’ |
| Suzan | a, nan desu ka? | ‘What is it?’ |
| S | a, ko, ko, kono kohi desu. | ‘um, this, this coffee.’ |
| Suzan | un. | ‘OK.’ |
| S | kono kohi desu yo. | ‘This coffee.’ |
| Suzan | kono koOHi | ‘kono koohii’ |
| S | koOHi desu yo. | ‘This coffee.’ |
| Suzan | un. a, iya, ii desu yo. | ‘Yes. Well, no, I’m good.’ |
| S | doozyo, doozo. | ‘Please (I insist).’ |
| Suzan | a, soo desu ka. zyaa. | ‘Well, then (I will take it).’ |
Occasional, but less frequent, departures from the standard in Suzan’s pitch accent remained in her Japanese in later observations, but the fact that she started to provide corrections for subtle pronunciation errors and pitch accent shows her gaining more control over the standard dialect, and confidence enough to correct in at least some cases.

Unlike Harumi and Regina, Suzan was not assigned to teach in the classroom track during the time of this study. This seemed to limit her opportunities to be creative since she had to use the premade lesson plans and visual aids to keep the lessons consistent with other teachers in the I.I. track, and she did not seem to deviate from the premade lesson plans for the most part. But at the same time, using the premade lessons seemed to have brought her a sense of security along with the “breathing room” to analyze the kind of mistakes that her students commonly made. The I.I. track also provided numerous opportunities for her to connect with her students individually as she seemed comfortable using English at the end of each Act session to explain things that her students seemed to struggle with. This kind of individual relationship seemed more difficult to establish in the classroom since there are many more students in class. Suzan said the following in the last interview: “I do feel more secure in what I’m doing. I know how to deal with common student problems ... I know how to point out if they [make mistakes] and pretty much get them to self-correct [their mistakes].”

205 She sometimes adjusted the length of the lesson plans since some of them were longer than others, and some students performed more slowly than others. The premade lesson plans were all printed out and some of the lesson plans had handwritten revisions written in by other instructors who had previously taught those I.I. sessions. Suzan followed these handwritten revisions as she deemed necessary.
Suzan’s case illustrates another type of divergent language teacher in that she did not have a shared L1 with any of her students. But it did not seem to affect her as much since she was comfortable as a base native with her proficiency in English. Other nonnative-speaking teachers who did not have a shared L1 with their students seemed fine as well since they, too, seemed comfortable with their English. The Japanese teacher trainer provided error corrections on her pitch accent privately. Having that guidance, along with her own seeking ways to improve her language ability resulted in her gaining more control over the standard dialect. Using the premade lesson plans in the I.I. did not provide many opportunities for her to come up with her own lesson plans, but at the same time, she found security and opportunities to connect with her students and became familiar with common mistakes that students in the I.I. track made.

5.9. Frank

“I don’t wanna screw up people with my own pitch accent.”—Frank

Frank considered himself a nonnative speaker of Japanese because he learned Japanese later in his life and had, in fact, the least, in number of years, formal association with Japanese of all the focal participants. Students’ perceptions of Frank were very similar to those of Suzan, in that many of his students guessed that he learned Japanese as a second language from his appearance as a white person and pronunciations in his Japanese that seemed to be “affected” by English. A few beginning-level students considered him a native speaker of Japanese because of his proficiency and fluency in the language. The fact that English is his L1 makes him a base native since many of his
students were L1 English speakers. However, we need to keep in mind that, if we assume that the term “base native” refers to a base in the English language, we are overlooking the increasing number of students whose L1 is not English. As documented in 3.1.1, about a quarter of the student population in this university’s Japanese program were made up of L1 Chinese speakers. For these “base Chinese” students of Japanese, L1 Chinese-speaking teachers of Japanese would be the corresponding base natives, although they would still communicate in English in Fact class.206

In the beginning, Frank seemed hesitant to make error corrections in his teaching. Perhaps this is because he had the least amount of exposure to Japanese language among the four focal participants. In Excerpt (13), Frank starts his first practicum by modeling a pitch accent. But instead of correcting errors, he ends up just having everyone repeat after his model since he seemed to not be able to tell whether his students had a correct pitch accent pattern or not. His projection of voice as a teacher was somewhat quieter than the other teachers.

(13) (August, 2014) Participants: Frank, Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frank</th>
<th>minisan konnitiwa.</th>
<th>‘Good afternoon everyone.’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>konnitiwa.</td>
<td>‘Good afternoon.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>motto ookina koe de hanasite kudasai.</td>
<td>‘Please speak louder.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>konniti wa.</td>
<td>‘Good afternoon.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>koN, koN, koNNITI WA</td>
<td>‘Kon, kon, konnitiwa.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>koNNITI WA.</td>
<td>‘Konnitiwa.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>koN. koNNITI WA.</td>
<td>‘Kon, konnitiwa.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

206 As one Japanese student whose L1 is Chinese was cited as pointing out (in 4.5), some L1 Chinese speakers find it odd to communicate with other L1 speakers of Chinese in English.
Unlike Suzan, Frank did not seem to improve his pitch accent as a teacher during this study, and interestingly, this instance was the only pitch accent model that he provided in the 9 sessions of observation (roughly two hours) video recorded over two semesters. Along with other teachers new to the program, Frank’s teaching behavior was corrected over the course of the teacher training and the following semester when the teacher trainers and the supervising coordinator went to observe their class. Frank learned to project his voice and was able to come up with various contexts for students to perform in Japanese by the end of the intensive teacher-training week, but, just like Suzan, he seemed to have a difficult time perceiving subtle pronunciation and pitch accent differences. In one of the feedback sessions where grades for each student were collected and displayed on the screen, Frank seemed embarrassed about the grades he had given because they differed from those of other teachers. When he was asked to explain his reasons, he had his head down because he did not seem to be able to explain his reasoning. Unlike Frank, Harumi, Regina, and Suzan were able to provide reasons for the grades they had assigned.

After the teacher-training week, Frank was assigned to teach I.I. sessions and continued to teach in the same setting for two semesters until he went to Japan to study in an advanced Japanese program. In the first observation held in September, 2014, Frank provided some error corrections in his teaching, but he also made some mistakes himself. For instance, in Excerpt (14), he guides his student to use direct style by reminding his student about his role as a friend, but Frank later inserts a distal style sumimasen ‘Excuse me’ as a friend, which sounded somewhat odd.
In the last part of Excerpt (14), Frank responds to his student’s conjugational mistake *sitte nai* by responding with the correct form *siranai*. In the end, his student was able to come up with the correct form, but whether Frank knew his student made a mistake or not is difficult to tell. In Excerpt (15) from the same I.I. session, Frank’s student mistakenly says *tukatteru* ‘is using’ instead of *tukutteru* ‘is making,’ and again, Frank responds to his student’s mistake with the correct form. The activity moved on and his student did not get a chance to correct his mistake this time. At the end of I.I. sessions, I.I. teachers usually gave some feedback in English, but Frank did not bring up these mistakes in the feedback he provided for the student.

### Excerpt 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frank</th>
<th><em>a, atarasi meuru kiteru.</em></th>
<th>‘Oh, I have a new email.’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>... dare kara kita n desu ka?</td>
<td>‘From whom?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td><em>a, tomodati.</em></td>
<td>‘a friend.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td><em>a, tomodati. gomen nasai. ee. dare kara kita no?</em></td>
<td>‘Oh, a friend. I’m sorry. Well, from who?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>(flips a page to provide another situation)</td>
<td>‘Excuse me. Do you know the telephone number for the Health Center?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td><em>itte, sitte nai.</em></td>
<td>‘No, I don’t.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td><em>siranai no?</em></td>
<td>‘You don’t?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td><em>hai, siranai.</em></td>
<td>‘Yes, I don’t.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Excerpt 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frank</th>
<th><em>sumimasen. NOda-sensei kariMUra-san ni denwa dakedo, kanozyo, ima nani siteru?</em></th>
<th>‘Excuse me. There is a phone call from Dr. Noda to Ms. Kimura, what is she doing?’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td><em>etto, ima wa KlMura-san wa, ressun puran, ressun puran o tukatte iru.</em></td>
<td>‘Well, Ms. Kimura is *using her lesson plan now.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Frank | *aa, ressun puran tukutte ru no. doko de?* | ‘Oh, she is making her
Frank’s inconsistent pitch accent patterning of people’s names can also be seen in Excerpt (15) (i.e. *NOda sensee as opposed to noDA SENSEe ‘Prof. Noda’; *kiMura or *KiMura as opposed to kiMURA ‘Mr/s. Kimura’). In the interview, Frank talked about how he was always worried about messing up his students’ pitch accent with his own as a teacher. He said he might have formed bad pronunciation habits that did not get fully corrected in his formative years of Japanese instruction. He suspected that this is because not much emphasis was placed on pitch accent in the language program in which he first started studying Japanese. He said he talked with other nonnative teachers of Japanese in the present program who seemed to have the same concern, and how hard it was for them to acquire the standard pitch accent. As a remedy, Frank talked about how he tried to listen to the audio program to imitate the model as much as he could during his preparation time. However, he said he was never sure how to tell if he is approximating them closely enough because he “only” had the recordings and his own judgment. He seemed to like working alone, and perhaps he did not want to bother other teachers about his pitch accent, but his comment in the interview about his pitch accent suggests that he did not take the time to check his pitch accent with other teachers. Perhaps he did not see the need to improve it, because he said in the survey that he did not think his pitch-accent errors were “terribly glaring.”
Frank’s attitude towards his pitch accent is different from Katrina’s, in that he seemed somewhat more comfortable with his pitch accent and did not seem to develop the sense of “guilt” for not having the “perfect” pitch accent. Perhaps, it was his defense mechanism towards his foreign language anxiety or lack of motivation to improve his pronunciation. Just like Suzan, Frank also received some feedback with regards to his pitch accent from the training coordinator privately. He also went and observed other teachers as per the training course requirement, but unlike Suzan, he did not bring these experiences up during the interview sessions or in his survey response. His pitch accent patterns continued to be different in the following semester when he pronounced certain proper names, loanwords (i.e. *KOohii as opposed to koOHii ‘coffee’), as well as other vocabulary items (i.e. *KAdda as opposed to kaTTA ‘bought,’ *SYUumatU as opposed to syuUMATU ‘weekend’ and *yoKAdda as opposed to YOkatta ‘it was good’). As in the first semester of his teaching, Frank did not provide any error corrections of pitch accent mistakes in the second semester either. The excerpt below (16) from the Level 1 I.I. session observed in March 2014 shows Frank’s and his student’s inconsistent accent patterns of the demonstrative pronouns in Japanese (which should be soRE ‘that,’ koRE ‘this,’ and DOre ‘which one’). Frank did not provide error corrections on the pitch accent; given his own similar error (soRE desu instead of soRE DESu), perhaps this was because he did not recognize the students’ errors.

(16) (March, 2014) Participants: Frank, S

| Frank | S | 
|-------|---|---|
| **nan desu ka?** | **doRE desu ka?** | ‘What is it?’ ‘Which one?’ |
| S | **soRE desu.** | **KOre desu ka? yonhyaku en desu.** | ‘That one.’ ‘This one? It’s 400 yen.’ |
During the interview held after my observation sessions in the second semester, Frank said that he felt his Japanese was deteriorating. He explained that this is perhaps because he only used elementary-level Japanese with his students in the I.I. sessions. He did not have to use Japanese extensively in classes he was taking as a student, and unlike Suzan, Frank did not seem to find ways to exercise his language ability outside of teaching contexts. Using the premade lesson plans for the I.I. sessions provided a comfort zone for Frank as he became familiar with the lesson plans and common student mistakes associated with each lesson plan over the course of two semesters, but it did not seem to motivate him to go beyond the required tasks as a teacher to improve his spoken skills.

Interestingly, although Frank did not use English in his I.I. sessions until each session was over, during the interview with me he noted that he used written English cues (a staple technique in all I.I. sessions) and has spoken a little English, as Regina did (see Excerpt 10), to help his students understand the context. He suspected that other teachers in I.I., too, used English cues with their students in a similar manner. He also pointed out that written English was extensively used in the visual aids used in the cue cards premade for each lesson, as in Figure 20. In his own words,

They say not to use English, but everybody in the I.I. does it, like you see even on the lesson plans that there are things that must be 10 years old or older, where you just have, people writing English cues [to elicit target vocabulary items and grammatical patterns]. … what other [ways can] you [elicit these things], especially, at this level?
The visual aids used in I.I. with the extensive use of instructions written in English might be thought to contradict the instructions given during the teacher-training sessions with regards to creating visual aids for application exercises in classroom Act classes (i.e. the less often instructions are spelled out in English, the better). Frank seemed thrown off by these apparent gaps between the teacher-training guidance (intended for classroom teaching) and the I.I. format’s reality. However, it is relevant here that the I.I. activity cue cards in fact resemble closely the large set of /scenario + task/ problems, written in English, that conclude every lesson in the textbook, in the “Utilization” section. These problems, projected in classroom Act class as written in the textbook, are a regular feature of Act sessions taught around the conclusion of a lesson, and were not practiced in the pre-semester training. Frank himself participated in such Utilization work when he took classroom Japanese courses a few years earlier in the same program. His confusion, if actual, suggests that trainees need more of an orientation to I.I. sessions as the
assessment-centered encounters that they are, and the ways in which they both resemble (in Utilization) and differ from (in Application Exercises) classroom Act classes.

In sum, Frank can be considered a typical base-native speaker in that his L1 is shared by most of his students. Though some of the students he taught seemed to have a different L1, Frank could still use English, if needed, to communicate with them since all of them spoke English—and were enrolled in a course at a university where English is the community’s default language of instruction. Frank received feedback on his pitch accent privately, but he did not seem to think it was problematic enough to work on. This may be a matter of unconscious resistance or a protective mechanism against the high standard set by the teacher-training program, perhaps a way to avoid the problem—and thus the “guilt” that Katrina felt in acknowledging her pitch accent problems. Frank seemed to have some confusion and perhaps unsettled feelings towards some of the standards established by the program such as the “No spoken English” rule and limiting the use of written English instructions in the visual aids.

5.10. Summary

This chapter has qualitatively explored the construction and effects of the iconized notion of “native speaker” as established in the language program observed. Though not many participants made a special note about their hiring experience in the survey, Harumi, Katrina, and Andrew from the Japanese program reported feeling “unqualified” in the process of their hiring experience. They felt they deviated from the standard “native speaker” and/or were dissatisfied with their language ability. There are
various potential sources for their insecurity, such as their general proficiency level in the standard Japanese dialect, limited work and/or teaching experience in Japanese, and nonnative-speaking teachers’ status as learners of Japanese, etc. Of course, we need to distinguish between (a) the native speaker as assumed audience and performance model for the learners and (b) the actual native speakers teaching in the program. In other words, (a) is a legitimate pedagogical construct (not a real person or people), while (b) is actual individuals, who (as preceding discussion notes) can vary quite a bit. “The native speaker” taken as assumed audience and performance model for learners in both the Japanese and Chinese language programs were perceived as a standard dialect speaker with limited experience communicating in other foreign languages. Many teachers in both the Japanese and Chinese programs expressed their desire for facility in the standard dialect and displayed different levels of confidence in their present facility.

Teachers are loosely differentiated in these programs in a dichotomy of target and base natives. Though this categorization neglects those with deviant characteristics, the term “base native” seemed to be an empowering concept for those who would otherwise be referred as “nonnative” speakers. Target natives were mainly assigned to teach Act classes, and base natives were indeed assigned to teach primarily Act classes, but Fact classes as well. Great emphasis was placed on pronunciation in the Japanese teacher trainer’s demonstration of a first-hour Act class in an introductory-level course, and this emphasis continued through the intensive practicum. The aim was said to be to equip teachers to better guide their students to an accurate pronunciation, at the most effective and efficient time to do so, namely when they are just beginning and do not yet have “bad
habits to break.” This kind of reasoning also applies to adherence to the standard language chosen as the program’s target for students. The “No spoken English” rule for Act classes was established during the intensive pre-session, and the teacher trainers followed up on how well this and other guidelines were being followed, by visiting the new teachers’ language classes after the semester began. A certain type of “native speaker” was identified as the audience assumed for student in-class performance, in the criteria used for grading student performances in Act class. In these ways, the language program constructed its “native speaker” standard for the teacher trainees, so that it aligned with what their students would be told.

Some communal differences between the Japanese and Chinese programs were pointed out. The Japanese program and Chinese program differed in their teaching assignments, in that while native-speaking teachers of Japanese were almost always assigned to teach Act class only, some native-speaking teachers of Chinese were assigned to teach both Act and Fact class. Section 5.3 discussed how this might be a source of the Japanese language student participants’ stronger preference for native-speaking teachers. The Japanese program seemed stricter in its endorsement of the standard dialect and other guidelines (e.g., limiting the use of written English and unfamiliar vocabulary, and avoiding teacher-like responses when playing the role of conversant), and an incident of over-correction of a nonnative’s pitch accent by a “standard enforcer” was reported in the Japanese program.

The focal participants, Harumi, Regina, Suzan, and Frank, reacted to the Japanese program’s goal of insisting on accuracy in teacher modeling and student performance of
the standard differently, and their long-term language socialization experiences showed different effects of the iconized “native speaker” in their development as language teachers. Harumi reported feeling “guilty” about her pitch accent deviating from the standard. She worked at acquiring the standard pitch accent by writing down the accent patterns from the textbook and listening to the news in the standard dialect. Harumi eventually gained confidence as a language teacher as she continued teaching the same groups of students and built rapport with them, and as the focus of her error corrections shifted from pitch accent to other types of errors. She seemed to feel her Japanese capability in standard Japanese was somewhat validated after she managed to attain the highest level score in the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview.

Regina, though she was raised in the U.S., did not seem to carry the same “guilt” about her pitch accent since she grew up speaking the standard dialect with her mother. Regina seemed more comfortable considering herself a target native speaker and seemed to strictly follow the “No spoken English” rule in her Act class teaching. On the other hand, she reported not feeling comfortable explaining Japanese language and culture in English. With a transition from the I.I. track to classroom track, her opportunities to teach certain groups of students seemed limited, which did not seem to help her develop a good rapport with her students. Unlike with other teachers, her classroom students did not ask her questions in English before or after class.

Suzan, an L1 German speaker, did not share her L1 with any of her students, but this did not seem to affect her teaching as she seemed very confident in her English ability. She was aware of her deviations with regards to some aspects of her Japanese
pronunciation and pitch accent, and put some effort into improving her language ability by interacting with another Japanese speaker via Skype on a weekly basis, and learning from observing other teachers. As a result, her confidence and ability in providing pitch-accent modeling and corrections seemed to improve over the course of three semesters of observations.

Frank is a native speaker of English and shares his first language with many of his students, though in the interview, he seemed to feel a little “guilty” about using English with his students at the end of his I.I. sessions, to clarify points as needed. Frank’s pitch-accent patterns were sometimes inconsistent with the students’ standard dialect models, but he did not seem to mind it as much as Harumi or Katrina did. His pitch accent did not seem to improve over the course of two semesters of observation. His opportunities to use Japanese were limited to interacting with his students in the I.I track and he said he felt his Japanese was deteriorating.

Some implications from these observations will be discussed in the next chapter, which presents the conclusions, implications, and limitations of this study. Some suggestions for how to address various needs of language teachers in training will be provided as well.
Chapter 6: Conclusions

The purpose of this study has been to examine the construction and effects of the notion of "native speaker" in the context of a Japanese language program in the U.S. In order to investigate this topic, which has seen little research outside of TESOL, this study addressed the following questions: (1) How do language teachers and students of Japanese in this program perceive native and nonnative language teachers? (2) How does the iconic construct of “native speaker” affect the language teachers of Japanese in this study? Since both the Chinese and Japanese language programs share the same language instruction approach (the Performed Culture Approach, or “PCA”), teachers and students from both programs were studied for the purpose of comparison.

The communities of language teachers and students from the Japanese and Chinese language programs were documented by both quantitative and qualitative collected from survey questionnaires, interviews, and observations. As a theoretical framework, Irvine and Gal’s (2000) three semiotic processes provided a way of looking at how language ideology and linguistic differentiation might be manifested in a language program. As an iconization of native speaker, the educated, standard-dialect speaker was used as a pedagogical model by the Japanese and Chinese language programs studied. As instances of fractal recursivity, manifestations of idealized characteristics associated with native-speaker status were found in the survey responses.
The dichotomies used to categorize language teachers (i.e. native/nonnative and target/base native) are prone to “erase” or disregard their “divergent” characteristics, but such “divergent” nature found in the dichotomies was acknowledged during the teacher training and in some of the participants’ survey responses.

Quantitative data from the survey questionnaires (N=593), which includes students and teachers (mostly GTAs) of Chinese and Japanese, indicated that native-speaker status was associated with a variety of abilities, such as competency in a variety of subjects and situations (77%), reading and writing ability (73%), pronunciation without foreign accent (60%), ability to use grammatical patterns without mistakes (55%), as well as the ability to teach their native language as a second language (30%). Along with appearance and name, these characterizations were used by students of Japanese and Chinese as common criteria to determine their teachers’ identity as a native or nonnative speaker of Japanese or Chinese. There were also some negative characteristics associated with native-speaker status, such as foreignness, and inapproachability, as well as negative views on their English ability. These are potential instances of fractal recursivity, in that the opposition of social status as native or nonnative speaker may be projected onto other analogous oppositions in different domains, such as linguistic competence vs. incompetence, ability vs. inability to read and write in the target language, and being able to teach vs. not being able to teach the target language as a second language, etc. Those who are identified as “nonnative” may be associated with the negative ends of such oppositions. Being a language teacher, as opposed to a student, in the programs studied seemed to have a strong influence on the
participating teachers’ characterization of “native speaker,” in that the teachers’ survey responses reveal a less idealized characterization of “native speaker” than do their students’ responses. On the other hand, “native speakers” were found to be more idealized among certain L1 language speakers such as Chinese and Korean, though the number of Korean native speaker study participants was only 10 (1 teacher and 9 students; see Table 5 in 3.1.1).

In general, native-speaking language teachers were preferred by both students and their teachers in many more areas than nonnative-speaking teachers. They were preferred as a pronunciation model (by 92% of respondents), as teachers of advanced-level speaking/listening (73%) and reading/writing classes (59%), and they were believed to set the linguistic standard in the target language (64%). None of these criteria reached 50% for preferring nonnative-speaking language teachers. The independent variables used in the multiple regression, namely, Status, Language program, Gender, Age, Level, Race, and Native language, only accounted for 5-8% of the variance for participants’ preference for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers, which suggests that one’s preference is influenced by many other factors, presumably at the communal and individual levels.

Despite their seemingly small contributions in explaining participants’ preferential trends, there were some variables that were found to have a significant association. Specifically, native speakers of Chinese and Korean were found to have a stronger preference for having native-speaking teachers. A stronger tendency to prefer native-speaking teachers was also found among students enrolled in courses of Level 3
or higher. On the other hand, multilingual speakers were found to have a slightly stronger preference for nonnative-speaking teachers. Teacher participants, in comparison to Level 1 students, expected their students to prefer both native- and nonnative-speaking teachers (each for different reasons) more than their students actually did.

Similar preferential trends for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers were found in the Japanese and Chinese language programs, but statistical analysis revealed that students from Japanese courses had a slightly stronger preference for native-speaking teachers, and slightly less preference for nonnative-speaking teachers. The fact that target native-speaking Japanese teachers were not assigned to teach Fact class was discussed as one of the potential sources of this difference, in 5.3.

The introductory-level textbooks used in the two language programs described Japan and China differently in terms of the linguistic complexity that exists in each country, but both the Japanese and Chinese programs used each country’s standard dialect as a model by characterizing “native speaker” as someone from the target culture who is not familiar with foreigners and foreign languages. This characterization was reinforced by specific policies set by the programs such as directing teacher trainees to use the pronunciation of the standard dialect. Another policy is to avoid speaking English in Act classes. Some Japanese teacher participants felt they deviated from these standards and reported feeling “guilty” or “unqualified,” but such feelings were not as strongly expressed by the Chinese teacher participants. While there are many individual factors that could potentially account for this difference, some communal differences
that could also account for it were discussed. It was pointed out that there was less expression of concern for strict adherence to the standard language by Chinese language faculty members than by Japanese faculty in the Japanese program. An incidence of repeated uninvited correction of pronunciation during teacher training by a “standard enforcer” was reported by a nonnative-speaking teacher of Japanese, but not by any teachers of Chinese. The fact that there were more nonnative-speaking faculty members involved in graduate studies in language pedagogy, including teacher training, in the Chinese language program may have led to a sense of more support in that program for nonnative-speaking teachers.

Language teachers in the Chinese and Japanese programs were assigned to teach Act and Fact classes according to their categorization as either target-language natives or base-language natives. In this division of labor, speaker characteristics that deviated from the base/target dichotomy were recognized but disregarded when necessary. The focal participants from the Japanese program, Harumi, Regina, Suzan, and Frank, reacted differently to the pressures to conform into the standard/typical base and target native dichotomy.

A dialect speaker of Japanese being assigned to teach Act class, Harumi was obligated to use the standard dialect and worked at modeling the standard dialect by writing down pitch-accent patterns and listening to the news in the standard dialect. Though she sometimes had to deal with students’ questions in English outside of Act class settings, she did not have to do the work usually assigned to base natives, that is, she did not teach any Fact classes. Harumi seemed somewhat insecure about correcting
pitch accent in the introductory-level Japanese course. The way she provided corrections for expressions like *yokatta desu ne*, ‘That was good,’ and words like *tika*, ‘underground,’ seemed to show her determination to follow the textbook’s pitch accent, but she unwittingly provided inconsistent feedback and model in the beginning.

Harumi’s focus on error corrections eventually shifted from students’ pitch accent to other types of errors after she transitioned from the introductory-level to an intermediate-level course, and she seemed to be not affected by her guilt any more as an intermediate-level teacher. She felt her standard Japanese was validated after she was able to attain the highest level on the OPI.

Regina was introduced as being both a target and base native speaker, since she grew up speaking both Japanese and English in the U.S., but she seemed more comfortable considering herself a target native speaker teaching Act class because she spoke the standard dialect. She commented that she felt she could not “explain it the best” when her students asked questions about Japanese language and culture in English. This, along with her limited opportunities to interact with classroom students, which seemed to keep her students from asking her questions in English, seemed to keep her from building a good rapport with her students. In contrast, other teachers in the program, including the teacher trainers, used English outside of Act class as needed, and to a degree during the Act class, as when using the last few minutes to clarify certain confusions that might have arisen in class. As discussed in sections 4.4 and 4.5, the use of English is associated in the questionnaires with nonnative-speaking teachers of Japanese and Chinese. Some students apparently projected this association into an
assumption about the approachability of those teachers. This projection seemed to help the teachers involved build rapport with their students.

Suzan’s L1 did not match any of her students’ L1s, but she was able to do the work usually assigned to a base native, with her English ability. She also did the work preferentially assigned to target natives in Act classes. As an Act teacher, she became aware of her pitch accent deviating from the standard after her Japanese teacher trainer met with her privately to point it out. She sought ways to improve her language ability and the observation data from her second semester showed that she has gained more control over the standard dialect in her improved ability to perceive and provide corrections for subtle pronunciation errors and pitch-accent errors.

Frank, on the other hand, did not think his pronunciation and pitch accent deviated too far from the standard. Despite receiving guidance on his pitch accent privately, his pitch accent of the standard dialect did not show improvement. Unlike Suzan, Frank did not show signs of improved pitch accent in a follow-up observation in the second semester of teaching. Being able to use the premade lessons in the program’s I.I. courses provided security for Frank, as he only had to deal with beginning to intermediate-level students, using the same lesson plans. He said that he felt his Japanese was deteriorating by the end of the second semester. Perhaps this is because the only use of Japanese that Frank engaged in during this study was when he taught the I.I. class. As a consequence of not using the language regularly and in a variety of contexts, he probably felt his Japanese was not as good as it was before.
6.1. Implications

Some ideas and suggestions for improving foreign language teacher training and foreign language instruction will be proposed in this section.

First, some “iconization” of a representative native speaker is not necessarily a “game-ender,” or even the hegemony-inducing problem that it is sometimes made out to be in the literature: we, as language educators, can manage it for our purposes.\(^{207}\) It is a consequence of using models for imitation that have to be consistent and viable in the target culture—hence the aptness of standard Japanese. As discussed as part of 5.2, the standard dialect has its own efficiencies, such as the fact that learning to communicate well in one variant (a standard) can serve as a basis for entry into other varieties and their communities. On the other hand, teaching one or more other regional dialects at the beginning is, for the reasons we have acknowledged in 5.3, both pedagogically dubious and logistically impractical. Despite the ways in which it can be abused, an “iconic” standard is pedagogically useful and even necessary.

While it is true that incorporating the standard dialect disregards divergent individuals that do not fit in as embodiments of the standard, we should not simply ignore its usefulness by only focusing on this aspect. As pointed out, standard dialects provide a common ground when used as a lingua franca in communication among strangers, and in learning other, non-standard dialects. Imposing a characterization like "erasure" on provisions that have real pedagogical utility in the early stages of L2/FL education hides—we might say erases—most of what those provisions are about. If we say that

\(^{207}\) I am indebted to Charles Quinn for discussing a number of the issues raised in this section.
meeting our L2/FL pedagogical needs entails some “erasure,” then we might also say it of L1 acquisition and some school subjects. Do children in any L1 typically begin by learning to speak dialects of other regions or socioeconomic groups? Why should we introduce beginners in arithmetic first to base-10, but not to other numeral systems?

As we propose to support the idea of using the standard dialect as a model in language instruction, it is important to remind language teachers and students that there is a wide variety within the standard itself. The linguistic uniformity (or “iconization”) that a language textbook presents is by no means absolute. There is variation in particle use vs. non-use (“dropping”), variable contractions, and the myriad of ways in which politeness and other indexed stances are treated. For instance, speakers of Japanese usually vary their speech style by mixing casual and careful style as they interact with others, depending on many factors, such as whom they are talking with, what kind of settings they are in, and what kind of intentions they have, etc. In other words, the variety of language models presented in the textbook is just one representation of language performance suited for given situations. After all, even within the standard language of their models, language learners will be learning to recognize and use different social styles. As long as this “one language” criterion is pedagogically the best choice for beginners, and includes a variety of speech styles, whether that standard creates political hegemony, etc. is debatable.

In a sense, no dialect anywhere is anything but an iconized idealization. “The X dialect” is a construct, just as are “the X language” and “standard X”—each of which naturally varies a bit in actual performances—which is where they change over time as
well. These are simplified ways of talking about social realities that are autopoietic, or self-creating, as if they were entities or things. “The X language (or dialect)” is thus a kind of metaphor, since it refers to a life form—something that is constantly remaking itself—as if it were something fixed. Variation is inherent in any living language in many ways, not least because, for example, indexical variables are always open to picking up new associations. Neither L1 acquirers nor L2/FL learners can avoid encountering variation, as long as they engage in communicating with others. Students interacting with one target native-speaking teacher and interacting with another target native-speaking teacher will invariably encounter some differences, even if they are both trying hard to stick to the same “pedalect”—the pedagogical dialect that has thus far been introduced to a cohort (e.g. Level 1) in the language program. Some students also have semi-regular to frequent contact with Japanese outside of class, where there is far less control for vocabulary, morphosyntax and phonology. Thus, language learners are not being held captive to a monolithic version of standard Japanese, just because the language program insists on “accuracy” or consistency with the social precedent in standard Japanese.

We may ask “Does having a specified pedalect in itself necessarily encourage or help perpetuate the disfranchisement of language teachers who diverge from an idealized, iconized type?” It might, if we look at the dialect as a homogeneous entity shared by a homogeneous group of people. But even a standard dialect is autopoietic. It is constantly growing and changing as its users encounter and perform different kinds of tasks or “stories,” in which all linguistic matters—phonology, morphosyntax, semantics,

---

208 For an exploration and articulation of this view of communication, with an eye to L2/FL pedagogy, see Wang (2016).
pragmatics—function organically together, learned with their mutual associations intact in memory. Maybe if we think in terms of this frame, and focus carefully on what is involved in providing our learners this kind of experience, we can sort out a range of complementary and useful roles for “divergently” contributing teaching talents. We need to get better at talking and thinking about languages as forms of life, especially if we are in the L2/FL pedagogy business. Objectifying, regularization and uniformity (“iconization”) are part of constructs like “the X language” or “the X dialect,” and of “native speakers who have no experience interacting with foreigners,” but these metaphors can still be useful for language instruction if we regard them as something dynamic and changing.

Language is constantly changing and the standard language described in the language textbooks cannot reflect every ongoing change. While it is important to respect and try to incorporate what is described in the chosen language textbook into teaching, one should be cautious about when and when not to hew tightly to the textbook’s standard, and be willing to question what is presented as the standard in the textbook, if something seems odd. If, for example, some language phenomena described in the textbook seem outdated, it is important to investigate and find out whether they are really outdated or not. To do so, choosing an appropriate source of information is important, since not all “native speakers” amongst us (or on the Internet!) may actually be familiar with the language phenomenon in question and its typical performance parameters, but without this familiarity, s/he is not in a position to provide accurate information. Some language teachers like to discredit certain language textbooks for presenting language
that they consider out of date, but such items also present an opportunity to discuss the dynamic nature of language, and how language users can help themselves by keeping an ear cocked to notice changes in everyday communication. Textbooks that actually inform learners of changes underway, as when distinguishing innovative and established expressions of the same grammatical category, have seized the opportunity to clue their users on an essential quality of language—including dialects that serve as standards in their societies. At any point in time, standard languages too have their more or less established parts their innovative parts and their “old fashioned” parts, and serious learners deserve to know about them.

It is oftentimes the case that people of groups that do not dominate their society lead the ways of change in society. Linguistic changes that eventually take hold too are often initiated by people, some of them younger people, who may not yet be accustomed to societal standards. Language teachers need to be aware of such processes and the innovations that have sizable followings among speakers, but at the same time, they should still introduce the standard language. The majority of innovative expressions created by younger generations are short-lived and may not be useful in the long run, and knowing the standard is the most direct route for helping learners to become accustomed to the target society.

Second, while using an “iconized native speaker” as a language model has many pedagogical benefits, it is still useful to “deconstruct” the “iconic” standard, especially for language teachers in training. As part of language-teacher training, it needs to be explained how the construct of a standard dialect, though quite useful, is also in some
significant respects a fiction—a repertoire that is not exactly the same for all of its actual speakers, open-ended and changing as long as its speakers are speaking: what we refer to as “the” standard language is never at a standstill and differs in some ways for all of its speakers, according to their lived experience. Language teachers need to know where their model comes from and why it is used as a model in their language program, as well as the relative nature of it as a construct. We suggest the following topics be addressed as part of the discussion: (1) the heterogeneity that exists within the standard language, (2) the fact that the iconization of “native speaker” is not absolute, and (3) the idealized quality in characteristics that language teachers, program administrators, and language learners may unconsciously associate with their characterization of “native speaker.” Exemplified instances of fractal recursivity that were documented in Chapter 4 (which is summarized in Table 16) can be useful in discussing these matters.

As language educators, we can deconstruct many of the false assumptions about the iconic, idealized “native speaker,” while making sure that our pedagogy/teaching puts it to work as judiciously, effectively, and fully as needed. Allowing a “whatever” kind of approach, in which any way of saying something is acceptable, just because “everyone is different” may be one way of resisting standardization, since it encourages acceptance for deviating characteristics, but it may not result in effective language instruction in the long term. While language learners fostered in such settings may feel comfortable in their language class settings as they nurture their “idiolects,” it is likely that they are not going to be able to function well when they are out in the target culture. Kyoko (discussed in 2.3) seemed to feel that what she called ‘her English’ worked well enough with her
fellow Asian ESL classmates, and saw it as a means of resistance to the course’s standard English, but if it is their own pidgin, it will be of decidedly less value outside their little community.

In communities like Japan where standardization of many kinds plays a vital role in shaping what is appropriate and not appropriate in everyday life, it would be beneficial for anyone who is entering that culture to understand those rules that are explicitly spelled out as well as those that are tacit. In each community, there are certain communal conventions, explicit or tacit, that members abide by, which we broadly refer to as “culture.” For instance, besides language, there are rules in a variety of domains such as sports, music, or religion. Knowing (explicitly or tacitly) and following conventions in any of community can help participants to become functioning, successful members in their community; indeed, it amounts to “knowing what to do” and is a meta-index of belonging. In other words, following conventions is an index of belonging in many specific domains. However, not knowing and/or not following these conventions can prevent one from truly entering the community, and leave one treated as a guest at best, or an outsider, or, at worst, an undesirable. Thus, it is crucial for language educators to prepare their students to enter into the target culture by training them to be observant of the interdependent details of what Walker and Noda (2010) term “performances” in target culture, so that they do not blindly try to act and interact according to norms of their base culture when in the target culture. Needless to say, the target language is a subset of the larger lifeway, the target culture.
Error corrections play an important role in shaping one’s communicative ability and learners may miss out on many of the benefits when there is too little attention to pronunciation errors. For example, experienced language teachers, who are so used to learner errors that they can anticipate many of them, may be able to understand the language spoken by language learners, but that may not be the case with non-language teachers in the target culture (i.e. the general population) who are not accustomed to the kinds of language spoken by language learners—whose pronunciation, lexical and construction choices may be heavily influenced by their L1. This is why the programs I have reported on here say that they define their “native speaker”—the default audience imagined for their students—as one who lacks such familiarity. Receiving pronunciation error corrections can help language learners from forming bad habits, and having a proper pronunciation can certainly enhance their ability to communicate with people in the target culture. At the same time, too much emphasis on someone’s erroneous word choice, consonant or vowel pronunciation, or pitch-accent pattern can be a discouraging experience, particularly when done in front of a student’s peers. Receiving error corrections can be embarrassing and humiliating when it is done repeatedly and publically. Providing error corrections at the individual level in class certainly has its benefits, but singling out and lingering too long correcting an individual’s error can turn into public humiliation, which is neither a pleasant experience nor a motivator for keeping on (and fixing the problem). The way in which language teachers react to students’ errors seems to have a strong impact on such students, so great care is needed when providing error corrections.
There is a Japanese martial art concept, *shuhari* (守破離), which describes the stages of learning to mastery. It begins with *shu*, ‘protecting and obeying fundamental techniques,’ followed by *ha*, ‘detachment from the tradition,’ and finally *ri*, ‘separating and going beyond.’ As language teachers, it may be difficult for us to feel that we have fully “mastered” the fundamental or standard of the target language and its culture, but we can at least acknowledge and learn to deal with the anxiety that comes from learning to “master” and teach the standard dialect. Such efforts may eventually help us move onto other levels of mastery and creativity. To a knowledgeable audience, a creativity that impresses is one that is based on knowing what they know.

Being able to speak in the pitch-accent patterns of the standard Tokyo dialect may seem insignificant to some language educators (e.g., those who author and/or use pedagogical materials that ignore such “details”) and students, but the survey results indicate that there is a high demand for acquiring native-like pronunciation, and it can certainly enhance one’s chances of being understood and even well regarded in any number of Japanese language communities. In other words, it can be empowering. Speaking with accent patterns that are unique, on the other hand, will index that Japanese speaker’s unique background—a background shared with no one else known to the audience. In other words, it may index the speaker’s identity as a nonnative speaker, a *gaijin* ‘foreigner,’ along with other negative associations that go with *gaijin* in Japan. Whatever our L1, we have all had the experience of imagining what kind of person someone is, on the basis of their pronunciation. In the process of acquiring the standard dialect, those who are acquiring should understand that their identity, as they imagine it,
will remain their own regardless of which Japanese pitch-accent patterns they add to their original repertoire. They should also understand that it is to their advantage to know the standard dialect, including its pitch-accent patterns, particularly if that dialect is the developmental target in the language training they are giving their students. Students of the language, like base-native teachers, should also be aware of the potential negative consequences in approaching communication in the target culture without becoming aware of and following local practices of interaction. “Uniqueness” in one’s speech that has no precedence in the target culture is part of another icon, the gaijin speaker of Japanese.

Third, to provide effective pedagogical instruction, we need to take concrete steps to help language teacher trainees grow stronger in areas they are weak in, among other things. The addressable issue here is how we as language teachers and teacher trainers deal with that anxiety—which will not be the same for all language teachers; each teacher has their own individual challenges. For example, native nonstandard dialect speakers do not necessarily have the same source or kind of anxiety as nonnative teacher trainees will. Our efforts to support novice language teachers should acknowledge and address their individual weaknesses and strengths, as well as those that they share.

Discussing the article written by Horwitz (1996) on foreign language anxiety experienced by language teachers, as part of the teacher training, may be a good start. It will help set the safe environment for language learners with high foreign language anxiety to openly talk about their challenges. Some of the suggestions that Horwitz (1996) made about dealing with foreign language anxiety may be useful, for example, in
making a plan to improve one’s language proficiency. A standard language provides a
goal for native and nonnative as well as any divergent speakers to expand or develop a
better control of their language ability along with socially accepted behaviors in the
larger target language community. Anxiety, like stress, comes with any learning of
something new, but we can also learn to manage these emotions productively. Instruction
that addresses such issues explicitly can help.

The standard dialect used as a model in the language program provided Suzan a
goal in improving her language ability, which seemed to pay off as she seemed to gain
more control over the standard dialect with her mastery of some subtle pronunciation and
pitch-accent patterns in the standard dialect. On the other hand, Frank did not seem to set
a goal to improve his language ability, at least with regards to acquiring the standard
dialect pitch-accent patterns. As a consequence of much less speaking, he felt his
Japanese was deteriorating by the end of his second semester as a language teacher. As a
native speaker, Harumi strove to improve her language ability by studying and practicing
the standard dialect pitch-accent patterns and listening to news in the standard dialect.
She seemed to gain more confidence as a language teacher as the result of her consistent
efforts to acquire these features of standard dialect. Like Suzan and Harumi, we should
always strive to improve our language skills as language teachers, and be supportive of
other language teachers who are trying to improve their language proficiency.

In helping language teachers deal with their foreign language anxiety, it is
important to keep in mind those whose divergent characteristics may be disregarded in
the usual categorizations of language speakers. As language teachers, divergent language
speakers may be trained to model a standard dialect speaker in order to present language
that is consistent with that in the video and audio media that the learners are hearing so
much more of (provided they practice and rehearse outside of class, as directed).
Consequently, they may have to strategically put aside their proficiencies in a minority
dialect or foreign language. There is good, defensible pedagogical motivation to do so,
but this can be a difficult process for some divergent language teachers especially when
they lack certain life experiences that “typical” native speakers have, such as receiving
education in the target language or growing up speaking the standard dialect. Needless to
say, adhering to this high standard can be extremely difficult for those who lack the
intuitions and competency that come from extensive experience in target language
communities (e.g., being educated or having work experience in the target language
communities, etc.). It would be beneficial for such divergent language teachers if their
teacher trainers and colleagues were to explicitly acknowledge and try to understand their
unique challenges (e.g., difficulty of modeling the standard dialect pronunciation patterns
and/or explaining cultural and linguistic concepts that are typical in standard dialect
communities, etc.).

At the same time, it bears keeping in mind that the learning regimen in these
programs is designed so that students do not depend on their Act (or Fact) hour
instruction for the introduction and initial modeling of new language-in-context to
observe, imitate and practice. This work is assigned, rather, as preparation for Act hours,
to be done using recordings of the standard-speaking models, which comprise all the
language in the textbook’s basic conversations (video and audio), drills (audio), and
listening comprehension exercises (audio; “Eavesdropping” in Jorden and Noda). In rehearsing for their (graded) Act classes, students should be listening and responding aloud for more hours per week with the recorded models than in the Act hours themselves, where each is one among 15-20 others. Thus, there is no need for students to depend on their Act class teachers for a majority of modeling and basic rehearsal of the language.

Nonnative-speaking teachers with high foreign language anxiety are at risk for becoming too harshly critical or distrustful of their language abilities, even when they have good language ability. It can be a devastating experience when such high anxiety encounters high standards and expectations in a language program, and can too easily seem out of reach. In fear of making mistakes in front of students or other teachers (whether friendly observers or standard “enforcers”), they may spend undue time preparing their lesson plans as they attempt to get rid of any and all perceived imperfections in their language. Or, they may strategically choose to avoid encounters that involve speaking in the target language with other teachers in the program. In order to provide a good model in class as language teachers, it is important for us to strive to become intimate with the models presented in the learning materials, but again, we need to remind ourselves that we are not the only models that language learners are exposed to. It may be reassuring for some language teachers with high foreign language anxiety, and spend time correcting their own pronunciation mistakes, to know that the main source of input for language learners who prepare well for class is actually the media, video and audio, of their learning materials.
Anyone who feels they are deviating from the standard may feel “guilty” and “unqualified” as language teachers. As Harumi’s case illustrated, even those who identify themselves as native speakers experience this “guilt” when they feel they lack certain linguistic intuitions, such as for the standard dialect pitch accent. Perhaps, this feeling of “guilt,” along with a fear of making mistakes in front of learners who are familiar only with standard pitch-accent patterns prompts teachers like Andrew to teach Act classes only with combinations of expressions and vocabulary from the assigned parts of the textbook. When setting a goal, it is important to give permission for ourselves to be less than perfect, as Horwitz (1996) suggested, so that we feel it is okay to sometimes make mistakes in the process of achieving our goals. We need to be willing to risk making mistakes in our quest to achieve our goals, and our language students should be allowed to feel the same. As teachers of first-time learners, it is difficult to progress and improve if we are not willing to try and make mistakes. Mistakes recognized and corrected can become new strengths.

In the process of expanding our language ability by adding a skill such as a new pitch-accent system, unless we are pure beginners, we need first to acknowledge and identify our deviation, so that we can learn to differentiate from the patterns we seek to learn. The use of technology such as listening to audio models and recording our own performance of the same pitch-accent patterns can be very productive, especially when there is someone to guide or support our efforts with feedback along the way (since “Practice makes permanent.”). Some language teachers may benefit from some form of pronunciation assessment or diagnosis at the beginning of the teacher-training program.
(preferably an audio-recorded one). As they strive to improve their language proficiency and their pronunciation in the standard dialect, they can retake the assessment so as to stay on task until they see progress.

Many who did not grow up speaking in the pitch-accent patterns of standard dialect may find it difficult to develop a feel for it if they do not know how to set an appropriate goal. As implied by the Japanese proverb  

*senri no michi mo ippo kara* (千里の道も一歩から) ‘Even a journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step,’ it is important to start the task of pursuing a goal with a single step. “Divide and conquer” offers similar advice. For example, acquiring the accent patterns of a single proper noun such as *suZUKI* ‘Mr/s Suzuki’ (as opposed to the all-too-common *suZUki*) can be a good start. It may seem like a tiny step, but if mastered, it is a step of real progress. In fact, many of the pitch-accent errors observed during this study seemed to be those of proper names and loanwords, as well as demonstratives. Knowing how to appropriately pronounce someone’s name is usually crucial in developing a good relationship with that person, just as being able to say place names as the locals do indexes more of a familiarity with both. Developing standard pitch accent can be a goal that motivates, as long as we know how to go about making it an achievable one. If language students can be guided to becoming speakers with intuitions for particular pitch-accent patterns, surely their teachers can be, too.

Those who are helping learners or their colleagues to adhere to the program’s chosen standard may have good intentions, but they should do so at an appropriate time and place, keeping in mind that how it is done can have a lasting impact on those whose
errors are corrected. A language classroom or teacher-training program certainly may be considered an appropriate place to provide error correction, since the intentions of participants in both settings (hopefully) are to improve their language (teaching) skills. However, as Horwitz (1996) suggested, it is also important for us to recognize feelings of foreign language anxiety within ourselves and others, and when guiding someone, by correcting them to standard language practice, to do it in ways that are unmistakably supportive, whether it be a teaching colleague or a language student. As we try to help others develop new skills (which, in this case, mean means better adhering to the standard), we need to remember our own feelings of foreign language anxiety, which can help bring a supportive mindset to the task, as opposed to merely focusing on “correcting errors.” Learning to communicate in an unfamiliar language can certainly help us remember what it feels like to be a language student.

Without receiving affective support, those whose errors are corrected may develop hostile attitudes towards the standard they are held to, as well as towards those who are enforcing it. It is difficult to build rapport and team esprit (‘the spirit of body or group’) if such hostile tension exists among language teachers and students in the program. No lesson plans will be shared when there is no rapport, and no language learners will be willing to take creative risks in the target language if they fear making mistakes and undergoing embarrassing error corrections. Some “standard enforcers” may not be aware of the potential for negative affective impact that error correction has, and may provide error corrections at the wrong time and place, or simply provide too many, or prolong them too long. As language-teacher trainers, we should look out for such
individuals in our language program, so that we can “guide” their corrective impulse into a more effective style.

Fourth, it is important to question and rethink our assumptions about native and nonnative speakers, since none of us has all the idealized characteristics of “the native speaker” of our own language. In present-day practice, the terms “native” and “nonnative” speaker are still frequently used in reference to language teachers, and “native” speakers are commonly regarded as the gold standard, and “nonnative” speakers as the non-standard. However, Harumi’s case illustrated that even native-speaking teachers feel that they deviate from the standard and feel it is necessary to work towards mastering the standard dialect. On the other hand, some nonnative-speaking teachers seemed comfortable and confident with their pronunciation in the standard dialect in the target language, which seems to illustrate that not all nonnative-speaking teachers are necessarily negatively affected by the native speaker fallacy. There are many individual factors that contribute to the effectiveness of language teachers, so we should not just assume all native-speaking teachers to be great, or all nonnative-speaking teachers to be suffering from the native speaker fallacy.

In the language teaching field, there is and, it seems likely, will be an increasing number of “divergent” teachers, particularly with the effects of globalization. For instance, Figure 21 below provides a photo of hāfu who are growing up speaking Japanese and English in the U.S.
Figure 21. Photo of hāfu growing up in the U.S.

When children like these grow up bilingual to some degree and, perhaps, become Japanese language teachers in 20 years, will they still be considered divergent teachers? Who is Japanese? What does it mean to be Japanese? Is Japan really a homogeneous monolingual country? Will it be then? Are we not all “divergent” speakers even in our native language? These are some questions to consider as we problematize and rethink our assumptions about native and nonnative speakers.

While Harumi and Suzan tried to master the pitch accent of the standard dialect, Frank kept his own pitch accent even though he received feedback from his teacher trainer suggesting that it needed improvement. The fact that Frank did not apparently strive to work on his pitch accent may seem like a bad example, but acknowledging and accepting his unique manifestation of pitch accent may lead in turn to questioning the iconization of “the native speaker” as educated monolingual speakers of the Tokyo dialect, exclusively. As noted by Doerr (2009b), the unique pitch-accent patterns of someone like Frank would give “the native speaker” a chance to get used to and
understand non-standard Japanese as spoken by “nonnative speakers” (Kubota, 2001).
Indeed, though the standard dialect has many pedagogical benefits, there is a time and place for such idiolects as well. For example, while it is culturally, in standard Japanese, the default to refer to someone with that last name as suZUKI-SAN ‘Mr/s. Suzuki’, in a wealth of situations in Japanese communities, pronouncing the same name as suZuki-san has its uses in the Japanese language as well. Someone may strategically use the latter pattern to bring playfulness into the conversation and/or to index a “foreign” identity, as desired. That said, however, such strategic codeswitching can only be pulled off when someone has acquired the standard—shu (守), which once in place provides them the option of ha (破), detaching from precedent, and separating and going beyond, ri (離).
Knowing the standard dialect on top of whatever other dialect(s) we speak can be very useful, socially and (for teachers and learners) pedagogically, and being stuck in a dialect that is our own but non-standard can be limiting in the same two domains, when there are many other people who use the standard dialect to communicate. This is certainly not what we want as language teachers for our students, so if they are starting from zero, why not make the standard their initial target?

As Japanese language teachers, of course, we have good pedagogical reasons to keep to the standard language, and it feels odd to allow what deviates from the standard. As mentioned, there is actually a time and place for both the standard and non-standard; their optimal balance may be far from 50-50, depending on the situation. Those who are helping others adhere to the standard should gauge carefully when and how to do so, because it can have a lasting impact on those who are being helped. On the other hand,
there is an increasing number of researchers (Doerr, 2009a; Tanaka, 2013; Doerr and Sato, 2008) who suggest that we should rethink or even resist the process of standardization. Those who resist or question the standard should know that it is okay to do so, as long as it is done for an informed and valid reason, at an appropriate time and place—not, for example when interacting with learners whose learning materials present the standard language exclusively. Any foreign language program needs to take care that a culture in which novices, the less proficient, and non-standard dialect speakers are belittled or undervalued does not take root in the minds of its teachers and students. This can be accomplished without a blanket vilification of a standard dialect and a consistent performance model. Given what the quantitative and qualitative data reveal, a reasonable conclusion seems to be that the iconization of “native speaker” can lead to its fetishization, and to a culture in which not all contributors are valued for what they can best contribute, where less experienced teachers, the less proficient, and non-standard dialect-speaking teachers are undervalued. Any dissatisfaction that such marginalized "less native" members feel can get in the way of delivering, as a coordinated team, better instruction for students.

The programs studied here are by no means immune to such problems, but appear to be meeting the challenge, maintaining a culture that over a span of years has managed the stresses and strains of adhering to teaching a standard language while inviting different contributions from different constituents, as they contribute to the program's goals. Policies such as the Act/Fact division of labor and taking advantage of nonnative-speaking teachers’ experience as foreign learners of the language have had positive
effects in this regard. Teacher trainers offer diagnoses and guidance when teacher trainees need help in better approximating the standard language that their learners' materials present. The criteria for daily grades are explained in detail in print syllabi and online, and repeated for students in each course in the curriculum. In these programs, anonymous evaluation questionnaires are a regular feature of teacher-training courses, graduate language pedagogy courses, and basic language courses alike. More informal, as well as in-course discussion of aspects of the program with a potential for creating stress for students and teachers, might be added to good effect. Concrete means for participants to express their feelings about pursuing a standard model need to be provided, such as having teacher trainees complete an anonymous evaluation survey of the teacher-training program or having students complete an evaluation for the language program. Having discussions about the standard used by the language program such as the grading rubric and “No English” rules can be useful, but it needs to involve all interested parties, from new teachers to experienced teachers, and be open to the notion that ideas to improve the language program may also come from new language teachers. The discussion should be conducted in an open and nonjudgmental manner so that participants, especially those who are less experienced, feel safe to communicate their real opinions rather than stating something that sounds good to those in charge. Among faculty, additional stressors, such as a budget process that has left some language faculty in career limbo for a time annually, need to be addressed also, as does the question of how a labor-intensive project like the language programs described here can best be managed going forward, in a changing institutional and political environment.
It is hoped that the findings and discussion offered in this dissertation can contribute in starting a meaningful discussion among native, nonnative, and any other kinds of language teachers, so that we can all move beyond the native speaker fallacy, to a place where our pedagogy is enriched anew.

6.2. Limitations

This study used survey data extensively, but the generalizability and reliability of the survey results are limited for the following reasons.

First, while most of the data collection was conducted by the investigator, the investigator had to ask some teachers to pass out the survey in their classes because of schedule conflicts. While these teachers were instructed not to look at the students’ responses, having their teacher present while taking the survey might have influenced their responses. Some of the classes were taught by the investigator (along with other teachers) and consequently, he collected the data from his class himself as well.

Second, the data input was done by the investigator by himself. While it was done carefully, inputting data obtained from more than 500 participants, alone, was an arduous task and there may be some mistakes in the data set. Having another person to help with the data input process would probably have improved the reliability of the survey results.

Third, inferential analysis on individual survey items was not conducted as part of this survey. As dependent variables for multiple regression, this study quantified survey respondents’ definitions of “native speaker” and their preference for native- or nonnative-speaking teachers by adding up their responses from the full range of points addressed in
the survey items. They were useful in representing survey respondents’ overall trends in their perception of “native speaker” and their preference for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers, but individual item-based analysis can shed additional insights into how participants’ background characteristics associated with each survey item.

Fourth, this study was conducted in two similarly designed and run language programs at the same institution of higher education in the U.S., so the generalizability of its survey results may well be limited to this particular program. Similar trends may be found in other language programs, but differences may also be found, depending on how other language programs are structured and what kinds of members (e.g., teachers, students, administrators) make up their communities. If, after such studies are carried out, any differences are found that seem significant, then characteristics of the given language programs need to be qualitatively analyzed for comparison in order to find the sources of those differences. Perhaps, the iconization of the native speaker may be different and it may have different influences on teachers and students and how they perceive native speakers of the target language.

Fifth, the numbers of participants in certain groups were low. Specifically, numbers of teacher participants, students who are older than 25, racial minority students, and native speakers of minority languages were small. More participants with these backgrounds are needed to confirm some of the trends found with these variables in this study. Adding more variables, such as the amount of teaching experience and expected grades, can also provide additional insights as well.
Sixth, while all participants had the experience of having both native- and nonnative-speaking language teachers in the program, prior learning experience was not controlled for in the survey. Nor are participants’ experiences with prior language teachers that might have influenced their perception of native/nonnative-speaking language teachers accounted for in the survey results.

Seventh, and finally, specific descriptions of “native speaker” and “nonnative speaker” were not given to participants because they were required to provide their own definition of native speaker in the same survey. Consequently, the kinds of native and nonnative speakers that participants had in mind in responding to the survey were not controlled for when they were instructed to indicate their preference for native- or nonnative-speaking teachers. This is potentially problematic because participants’ responses to some of the survey questions may have been different depending on how language students conceptualized native- and nonnative-speaking teachers or how language teachers saw their students. For example, some of the attributes of nonnative-speaking teachers that could be regarded as their strengths, such as having a linguistic background similar to their students, may not be applicable if the nonnative-language speakers that respondents had in mind did not share their native language with their students—as when a GTA whose L1 is Chinese is teaching students whose L1 is English. Also, teacher participants may have a different image of students in mind for different levels, if they are experienced in teaching more than one level.

As part of its qualitative analysis, this study only documented a few cases of divergent language teachers. While other teachers were also included in the data analysis,
it was beyond the scope of this study to provide a detailed analysis of each teacher that
was observed for this study. The 80 hours of video recordings were of 32 different
teachers and some of them were only observed once. This was done to look for general
communal differences between the Japanese and Chinese programs, but in doing so,
focus on individual teachers’ development was somewhat obscured. There would have
been more insights from the focal participants if more observation sessions were
conducted for them in a variety of settings in and outside of language class. For instance,
oberving more Fact sessions would likely have provided an interesting look at how
code-switching was strategically conducted by these focal participants and students.

Some participant teachers seemed more nervous about being video recorded
during the observations and seemed to be extra careful in their language use. Such
nervousness might have disappeared if more of their teaching sessions had been
observed, as they would become more used to being video recorded.

More can be learned by collecting qualitative data from participants whose
caracteristics were found to have a significant association with either their definition of
“native speaker” and/or preference for native- and nonnative-speaking teachers. In
particular, obtaining more qualitative data from participants with the following
characteristics would add significant parameters to this study’s findings: teacher
participants, participants from Level 3 or higher, native speakers of Korean and Chinese,
native speakers of English who are racially Asian, and multilingual speakers. Moreover,
measuring and accounting for the target language proficiency levels of language teachers,
as well as the English proficiency levels of international GTAs, will provide additional perspectives on the data.

It must be pointed out that, within the scope of this study, the qualitative analysis was mainly focused on (non)acquisition of pitch accent and reactions to the “No spoken English” rule in Act class on the part of the four focal participants: Harumi, Regina, Suzan, and Frank. This is because these aspects seemed to show the effects of adhering to a standard the most, but there are many other aspects of the language socialization process that can be analyzed, such as code-switching behaviors among teachers, the lesson preparation process, and the grading process, etc. For instance, studying how language teachers prepare their lessons would allow us to see what kind of principles and strategies they use to come up with their lesson plans. This may also show how they relate themselves to the language they are teaching, as well as certain ideologies about “native speaker” that they may subscribe to.

Finally, in the future, more cases of divergent language teachers need to be investigated, so as to find out how they are dealing with the standard that is set by their language program. Doing so will give us more insights into what kind of support they need in their development as language teachers, so that their contributions can be maximized in our continuing project of improving learner outcomes.
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Appendix A: Student Questionnaire

Student Questionnaire

Participant’s demographic information: (Please check the appropriate blank)
1. Current Class: Japanese: Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Level 4 or higher
   Chinese: Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Level 4 or higher
2. Age: 18-24 25-30 31 and older
3. Ethnic background: White African American Asian Hispanic Other ( )
4. Gender: Male Female
5. Native language(s): English Chinese Korean Other ( )

Part I: Native and Nonnative Foreign Language Teachers
Directions: Below are opinion statements about foreign language teachers. Answer the following questions with the assumption that you can only have one teacher as your Japanese/Chinese teacher. Please choose only one answer for each statement. You may place an ‘X’ to indicate your response. There is no right or wrong answer, so please indicate your honest feelings about foreign language teachers in general. Your response will be kept anonymous.

**The questions that follow are NOT about your current foreign language teacher(s). Please indicate your general feelings, which you feel would hold for any Japanese/Chinese language teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Native Teacher</th>
<th>No Preference</th>
<th>Nonnative Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>In the beginning level speaking and listening class, I prefer a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>In the advanced level speaking and listening class, I prefer a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In the beginning level reading and writing class, I prefer a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In the advanced level reading and writing class, I prefer a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In general, I prefer a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>If my teacher is not trained as a language instructor (but they have sufficient language ability), I prefer a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I want to develop pronunciation skills like a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>When the class is conducted entirely in the target language, I prefer a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>When it comes to studying grammar, I prefer a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>When it comes to learning informal, colloquial expressions, I prefer a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>When it comes to learning about the culture of the foreign language, I prefer a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>When it comes to asking my questions about the target language, I prefer a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>When facing difficulties in learning Japanese/Chinese, I think a is more compassionate and understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>When it comes to grading, I think a is more lenient.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>When it comes to making language learning fun and exciting, I prefer a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>When I think of someone who sets the standard for Japanese/Chinese language, I think of a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>When I think of an effective and qualified Japanese/Chinese teacher, I think of a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If any, please list one pro and one con of having a native/nonnative teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Teacher</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonnative Teacher</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If possible, would you prefer to have both native and nonnative teachers as language instructors at your current level of Japanese/Chinese class? Yes No No Preference

Please explain:
Part II: Definition of Native Speaker

In YOUR definition of a native speaker of a language (Japanese, Chinese etc.), would you include the following characterizations? (Please choose one for each row, using a check mark (✓) or an 'X' to indicate your response. There is no right or wrong answer, so please give your honest feelings. Your responses will be kept anonymous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>A person who has been using the language since birth/early childhood.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>A person who holds citizenship of Japanese/Chinese etc. speaking country or state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>A person who looks Japanese/Chinese etc. (e.g. Tanaka Wang).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>A person whose gender is male (I associate native speaker with a male speaker).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>A person who is straight (i.e., you associate a native speaker with being straight).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Ability</td>
<td>A person whose Japanese/Chinese etc. pronunciation is without foreign accent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A person who only speaks Japanese/Chinese etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A person whose Japanese/Chinese etc. is not influenced by another language they speak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A person who can read and write in Japanese/Chinese etc. in a variety of contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A person who can manage to use grammatical patterns without mistakes, regardless of various factors such as stress and anxiety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A person who can use idiomatic expressions in a variety of contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A person who speaks the standard language as opposed to a dialect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A person who can use the language competently in a variety of subjects and situations (e.g. education, politics, science, parenting, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>A person who can act appropriately in situations where Japanese/Chinese etc. is widely spoken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>A person who is educated in Japanese/Chinese etc. education system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Econ Status</td>
<td>A person who is socially connected and economically affluent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>A person who is familiar with Japanese/Chinese etc. culture and tradition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>A person who can teach Japanese/Chinese etc. as a second language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List your current Japanese/Chinese teacher(s). Do you regard your teacher(s) as a native or nonnative teacher (check one)? Why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Name</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Nonnative</th>
<th>I cannot tell</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do you feel about their grading in oral class? Do you think being a native or nonnative teacher has something to do with the way s/he grades?

Please explain:

This is not required—but if you do not mind, you’re invited to include your name and e-mail address below. Doing so acknowledges your identity as the respondent to the above questions; your responses will not be identified as yours to your language instructors, and a pseudonym will be used for any publications. Depending on the nature of your responses, you may (or may not) be contacted for an interview.

Name: ____________________________ E-mail: ____________________________
Appendix B: Teacher Questionnaire Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant's demographic information: (Please check the appropriate blank)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Class you're now teaching: Japanese: Level 1 ___ Level 2 ___ Level 3 ___ Level 4 or higher ___ Chinese: Level 1 ___ Level 2 ___ Level 3 ___ Level 4 or higher ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age: 18-24 ___ 25-30 ___ 31 and older ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ethnic background: White ___ African American ___ Asian ___ Hispanic ___ Other ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gender: Male ___ Female ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Native language(s): English ___ Chinese ___ Korean ___ Other ___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part I: Native and Nontnative Foreign Language Teachers

Directions: Below are opinion statements about foreign language teachers. Do you think students prefer native or nontnative teachers? Answer the following questions with the assumption that your students can only have one person as their Japanese/Chinese teacher. Please choose only one answer for each statement. You may check (x) or place an 'X' to indicate your response. There is no right or wrong answer, so please give your honest feelings about students' preferences for foreign language teachers in general. Your responses will be kept anonymous.

**The questions that follow are NOT about your current foreign language student(s). Please give your general feelings, which you feel would hold for any typical Japanese/Chinese language student.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Teacher</th>
<th>Nontnative Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In beginning level speaking and listening classes, students tend to prefer a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In advanced level speaking and listening classes, students tend to prefer a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In beginning level reading and writing classes, students tend to prefer a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In advanced level reading and writing classes, students tend to prefer a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In general, students tend to prefer a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If the teacher is not trained as a language instructor (but still has the requisite language ability), students tend to prefer a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students tend to want to develop pronunciation skills like a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When the class is conducted entirely in the target language, students tend to prefer a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. When it comes to studying grammar, students tend to prefer a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When it comes to learning informal, colloquial expressions, students tend to prefer a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. When it comes to learning about the culture of the foreign language, students tend to prefer a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. When it comes to asking questions about the target language, students tend to prefer a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. When facing difficulties in learning Japanese/Chinese, students tend to think a ___ is more compassionate and understanding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. When it comes to grading, students tend to think a ___ is more lenient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. When it comes to making language learning fun and exciting, students would prefer a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. When students think of who sets the standard for Japanese/Chinese language, they tend to think of a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. When students think of an effective and qualified Japanese/Chinese teacher, they tend to think of a ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If any, please list one pro and one con that you think students would associate with having a native/nontnative teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native teacher</th>
<th>Nontnative teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro:</td>
<td>Pro:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con:</td>
<td>Con:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would most students prefer, if possible, to have both native and nontnative teachers as language instructors? ___ Yes ___ No ___ No Preference ___

Please explain:
Part II: Definition of Native Speaker

In YOUR definition of a native speaker of a language (Japanese, Chinese etc.), would you include the following characterizations? (Please choose one for each row, using a check mark (✓) or an ‘X’ to indicate your response. There is no right or wrong answer, so please give your honest feelings. Your response will be kept anonymous."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Not Necessarily</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who has been using the language since birth/early childhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who holds citizenship of Japanese/Chinese etc. speaking country or state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who looks Japanese/Chinese etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person whose name is sounds Japanese/Chinese etc. (e.g. Tanaka Wang)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person whose gender is male (I associate native speaker with a male speaker)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who is straight (I associate native speaker with a straight person)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic Ability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person whose Japanese/Chinese etc. pronunciation is without foreign accent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who only speaks Japanese/Chinese etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person whose Japanese/Chinese etc. is not influenced by another language they speak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who can read and write in Japanese/Chinese etc. in a variety of contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who can manage to use grammatical patterns without mistakes, regardless of various factors such as stress and anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who can use idiomatic expressions in a variety of contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who speaks the standard language as opposed to a dialect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who can use the language competently in a variety of subjects and situations (e.g. education, politics, science, parenting, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who can act appropriately in situations where Japanese/Chinese etc. is widely spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who is educated in Japanese/Chinese etc. education system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social/Econ Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who is socially connected and economically affluent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who is familiar with Japanese/Chinese etc. culture and tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who can teach Japanese/Chinese etc. as a second language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider yourself a native or nonnative teacher? Why? Native__ Nonnative__ I cannot tell__

Please explain:

How do you feel about grades you give in grad classes? Do you think being a native or nonnative teacher has something to do with the way you grade?

Please explain:

This is not required—but if you do not mind, you’re invited to include your name and e-mail address below. Doing so acknowledges your identity as the respondent to the above questions; your responses will not be identified as yours to your language instructors, and a pseudonym will be used for any publications. Depending on the nature of your responses, you may (or may not) be contacted for an interview.

Name: _____________________________ E-mail: ____________________________
Appendix C: Teacher Questionnaire Part 2

Thank you for your willingness to participate in the study. In this questionnaire, you will be asked about your (1) background information, (2) language learning experience, (3) language-teacher training experience, (4) language teaching experience, (5) pronunciation, and (6) reflections on your experience. Please read each question carefully before you provide your response. If you wish to include more information than space has been provided for, feel free to add space (if you are typing) or continue on the reverse side (if you are hand-writing). If you are referred to in publications, a pseudonym will be used and your responses will not be identified as yours. Your comments will be valuable in improving future teacher-training programs and helping future teacher trainers and trainees. Thank you!
I. Background Information

1. What is your name and what program are you in?

2. Where were you raised?

3. Were you raised as monolingual or multilingual?

4. What language(s) did you use growing up? What dialect? If you have more than one language, please specify with whom you were using each language, and estimate what portion (or ratio) of time you spent using each language (e.g., English 40% and Japanese 60%). If you were learning a second language growing up, please list it as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>With whom?</th>
<th>Estimated ratio (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In the following contexts, what language(s) do you feel comfortable and confident using now? You can identify more than one language, as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfortable Language(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do you consider yourself a native or nonnative Japanese or Chinese teacher? Why?
II. Language Learning Experience

If you consider yourself to be a native speaker, please skip this section.

1. Why did you start learning Japanese/Chinese as a second language? If you remember any particular incidents that made you want to study Japanese/Chinese, please describe them (e.g., when, where, who was involved, other details you recall, plus your reflections on the incident(s) and any additional thoughts triggered by them).

2. Describe your experience of learning Japanese/Chinese as a second language. In particular, what textbook did you use and what approach(es) did you (if you were self-taught) or your teachers use? If any, include your study abroad experience as well. If more than one location applies to any of the following categories, please identify all of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where?</th>
<th>How long (year-year)?</th>
<th>Textbook(s)? AV media?</th>
<th>Briefly describe the pedagogy followed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad, internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Language Teacher Training Experience

1. If any, describe your training experience as a teacher of Chinese or Japanese. In particular, where and how long was the training conducted, what materials were used, and were native or nonnative teachers used as teaching models in the training? Were your trainers native or nonnative teachers? How were these courses and classes conducted? If you have had more than one teacher-training experience, please indicate. If necessary, please continue any of your response items by adding space if you are typing or on the reverse if you are hand-writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where?</th>
<th>How long?</th>
<th>Training material(s)</th>
<th>Teaching model(s) (native/nonnative or both)?</th>
<th>Trainer(s) (native/nonnative or both)?</th>
<th>Training description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In the teacher training(s) described above, was any feedback provided? If so, how?

3. In the teacher training(s) described above, was any aspect of the training addressed to, or designed for, nonnative teachers in particular? If so, how?

4. In your teacher-training experience, did you have any positive experiences directly attributable to your being a native or nonnative teacher? If so, please describe (when, where, who was involved, etc., detailing the incidents and your reflections on the incidents, and additional thoughts triggered by the incidents).

5. In your teacher-training experience, have you had any negative experiences directly attributable to your being a native or nonnative teacher? If so, please describe (when, where, who was involved, etc., detailing the incidents and your reflections on the incidents, and additional thoughts triggered by the incidents).

6. Did you find your language teacher training(s) useful? If you had more than one training experience, which one did you find more useful? Why?
IV. Language Teaching Experience

1. Why did you start teaching Japanese/Chinese? If you remember any particular incidents that made you want to teach Japanese/Chinese, please describe them—when, where, who was involved? Please describe those incidents and your reflections on them, including any additional thoughts triggered by recalling them).

2. Please describe your hiring process. Was the job available for both native- and nonnative-speaking candidates? If you were interviewed (e.g., on the phone, in a campus visit, or both), please describe briefly the interview and the rest of the hiring assessment process. Did you do a teaching demonstration? If so, how long did it run? Were the students real students in a real course? Were you given any advance information on the students and what you could expect from them?

3. How did the interview/assessment process leave you feeling? Qualified or unqualified? Satisfied with how you were considered? Why or why not?

4. Please describe your teaching experience. In particular, where and how long have you taught, what textbook(s) and media materials have you used? Were native or nonnative speakers the models in the media materials? Have you taught with and/or been supervised by native-speaking teachers, nonnative teachers, or both? How have you conducted your Chinese/Japanese language courses and classes? If you have taught Chinese or Japanese in more than one kind of program and/or pedagogy, please describe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where?</th>
<th>How long?</th>
<th>Textbook(s) (native/nonnative or both as a model)</th>
<th>Media materials (native/nonnative or both as a model)?</th>
<th>Colleagues/supervisors (native/nonnative or both)?</th>
<th>Teaching approach(es)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5. Have there been any **native-speaking** teachers of Japanese/Chinese (including, but not limited to same-program colleagues) who have impacted you in a **positive** way? If so, how?

6. Have there been any **native** teachers of Japanese/Chinese (including, but not limited to same-program colleagues) who have impacted you in a **negative** way? If so, how?

7. Have there been any **nonnative** teachers of Japanese/Chinese (including, but not limited to same-program colleagues) who have impacted you in a **positive** way? If so, how?

8. Have there been any **nonnative** teachers of Japanese/Chinese (including, but not limited to same-program colleagues) who have impacted you in a **negative** way? If so, how?

9. In your actual **teaching experience**, have you had any **positive** experiences directly attributable to your being a native or nonnative speaker of the language you teach? If yes, please describe (when, where, who was involved, etc., detailing the incidents and your reflections on the incidents, and additional thoughts triggered by the incidents).

10. In your actual **teaching experience**, have you had any **negative** experiences directly attributable to your being a native/nonnative-speaking teacher? If yes, please describe (when, where, who was involved, etc., detailing the incidents and your reflections on the incidents, and additional thoughts triggered by the incidents).
V. Pronunciation

1. When speaking Japanese or Chinese, do you think you have a non-Japanese/Chinese “accent”? How would you describe that accent? What makes it different from the way native speakers sound?

2. Do you generally feel comfortable with how you sound in Japanese/Chinese? Why or why not?

3. Hypothetical: If people (including your students) recognized that you spoke Japanese/Chinese with a non-Chinese or non-Japanese accent, would that bother you? Why or why not?

4. Hypothetical: If your spoken Japanese/Chinese has some non-Japanese/Chinese pronunciation features, are your students aware of it? If so, how do you know they are? Have they reacted to these features at all? If so, how?

5. How would you feel if a native Japanese/Chinese said that your Japanese/Chinese sounds like a native’s?

6. If you could choose any pronunciation, including your own, what kind of Japanese/Chinese pronunciation would you most like to have? Please describe that sound, and explain why you’d like to have it.
VI. Reflections

1. At this point in your Japanese/Chinese teaching career, how do you feel about it? After answering the preceding questions (thank you!), how do you feel about being a native/nonnative Japanese/Chinese teacher?

2. Has your experience as a native/nonnative teacher of Japanese/Chinese turned out as you expected, thus far? How so? How not?

3. From the perspective of this point in your teaching career, what kinds of adjustments do you think you will be making going forward? For example, are there any things that you no longer think worth doing, pedagogically, or new things that you plan to incorporate, or pay more attention to? How have you come to these conclusions?

4. Finally, what advice would you give a young person considering pursuing a career in teaching Japanese/Chinese?

Thank you for your time and valuable input!
Appendix D: Daily Grading Criteria for Act class hours used in the language program

Score / Description of what the score means

**4.0:** Performance is fully culturally coherent, that is, would present no difficulty, discomfort, or puzzlement in interaction with a native. Repair (restating or correcting yourself, requesting clarification, etc.) is self-managed.

**3.5:** Performance is superior, for the most part culturally coherent. There is little about it to create difficulties, discomfort, or puzzlement in interaction with a native. However, there is some aspect of the performance to make interaction less than maximally coherent for a native. Most repair is self-managed.

**3.0:** Performance is good: few aspects of it create difficulties, discomfort, or puzzlement in communicating with a native. Self-managed repair alone, however, is not sufficient; you also require occasional repair/correction from another (= instructor, classmate, etc.).

**2.5:** Performance enables communication, but also presents several clear-cut sources of difficulty, discomfort, or puzzlement in communicating with a native. Repair is largely a matter of correcting problems, and correction comes mostly from others.

**2.0:** Performance creates definite obstacles to communication, which usually involve more than simple discomfort. Utterances would cause puzzlement that the native is at a loss to resolve ("What is s/he trying to say?"). Repair requires multiple, often repeated, correction and guidance from another.

**1.5:** Performance shows many problems that would create difficulties, discomfort, and puzzlement in communicating with a native. Communication is achieved only with repeated correction and guidance from another. Clearly not in control of assigned material.

**1.0:** Attended class, but either (1) chose not to participate (for this option, notify your instructor before class begins), or (2) failed to perform with any culturally viable degree of competence.

**0:** Absent.