

How ‘Native Speakerism’ Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses

TSURII Chie

Abstract

The main aim of this research is to explore how widespread social practices pertaining to a deep-seated ‘native speakerism’ relate to English language education at Japanese universities. This article reports the findings of a content analysis of Japanese university prospectuses in Japan. Its most salient findings are (1) an implicit common understanding exists in Japan of what the term “‘native speaking’ teachers’ means; (2) university prospectuses aim to attract readers by offering ‘English conversation’ and related skills classes with ‘native’ teachers, and (3) the use of the term ‘native teachers’ and its equivalents is made in contrast to and distinction from the term ‘Japanese teachers’. This paper recommends that, in order to foster an appropriate perspective of languages, people, and the world, the purposes of learning English should be reviewed and the credentials of teachers required to achieve these purposes should be clearly defined. Teachers must be recruited based on an appropriate educational philosophy grounded in these criteria, rather than on whether they are ‘native’ speakers.

Keywords: native speakerism, higher education, English language teaching, content analysis, discourse analysis

Introduction

Heavy Reliance on ‘Native English Speakers’

In reforming English language education (ELE) in Japan, appointing *neitibu supikā*, or ‘native speakers’, is often considered a panacea. One example of such reliance on ‘native speakers’ can be seen in the 2013 policy of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan (MEXT): ‘An Execution Plan for English Education Reform to Respond to Globalization’. To realize a new approach to ELE, this reform programme proposes increasing the number of Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs) from English-speaking countries allocated to schools nationwide (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, 2013).

Another MEXT policy, the 2003 ‘Action Plan to Cultivate “Japanese with English Abilities”’, also gives the increase in ‘native speakers of English’ as a strategy for cultivating English-speaking Japanese people, based on the rationale that ‘a native speaker of English provides a valuable opportunity for students to learn living English and familiarize themselves with foreign languages and cultures. . . . [T]he use of a native speaker of English has great meaning’ (MEXT, 2003).

Heavy reliance on ‘native speakers’ can also be seen in the Japan Exchange and Teaching programme (JET Programme). Launched in 1987 by several government bodies, including MEXT, it aims to promote ‘internationalization and mutual understanding between Japan and other countries by enriching foreign language education and international exchange at the local level’ (The Council of Local Authorities for International Relations, 2015, p. 2). According to JET’s website, over 90 percent of JET participants are employed as ALTs,

How ‘Native Speakerism’ Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses

and most are from English-speaking countries. The programme started with 848 participants from the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, or New Zealand and participants from Canada and Ireland joined in the second year. In 2017, over 90 percent of the total participants (4,312 of 4,712) were from these six countries, indicating that the programme’s main aim was/is to employ young college graduates as ALTs of English.

Despite numerous scholars raising concerns about the programme and voicing doubts over its effectiveness (e.g. Yamada, 2003; Torikai, 2006; Galloway, 2009), the ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) announced its plan to double the number of teachers¹⁾ hired for the JET Programme: ‘[t]he LDP views the use of native English speakers as vital to improving English-speaking ability at a time when it is moving toward making a passing score on the Test of English as a Foreign Language mandatory for entering and graduating from college’ (Mie, 2013).

***Kokusaika* (Internationalization)**

In tertiary education, steadily increasing numbers of departments or schools relating to ‘international’ studies have been established since Ritsumeikan University (Kyoto) opened its college of international relations in 1988 (*Yomiuri Shimbun*, 2016). Kubota (1998) identifies the *kokusaika* (internationalization) discourse as key to understanding some aspects of Japanese society and culture, especially foreign language education policy and practices at Japanese schools. She traces this ideology’s emergence back to the 1980s, when the Japanese felt a pressing need for internationalization. This coincided with a shift in English-learning approaches away from reading literature, which was perceived as unhelpful for practical language skills. Since then, the slogan

kokusaika has become ubiquitous in Japanese business, education, and government policies. This trend is concurrent with the establishment of new university departments designating *Kokusaigaku* (International Studies) in their titles that incorporate English language programmes and classes.

Another often-used word regarding ELE in recent Japan is *gurōbaruka* (globalization). Faced with increasing globalization (although it is only discussed at a surface level), many people consider English-language acquisition to be essential. According to the abovementioned article by *Yomiuri Shimbun*, *gurōbaruka* is one reason for the popularity of such faculties: ‘because of globalization, foreign language abilities and experience in foreign countries will be needed, and the study abroad programme and careful support and instruction before and after the programme may become a hit with applicants’ (2016, author’s translation).

Research Questions

ELE at the tertiary level is undoubtedly influenced by popular belief in the necessity of learning English to manage ‘globalization’ or ‘internationalization’, with a preference for ‘native speakers’ from English-speaking countries. ELE is particularly susceptible to popular opinions, partly because most Japanese believe (or are directed to believe) that learning English allows for a better life, both socially and economically, in this globalized era. One common false assumption is that ‘native speakers’ of the target language will be the most suitable teachers. Phillipson (1992, pp.193-9) termed this ‘the native speaker fallacy’, and many people think that what is lacking in ELE in Japan is the opportunity to have conversations with ‘native speakers’. This paper’s main research question is as follows:

How ‘Native Speakerism’ Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses

How do Japanese universities portray themselves through using ‘native English speakers’ in advertisements for their English language education programmes?

My attention will focus on the use of terms that mean ‘native speakers’, as in the following research (sub)questions:

1. How many universities’ prospectuses use terms indicating ‘native English speakers’ in describing their English language education?
2. What characteristics are attributed by Japan’s universities to the words indicating that ‘native speakers’ are core components of their English language education programmes?

To answer these questions, I will explore and analyse descriptions of ELE in university prospectuses. In the pages targeting prospective students and their guardians, many universities use similar logic and phrases. Analysing the text content will reveal beliefs, both conscious and unconscious, that are prevalent in Japanese society.

Literature Review

Definition of ‘Native Speakers’

Discussions of ‘native speakers’ or ‘native speakerism’ seem to assume the existence of an identifiable group who could be labelled ‘native speakers’; yet the concept is ambiguous. Paikeday (1985) was ‘the first attempt to put “(non-)nativism” onto the centre stage of linguistic inquiry by challenging current undisputed assumptions on the matter’ (Moussu & Llorca, 2008, p.

315). Paikeday thoroughly discussed this basic concept of linguistics, concluding that ‘native speaker’ in the linguist’s sense of an arbiter of the grammaticality and acceptability of language is ‘quite dead’ (x). Medgyes (1994) also scrutinizes ‘whether the native/non-native division is indeed no more than a myth’ (16). Considering the characteristics of the present status of English, its diverse characteristics, and sociolects within one variety of English, he concludes that all the oft-quoted definitions are ‘fuzzy’, ‘inconsistent’, ‘subtle’, and ‘ambiguous’ (10-11). As shown here, many scholars have questioned the definition of ‘native speaker’. Throughout this paper, the terms ‘native (speaker)’ and ‘non-native (speaker)’ will be written with inverted commas, following Holliday’s (2013, pp. 19-20) assertion that the categories are ‘constructed by ideologies and discourse ... and they are always “so-called”’.

Despite such doubts about the term, ‘native speaker’ has been used as if the group to which it refers is self-evident. Through a recent questionnaire-based study, Oda (2012, p. 96) found that ‘native speaker’ is interpreted by many Japanese university students to mean people who use English as their mother tongue. He also notes that the Japanese loanword *neitibu* almost always means ‘Caucasian’ for Japanese learners of English. In Japan, where ‘a high proportion of the population are eager for tuition from English speakers’ (Braine, 2010, p. 12), few question the definition of ‘native speaker’ or its equivalent *neitibu*, and lay people and ELT professionals alike use the term unthinkingly or even habitually.

Studies that Triggered Awareness of ‘Native Speakerism’ in English Language Teaching

Until the late 1980s, the role of the ‘native speaker’ was centralized in English

How ‘Native Speakerism’ Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses

language teaching (ELT) and applied linguistics under the Chomskian paradigm (Mahboob, 2005), which retains some influence today. However, as English enjoyed ‘momentum of growth’ (Crystal, 2003, p. x), and with ‘the present international status of English’ (Kachru, 1992, p. 355), discussion commenced on the ownership of English and the role of ‘native speakers’ (Widdowson, 1994). Many scholars have challenged the mythologized role of ‘native speakers’ in ELT and applied linguistics. For example, Kachru, proposing teaching ‘World Englishes’, clearly undermines the role of ‘native speakers’ in the global spread and teaching of English. He declares false the shared belief

that the native speakers of English as teachers, academic administrators, and material developers provide a serious input in the global teaching of English, in policy formation, and in determining the channels for the spread of the language. (Kachru, 1992, p. 358)

Phillipson (1992) also refutes influential beliefs on the diffusion of English and ELT. He discusses five tenets, including ‘the ideal teacher of English is a native speaker’ (185), and concludes that this ‘dogma’ can be redesignated as a fallacy. By discussing the good qualities of a teacher of English, he argues the idea that ‘the ideal teacher of English is a native speaker is ludicrous’ (195) and labelled this claim the ‘native speaker fallacy’ (193–9).

In Japan during the 1990s, a scholarly movement highlighted the power of English and its influence in Japanese society. In 1995, a widely circulated magazine for English language teachers in Japan titled *Gendai Eigo Kyōiku* [*Modern English Teaching*] (Kenkyūsha, 1995) was published with feature

articles on linguistic imperialism in a section headed ‘Rethinking English’, to which leading scholars contributed.

Nakamura, Oishi, and Tsuda were often introduced as three major controversialists on this issue in this period. They had discussed the linguistic imperialism of the English language (e.g. Oishi, 1990; Tsuda, 1990; Nakamura, 1994), and subsequently raised issues of Western-centrism, the native fallacy, and other topics relevant to ELE in Japan. In discussing English linguistic imperialism, they often mention the native fallacy, or ‘native speakerism’, observable in Japan. Arguably, ‘native speakerism’ has become so ubiquitous that in any current discussion or delivery of ELE, this fallacy is taken for granted. Recently, when citing inefficiencies in the government’s foreign language education policies, many mention the native fallacy (e.g. Naka, 2006; Kimura, 2016; Sugino, 2016; Fujiwara, 2017).

Definitions of ‘Native Speakerism’

Against this background, Holliday (2006) offers the following definition of ‘native speakerism’:

[A] pervasive ideology within ELT, characterized by the belief that ‘native-speaker’ teachers represent a ‘Western culture’ from which spring the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology (p. 385, citing Holliday, 2005).

As suggested by Holliday, who maintains that ‘native speakerism damages the entire ELT profession’ (2015, p. 11), any aspect of the problems or difficulties in ELE in Japan seems to stem, at least partly, from ‘native speakerism’.

How ‘Native Speakerism’ Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses

Considering the ELT labour market and day-to-day experiences of ‘native speaker’ teachers in Japan, Houghton and Rivers (2013, p. 14) attempt to re-define ‘native speakerism’:

Native speakerism is prejudice, stereotyping and/or discrimination, typically by or against foreign language teachers, on the basis of either being or not being perceived and categorized as a native speaker of a particular language, which can form part of a larger complex of interconnected prejudices including ethnocentrism, racism and sexism.

As they highlighted that ‘while “non-native speakers” are certainly victims of prejudice and discrimination at the pre-employment stage, “native speakers” are also victims of prejudice and discrimination at the post-employment stage’ (7); their definition seems to capture the recent reality in Japanese society. Although it is worth investigating and discussing the impact of ‘native speakerism’ on hiring practices in Japan, it is beyond the scope of this paper. Here I will discuss ‘native speakerism’ itself, following the definition by Holliday.

‘Native Speakerism’ in ELT

Following the pioneering work of Phillipson (1992) and Medgyes (1994), more studies have emerged concerning the dichotomy between ‘native speaker’ and ‘non-native speaker’ teachers and the resulting inequalities in ELT (Moussu & Llurda, 2008). Many seem to focus on recruitment discourses in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages), within which ‘native speakerism’ can be found or inferred (e.g. Canagarajah,

1999; Selvi, 2010). In recruiting advertisements, Ruecker and Ives (2015) revealed that ‘the ideal candidate is overwhelmingly depicted as a young, White, enthusiastic native speaker of English from a stable list of inner-circle countries’ (733).

Regarding the unequal job opportunities for ‘native speaker’ and ‘non-native speaker’ teachers, most of the latter being Japanese citizens, studies of the Japanese situation seem confined to researching English conversation schools. In the private English language school industry, which has grown rapidly since the early 1970s, popular courses offer teaching of ‘English conversation’ (*eikaiwa*). Teacher employment has centred exclusively on ‘white’ teachers, especially males, with promotions targeting Japanese women with the promise of ‘[c]areer development, establishment of relationships with white males, and the potentials for foreign travel and study’ (Bailey, 2006, p. 105).

In public secondary schools, where only Japanese university graduates with a government-issued teaching certificate can teach, and administration and curriculum decisions are overwhelmingly taken by Japanese administrators, many ‘native speakers’ are hired as ALTs. In higher education, particularly at private universities operating (at least partly) *ad libitum*, a different demographic structure can be seen. The majority of university ELT staff, both ‘native speaker’ and ‘non-native speaker’ teachers, teach part time, and there are very few tenure positions available in expectation of a sharp decline in the college-age population²⁾. With fewer tenured positions, more universities have reformed ELE curriculum to look more ‘attractive’ by hiring new English language teachers on a fixed-term basis. For these positions, job advertisements almost always require applicants to be a ‘native speaker’. Consequently, ‘native speaker’ teachers can obtain full-time, though non-tenured, positions

How ‘Native Speakerism’ Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses
relatively easily.

Studies of Attributes Assigned to ‘Native Speakers’

On the treatment of ‘native speakers’ in Japan, Seargeant (2009) discusses the concept of Japanese ethnocentrism in foreign language learning, analysing ‘how English is positioned in Japan, both as a linguistic system and as a set of free-floating ideologies’ (xi). He suggests that the English language is seen as a ‘living artefact belonging to a foreign country’ (56), not as a tool for international communication.

He focuses on commercial language schools because the *eikaiwa* industry, worth 670 billion yen when his book was published in 2009, is the most visible context where ‘the actualities of language learning within Japanese society clash with current trends and recommendations in contemporary TESOL theory’ (94). Since commercial organizations seek profit opportunities, they offer a ‘saleable’ service of ‘real’ communication. In this regard, ‘native speakers’ are often associated with the idea of communicative practice, pitched as distinct from the traditional methods of government-run educational institutes or accredited institutions. As Seargeant notes (2009, p. 95, citing Bailey, 2006), the publicity materials of commercial language schools imply that ‘real practice requires that the interlocutor be a native speaker’.

This phenomenon, which persists today, is not confined to commercial language schools. Rivers (2013) interviewed his teaching colleagues to explore their experiences of employment in an English teaching institution, officially positioned as an affiliated research institute of a Japanese university. His findings reveal how ‘native speaker’ teachers are perceived and treated in that kind of English teaching institution:

In many ways the EC [English Centre] is a glorified English conversation school. They are using the fact that there are so many native English speaking teachers as their core promotional tool... It kind of says 'look how many happy foreigners we have here'. (82)

He then describes a sequence of events as 'the dehumanization of a process that ultimately reduces them to the role of designer mannequins' (82). It is questionable whether the attitude of Japanese society towards 'native speakers' is prejudicial, as the Japanese societal attitude towards 'native speakers' is not always negative. A more accurate perspective is that 'native speakers' are overly relied upon or mythologized in Japan, and 'native English speakers' seem to be perceived as a collective entity, resulting in 'native speaker' teachers being commodified unintentionally and holding an 'iconic' position.

Studies of University Prospectuses as Advertisements

This study treats printed university prospectuses distributed to Japanese students as data, considering them to represent social practice. In prospectuses, universities showcase educational programmes as their 'products'; therefore, they constitute 'advertisements', which 'reflect social developments' and 'must always appear up to date' (Williamson, 1978: p. iv). Advertisements' role is 'to attach meanings to products, to create identities for the goods (and service providers) they promote' (iv); therefore, the text and images on prospectus pages reflect how universities intend to show their products – namely, their education – to possible consumers (students, their guardians, and teachers) and to society.

How ‘Native Speakerism’ Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses

To my knowledge, no prior studies of ‘native speakerism’ in Japan have used published university prospectuses as empirical data. One relatively recent study of university prospectuses as advertisements, published outside Japan, is Askehave (2007). Through her genre analysis, she found that international student prospectuses together constitute a highly promotional form of advertising based on the perception that the marketization of higher education can be exhibited at the level of discourse in higher education. Askehave herself found a ‘thought-provoking’ study (724) by Fairclough (1993), which may be considered a classic of this topic. Fairclough analysed undergraduate prospectuses that ‘are highly selectively representative of the order of discourse of the contemporary university’ (145). He explained that changes in British society and in the higher education environment make universities ‘a good example of processes of marketization and commodification in the public sector more generally’ (143). To explore and describe a societal phenomenon at a certain time, data in a particular setting should be collected and analysed; this is the main purpose of this study, in which the discourses in prospectuses are regarded as social practices.

Emerging Issues and the Need for Empirical Research

For over two decades, scholars have warned professional groups and Japanese society of the existence of ‘native speakerism’ and the resulting injustices and adverse effects on ELE in Japan. Yet little has changed. Instead, Japanese society arguably contributes to intensifying or naturalizing these beliefs. As Kumaravadivelu (2015) describes, ‘[i]t has become an all-pervading entity whose tentacles hold a vice-like grip on almost all aspects of English language learning, teaching and testing around the world’ (viii). The Japanese situation

is no exception. ‘Native speakerism’ is too common to be noted or brought into awareness; ‘[a]ny meaningful attempt to disrupt, and eventually dismantle, the unfair native speaker dominance in ELT must begin with a clear understanding of what native speakerism is and how it operates’ (Kumaravadivelu, 2015: viii). With the ultimate aim of raising awareness of this ideology among Japanese people, the analysis of empirical data collected in contemporary Japanese society is worthwhile. Then, to pursue a fundamental solution to ELT’s educational and sociological problems in Japan, the ‘native speakerism’ in Japanese educational practices must be discussed.

Research Methods

Methodology

This study involves in-depth research, exploring a real-life setting (a university environment) in contemporary Japan. The analysis focuses on an ideology that is prevalent but (predominantly) unconsciously influential as a social phenomenon. Empirical data collected from multiple institutions are, therefore, analysed quantitatively and qualitatively. Content analysis and discourse analysis are applied, focusing on the use of words that indicate a certain group of people teaching English. An important contribution of this research is the analysis of empirical data on the extent to which the ‘native fallacy’ prevails in and affects ELE at Japanese universities in the 2010s.

Data Sources

Printed prospectuses, the primary source in this research, intertwine many aspects of society. A university’s web pages might be the first contact point for high school students seeking information. However, with websites, it is

How ‘Native Speakerism’ Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses

difficult to track the pages readers view, because links lead to multiple layers of information. Some educational content may not be read depending on the informational structure among these layers. With printed prospectuses, we can assume that the pages are read or at least seen by readers.

Of Japan’s 781 universities (as of 2014), comprising 86 national, 92 prefectural and municipal, and 603 private universities, Tokyo has the most (138) and Osaka the second most (56). In the National Capital Region (including Tokyo Prefecture, Saitama Prefecture, Kanagawa Prefecture, and Chiba Prefecture), there are totally 225 universities; in the seven prefectures of the Kinki area (Osaka Prefecture, Kyoto Prefecture, Nara Prefecture, Hyogo Prefecture, Mie Prefecture, Shiga Prefecture, and Wakayama Prefecture), there are 164 universities. Almost half (389) of the universities in Japan are in these two areas.

Prospectuses of private universities in the Kinki area were selected for analysis. The study focuses on the ELE offered in departments dedicated to foreign language education, with such designations as ‘international studies’, ‘English language’, and their equivalents. Across the four Kinki-area prefectures (Osaka, Kyoto, Nara, and Hyogo), 41 private universities have 55 faculties or schools whose main aim is to offer ELE. As some faculties and schools have multiple departments, the sample includes 63 departments in total.

Data Collection and Coding Procedure

Of Japan’s 781 universities, 41 private universities in the Kinki area were selected. Three were unavailable because they were out of stock. All the 38 examined universities have one or more departments with the designation ‘international studies’, ‘foreign studies’, or an equivalent. The selected prospec-

tuses, including their accompanying leaflets, contained a total of 4,609 pages. Each page delineating the features of the relevant department and its programmes was cut out, and .pdf files were created for each department.

In some instances, multiple .pdf files were created. For example, one university has a division conducting foreign language research and providing foreign language education to students of two other departments; three .pdf files, one in the name of this university and the other two in the name of this university and each respective department, were created. Other universities offer English education as a mandatory or elective component, with the same programmes available regardless of each student's school or faculty. Explanations of ELE are often given in the general education programmes information. In such cases, I created one .pdf for each department and another .pdf for the university.

In total, 73 .pdf files were created and stored as nodes in NVivo, a qualitative data analysis support software, and the contents of all 826 A4 pages were studied. During this process, three files were deleted from the dataset as the focus of their educational objectives was found not to include ELE. Therefore, a total of 70 .pdf files of university prospectuses (covering 60 departments in 52 faculties of 38 universities) were used for further analyses.

The first coding procedure was performed by reading every page of each .pdf file. When one part (a word, words, a phrase, phrases, a sentence, sentences, a paragraph, paragraphs, an image, or images) of a prospectus seemed relevant to ELE, it was selected and coded as either 'description of English language education' or 'terms used to indicate "foreign teachers"'. Detailed coding criteria for these nodes are shown in Appendix 1.

Ethical Considerations

Because my research is based on publicly available documents, many of the typical human research ethical issues (confidentiality, coercion, etc.) are not a concern. However, as programmes are critically analysed, my findings may influence people based in these establishments. This study's purpose is not to attack any individual or institution but, rather, to explore social phenomena while assuring anonymity and applying the ethics of respect for the person (British Educational Research Association, 2011). Another potential issue is references to or comments on the race, ethnicity, nationality, or gender of the people being discussed. The study's main theme may necessitate discussing inequalities based on these factors. However, the ultimate aim of this project is resolving these inequalities in ELE. By explaining the purpose of this paper here (and wherever necessary) clearly and sufficiently, the author aims to ensure that the four responsibilities outlined by the British Educational Research Association (BERA) (2011) – 'to participants', 'to sponsors of research', 'to the community of educational researchers', and 'to educational professionals, policy makers and the general public' – are respected.

Results

Content Analysis Results

To answer the first research sub-question, terms used to indicate 'foreign teachers' in prospectus pages were coded as explained above, and their frequency was counted.

Appendix 2 lists the terms referring to a certain group of people. Of the 38 universities, 34 were found to use terms at least once that indicate 'native English speakers'. In total, 175 cases were found. Most include the expres-

Table 1. University prospectus terms referring to a certain group within the teaching staff

Romanized Japanese words	Literal translation into English	Frequency
<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher (as a noun in Japanese ^{*1})	39
<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher (as a noun phrase in Japanese ^{*2})	28
<i>neitibu no sensei gata</i>	native teachers ^{*3}	1
<i>neitibu no kyōin</i>	native teacher	3
<i>neitibu no kōshi</i>	native instructor	2
<i>neitibu no kōshi jin</i>	native instructors	1
<i>neitibu supikā</i>	native speaker ^{*1}	8
<i>neitibu supikā no sensei tachi</i>	native speaker teachers ^{*3}	3
<i>neitibu supikā no kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher	8
<i>neitibu supikā no kōshi</i>	native speaker instructor	1
<i>neitibu supikā kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher ^{*1}	17
<i>neitibu</i>	native	9
<i>gaikokujin kyōin</i>	foreign teacher ^{*1}	4
<i>gaikokujin kōshi</i>	foreign instructor ^{*1}	4
<i>neitibu sutaffu</i>	native staff ^{*1}	7
<i>eigo ken syusshin no sutaffu</i>	staff member who comes from an English-speaking region	3
<i>neitibu supikā no sutaffu</i>	native speaker staff	2
<i>eigo neitibu kyōin</i>	English native teacher ^{*1}	1
<i>eigo neitibu supikā no kyōin</i>	English native speaker teacher	1
<i>eigo no neitibu supikā dearu kōshi</i>	instructor who is a native speaker of English	1
<i>eigo no neitibu supikā no sensei</i>	English native-speaking teacher	1
<i>eigo no neitibu supikā kyōin</i>	English native-speaking-teacher	1
<i>eigo o bogo to suru kyōin</i>	teacher who has English as their mother tongue	1
<i>bogo ga eigo no kyōin</i>	teacher whose mother tongue is English	1
<i>eigo de sapōto suru sutaffu</i>	staff members offering support in English	1
<i>neitibu no sutaffu</i>	native staff	1
<i>neitibu sensei</i>	native teacher ^{*1}	1
<i>neitibu supikā no adobaizā kyōin</i>	native speaker advisor teacher	1
<i>neitibu tīchā</i>	native teacher ^{*1}	1
<i>[university name] kara tokubetsuni shōhei shita kyōin</i>	teacher(s) who has (have) been specially invited from [university name]	1

Total 175

^{*1} The translation here was conducted word for word. In order to show the subtle differences in

How ‘Native Speakerism’ Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses

the original Japanese, explanations about the Japanese expressions are provided in parentheses. For example, the Japanese expressions *neitibu kyōin* and *neitibu no kyōin* can both be translated as ‘native teacher’. However, the former (*neitibu kyōin*) is used as a noun, and the latter (*neitibu no kyōin*) is a noun phrase. Hereafter, *¹ indicates that in the original Japanese, the word(s) is (are) used as (a) noun(s).

*² Same as above. All terms, except the ones with *¹, indicate that in the original Japanese, the word(s) is (are) used as a noun phrase.

*³ In the Japanese language, we cannot tell from the form of a word whether it is singular or plural. In this case, one Japanese word can indicate a single teacher or a group of teachers. This is why, in an English translation, the article and morphemes to indicate plurals are excluded. However, as in the examples marked with *³ above, the inclusion of the morphemes *gata* or *tachi* after *sensei* clearly indicates plurality.

sion *neitibu* (native) as a noun or an adjective. The word *neitibu* is always written in *katakana* characters, often used in foreign loanwords; they stand out among the other words written in Chinese characters and *hiragana*, another writing system used for native elements of the Japanese language. A list of the terms referring to a certain group within the teaching staff, often including *neitibu*, is shown in Table 1, accompanied by the number of times each was used.

By revisiting the original .pdf files of university prospectus pages, the contexts of the coded terms for a foreign teacher (in most cases, terms with ‘native’) were studied to identify characteristics attributed to the word(s) used in describing ELE at Japanese universities. The surrounding description of each term was carefully read, and key words attached to the terms were coded. In this analysis, similar expressions with only slight differences in their wording or writing system were treated as the same code when seeking to understand the concept of each expression.

Table 2 shows the concepts accompanying the terms meaning ‘native teachers’. These concepts are roughly divided into three types: (1) things that can be learnt; (2) programme characteristics; and (3) ‘native teacher’

Table 2. Contextual concepts accompanying ‘native’ teachers and equivalent terms

Concepts	Frequency
(1) Things that can be learnt	
English conversation	28
to improve English	25
to improve English proficiency test scores	21
ability to communicate in English	15
presentation	12
practical English ability	11
command of English	10
the four skills (reading, listening, writing, speaking)	10
communication	9
‘living’ English	9
global perspectives	7
speaking and listening	7
self-expression ability	5
real pronunciation	5
world citizen	4
discussion	3
gaining international perspectives	3
oral communication	3
writing	3
basic English	2
natural English	2
real English	2
speaking	2
foreign language ability necessary to study abroad	1
how to learn English continuously	1
maintain linguistic skills	1
reading	1
theoretical way of thinking	1
useful English	1
(2) Programme characteristics	
special programmes	40

How 'Native Speakerism' Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses

'English only'	37
easily and casually	27
out-of-class support	26
teach in a fun manner	21
preparation for studying abroad	18
intensive teaching	17
environment like foreign countries	16
small class size	15
private consultation	10
learn English unintentionally without [formally or intentionally] trying to learn	9
human contact	8
advice	6
learn something 'IN' English	6
international exchanges	5
tailored to needs	5
studying at various levels depending on proficiency	4
community	3
fulfilling learning experience	2
different from high school	1
giving necessary input	1
preparation for job interviews	1
(3) 'Native teacher' attributes	
both 'native teachers' and international students	15
'native teachers' and Japanese teachers	7
a kind of icon	13
teach 'local' cultures	7
representative of a culture	6
aspiration for English	4
interest in English language	1
from English-speaking countries	6
as a model/goal	4
qualified	2
abundant individuality	1
English easy to understand	1

attributes.

In **(1) things that can be learnt**, 29 concepts were found. More than half can be interpreted as indicating ‘spoken English’. By considering the concepts and intentions behind them, we can infer that almost all imply some intention to foster ‘spoken’ English ability.

Multiple Japanese wordings are used for which the underlying concepts are difficult to understand and, therefore, to translate into another language: for example, “‘living’ English”, ‘natural English’, ‘useful English’, and ‘real English’. It is difficult to define ‘living’ or ‘natural’ English. These often appear in policy documents by MEXT and can be interpreted as intended to mean spoken English. Each seems to mean the opposite to what is taught in traditional ELE as discussed in Seargeant (2009), which has often been considered ‘impractical’ because it is not natural, useful, or real, and cannot help students become fluent English speakers.

Most descriptions attached to terms for ‘native teachers’ and equivalents referred to **(2) programme characteristics** for those led by ‘native teacher(s)’. Five often-found concepts are as follows (the numbers in parentheses indicate frequency): ‘special programmes’ (40), ‘English only’ (37), ‘easily and casually’ (27), ‘out-of-class support’ (26), and ‘teach in a fun manner’ (21). Identified descriptions relating to **(3) ‘native teacher’ attributes** included ‘both “native teachers” and international students’ (15), “‘native teachers’ and Japanese teachers’ (7), and ‘a kind of icon’ (13).

Analysis and Discussion

Prevailing Ideas on the *Neitibu*

All of the analysed universities used terms highlighting a certain group of their

How ‘Native Speakerism’ Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses

teaching staff: mostly, ‘foreign’ teachers. All but two universities used a term containing ‘native’ at least once. The noun, *neitibu kyōin*, meaning ‘native teacher’, was used most frequently, although this phrase does not make sense in either English or Japanese. It is used similarly as *neitibu supīkā* (native speaker), but the phrase *neitibu kyōin* is ambiguous, considering that the definition of *neitibu* is ‘indigenous people’ (author’s translation) (*Digital Daijisen*, n.d.).

Despite many scholars having highlighted the ambiguous definition of ‘native speaker’ (e.g. Paikeday, 1985; Medgyes, 1994; Cook, 1999), there is an implicit common understanding of what ‘native’ means for the readers of these prospectuses, their guardians, and in Japanese society. This might be a chicken-and-egg debate: university prospectuses may contribute to creating this common understanding or may simply reflect an existing understanding among university and high school students. In either case, university prospectuses arguably function to instil or reinforce the idea that ‘natives’ are Caucasians, who speak English as their mother tongue, as discussed in Oda (2012).

Terms for another group, ‘Japanese teacher (of English)’, were also found. However, these were used in only a few cases (totalling seven). Other terms indicating a particular group are mostly general words, such as ‘teacher(s)’ or ‘teaching staff’. The term ‘Japanese teacher (of English)’ was always used in contrast to ‘native teacher’, seemingly suggesting that the two are different or belong to different groups. By separating ‘native’ teachers from other faculty members, the message is conveyed that the university has different types of teachers, and students can benefit from new ELE using ‘native teachers’, which differs from traditional teaching by ‘Japanese teachers’. This message

will reach prospectus readers and, eventually, the society to which they belong.

Introducing ‘English Conversation’ Taught by ‘Native’ Teachers as a Panacea

In the characteristics attributed to ‘native teachers’ in descriptions of ELE at Japanese universities, ‘English conversation’ or skills considered similar to spoken English are emphasized. This reflects the popular demand in Japanese society for practising English conversation in ELE. High school students/graduates unquestioningly believe that this practice is the ideal way to improve their foreign language ability. Many Japanese, including policy-makers, still believe that English education has been lacking in ‘oral English’ (‘oral communication skills in English’) in the globalization era, and that speaking skills should be improved at the expense of learning grammar (Torikai, 2006, pp. 148-152). This belief persists despite public ELE shifting from the grammar-translation method to fostering oral communication skills over recent decades, since the introduction of ‘oral communication’ in the ministry’s curriculum guidelines from 1989 (Torikai, 2006; Abe, 2017). Being challenged to recruit more students, universities show what they provide for their English education, not only to the applicants themselves and people directly involved, but also to the general public. The misguided perception of ELE among the Japanese was likely at least partly created by mass media, including national newspapers, which fail to correctly recognize the current situation (Torikai, 2006). University prospectuses are either mirroring these public opinions, so as to profit from them, or are themselves forging ideas on the most effective English language learning; perhaps both.

In addition, associating conversation skills with ‘native teachers’ might cause false perceptions about teacher qualifications. By assuming that ‘English conversation’ should be taught by ‘native teachers’, or that what ‘native teachers’ can teach is ‘English conversation’, this perception might diminish the standing of teachers who are effective and competent in teaching other skills.

Stereotypical Ideas of Lessons by ‘Native Teachers’

The concept category ‘programme characteristics’ provides some ideas about the nature of courses/lessons involving ‘native teachers’. University prospectuses often boast that their course(s) taught by ‘native teachers’ have an ‘English-only’ policy, the implication being that this is especially conducive to improving students’ English. Here, we can observe the fallacies – the native speaker fallacy and monolingual fallacy – proposed by Phillipson (1992). Even though the effectiveness of using the learners’ first language in certain situations is supported (e.g. Auerbach, 1993; Nation, 2003; Nazary, 2008), and is even understood by ‘native teachers’ themselves, ‘native teachers’ must confine themselves to exclusively using English.

Another characteristic of programmes taught by ‘native teachers’ is their informality: they are taught ‘in a fun manner’ with ‘out-of-class support’, and students participate in the programme ‘easily and casually’. It is also implied that students can ‘learn English without [formally or intentionally] trying to learn’ through placement in an ‘environment like foreign countries’ with ‘small class sizes’. Given the relatively great distance between English and Japanese (Kadota, 2015b), ELE practice should be based on research findings on language processing and memory for effective learning. Without considering the

mechanisms of foreign language learning, supported by research findings, many universities are reproducing the discourses created by commercial English conversation schools, using the same tired clichés in advertising. This practice masks two key deficiencies in Japanese English education: enough input from the target language to enable automatic processing (Kadota, 2015a) and sufficient study time (Torikai, 2006).

‘Native Teachers’ as a Collective Entity

Another key finding is that the term for ‘native teachers’ is used in parallel with the term ‘international students’, and in contrast to the term ‘Japanese teachers’. For example (each phrase below is the author’s own translation):

(1) In the foreign language communication room located on each campus, students can communicate with ‘native teachers’ and international students easily and casually.

Here, ‘native teachers’ and international students are treated in parallel: both are accessible via the university’s communication room. By contrast:

(2) We have both Japanese teachers and ‘native teachers’. The aim of the general ELE curriculum is to equip each student with a good command of practical English through practical learning intended to improve TOEIC scores and courses intended to impart the ability to communicate in English.

(3) From the first year at university, lectures, such as ‘British culture

How ‘Native Speakerism’ Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses and literature’, ‘American culture and literature’, ‘Comparative culture and literature’, ‘Language’, and ‘Communication’ are being offered by professors, including ‘native speakers’.

Within a group of teachers or faculty members, Japanese teachers (in the majority) and ‘native teachers’ are evidently treated differently, as if they belong to a qualitatively different type of teacher. Thus, teachers are categorized not by their expertise or the courses they lead, for example, but on ‘nativeness’ in the target language, or how they fit the criteria for ‘native teachers’ set in Japanese society. ‘Native teachers’ are treated and referred to as a collective entity, regardless of individual skills and talents. Sometimes they are part of the faculty while, at other times, they stand out. ‘Native teachers’ may enjoy an advantage in the hiring process, but it seems that, in many cases, they are hired not primarily as members of the faculty but instead to attract prospective students.

This might be related to another identified concept: ‘a kind of icon’. Ten of the 13 cases categorized as ‘a kind of icon’ used the term ‘native speaker’ alone or as part of a phrase. For example:

(4) We try to create ideal learning environments so that students can improve their English effortlessly, by staffing many ‘native speaker’ teachers.

(5) At [name] Lounge, users are asked to carry a stamp card, and the ‘native speaker’ validates your stamp card at every visit.

(6) [the aim of one of the courses is] – to get used to ‘native speaker teachers’ (author’s literal translation)

These all imply that being a ‘native speaker’ is an important element in being hired to teach at these universities. In these organizations, as well as throughout Japan, there seems to be a pervasive belief in the existence of a group of ‘native speakers’, which potentially results in its purported members being dehumanized. Why do people who validate a student’s stamp card, which works to confirm attendance, need to be ‘native speakers’, as in example (5)? Is being a ‘native speaker’ more important than being a teacher? What is implied by using the term ‘native’ instead of ‘teacher’ or ‘staff member’? For students or high school graduate applicants, the lounge in example (5) could be imagined as a type of theme park, where they can enjoy the longed-for contact with ‘native teachers’.

The following is another example of dehumanization:

(7) In the English *café*, staff members who come from an English-speaking region are on duty at all times. Communication should be in English. By communicating with international students and staff members, students can improve their English.

The implication is that students visit this English *café* to improve their English, not because they are interested in communicating with the people. They use English to improve their skills, even when using Japanese or other languages may be more effective to facilitate communication. In this sense, in-

terlocutors are not human beings in whom another interlocutor is interested but solely a provider of target language learning.

Conclusion

This study’s overarching purpose was to explore the impact of ‘native speakerism’ on higher education ELT in Japan. Content analysis of university prospectuses identified that in ‘international studies’, ‘English language’, and equivalent departments or schools, special courses or programmes to teach ‘spoken English’ or ‘English conversation’ emphasize the use of ‘native English speakers’. Despite ambiguous definitions of ‘native English speaker’, there seems to be a common understanding of who *neitibu* refers to in Japan and the natural benefits of their presence to the language aspirations of university applicants and students.

Focusing too much on introducing ‘English conversation’ taught by ‘native’ teachers into tertiary ELE and luring learners with appealing words might have some societal impacts. Speaking skills cannot be learnt automatically without study and preparation, as implied in the prospectus descriptions. Merely being surrounded by ‘native speakers’ does not of its own accord make learning happen. Exposing learners to attractive and misleading phrases may cause them to underestimate the required serious and tedious practice considered necessary for effectively learning a foreign language, according to cognitive science and psychology research. Students without a sound foundation in, for example, grammar, vocabulary to build upon, and reading skills, and who eschew fundamentals and their practice, may even lose academic skills.

The ways ‘native teachers’ are treated may additionally influence students’ perceptions about English, foreign language learning, and interpersonal com-

munication. Repeated emphasis on ‘native speakers’ as the ultimate authority might lead students to believe that speaking like a ‘native’ is the only goal of learning English. However, this is an impossible objective, given the working definition of ‘native speaker’ in Japanese society, and is unnecessary for learning English as a lingua franca. In addition, students (and society) may be led to believe that the English spoken in ‘Inner Circle’ (Kachru, 1992) countries is correct, whereas other varieties of English should be denigrated. Such warped perceptions may hinder learning, in particular by convincing students to never be satisfied with their achievements, pursuing so-called ‘native-like’ English proficiency.

By repeatedly propounding that language learners will only improve by speaking to ‘native English speakers’ only in English, or that ‘native teachers’ are always accessible to students who wish to practice, students might develop incorrect perceptions about language learning and interpersonal communication. At Japanese tourist destinations and other places, including schools, people attempting to talk to foreigners solely to practise English are an all-too-common sight. Even when the interlocutor is fluent in a language other than English or in Japanese, some people insist on using English. Humans are not trial horses, intended to be used for language practice. The way that ‘native teachers’ are depicted in university prospectuses might reinforce this distorted perception. One purpose of foreign language education is to develop a sense of fairness about languages, people, and the world, meeting standards of human decency and dignity. The purposes of learning English and required credentials of teachers should be clearly defined. Accordingly, teacher recruitment and deployment must be conducted in accordance with genuine and attested educational philosophy, rather than solely concentrating on ‘native

How ‘Native Speakerism’ Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses speaking’. Finally, in their marketing and advertising, universities must avoid using ‘native teachers’ to lure customers.

Notes

- 1) ALTs are mostly not qualified/certified teachers, but ‘teacher’ is the word used in *The Japan Times*.
- 2) In Japan, the population of men and women in the 18-year-old bracket has been declining since 1993 (MEXT 2017: http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo4/gijiroku/_icsFiles/fieldfile/2017/04/13/1384455_02_1.pdf Last Accessed 6 May, 2018).

Since many students attend universities or junior colleges directly after high school graduation, mostly at the age of 18, this sharp, steady decline of the 18-year-old population is a serious concern for Japanese universities.

Acknowledgements

An earlier version of this paper was part of the MRes dissertation I submitted to the University of London. I would like to express my gratitude to Dr Olga Cara for her comments and suggestions. I would also like to express my gratitude to Michael Carroll and Adrian Wagner at St. Andrew’s [Momoyama Gakuin] University, Japan, and Warren Decker at St. Andrew’s [Momoyama Gakuin] University of Education, Japan, for their invaluable help and comments in the process of revising this paper.

References

- Abe, M. (2017). *Shijō saikaku no eigo seisaku: Uso darake no “yonginō” kanban* [English education in chaos: Confusion and dishonesty in Japanese government policy]. Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobō.
- Askehave, I. (2007). The impact of marketization on higher education genres – the international student prospectus as a case in point. *Discourse Studies*, 9(6), 723–742. doi:10.1177/1461445607082576
- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL*

- Quarterly*, 27(1), 9. doi:10.2307/3586949
- Bailey, K. (2006). Marketing the *eikaiwa* wonderland: Ideology, *akogare*, and gender alterity in English conversation school advertising in Japan. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 24(1), 105-130. doi:10.1068/d418
- Braine, G. (Ed.). (1999). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Braine, G. (2010). *Nonnative speaker English Teachers: Research, pedagogy, and professional growth*. New York: Routledge.
- British Educational Research Association (BERA). (2011). *Ethical guidelines for educational research*. Retrieved from British Educational Research Association website: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/BERA-Ethical-Guidelines-2011.pdf?noredirect=1> (Last accessed 3 May 2016).
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). Interrogating the “native speaker fallacy”: Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77-92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185. doi:10.2307/3587717
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language, second edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 133-168. doi:10.1177/0957926593004002002
- Fujiwara, Y. (2017). Jiritsu shita Nihon no eigo kyōiku e [For autonomous Japanese English education]. In Y. Fujiwara, K. Naka, & T. Terasawa (Eds.). *Korekara no eigo kyōiku no hanashi o shiyō* [Let's talk about English education in Japan: Debating the future] (pp. 49-94). Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobō.
- Fujiwara, Y., Naka, K., & Terasawa, T. (Eds.). (2017). *Korekara no eigo kyōiku no hanashi o shiyō* [Let's talk about English education in Japan: Debating the future]. Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobō.
- Galloway, N. (2009). A critical analysis of the JET programme. *The Journal of*

How ‘Native Speakerism’ Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses

- Kanda University of International Studies*, 21, 169–207. Retrieved from https://ci.nii.ac.jp/els/contentsciinii_20181012135023.pdf?id=ART0008988840
- Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holliday, A. (2006). Key concepts in ELT: Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, 60 (4), 385–387. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cc1030>
- Holliday, A. (2013). Native speaker teachers and cultural belief. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (Eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education* (pp. 17–26). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Holliday, A. (2015). Native-speakerism: Taking the concept forward and achieving cultural belief. In A. Swan, P. Aboshiha, & A. Holliday. (Eds.), *(En)Counter-ing native-speakerism: Global perspectives* (pp. 11–25). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Houghton, S. A., & Rivers, D. J. (2013). Introduction: Redefining native-speakerism. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (Eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education* (pp. 1–16). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Houghton, S. A., & Rivers, D. J. (Eds.). (2013). *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Kachru, B. B. (Ed.). (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures, second edition*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kadota, S. (2015a). *Eigo jyōtatsu 12 no pointo* [12 keys to improving English]. Tokyo: Cosmopier.
- Kadota, S. (2015b). *Shadōingu ondoku to eigo komyunikēsyon no kagaku* [The science of English communication and shadowing and reading aloud practices]. Tokyo: Cosmopier.
- Kenkyūsha. (1995). *Gendai eigo kyōiku* [Modern English teaching]. Tokyo: Kenkyūsha.
- Kimura, G. C. (2016). *Setsuei no susume* [Recommendation of abandoning the heavy use of English]. Kanagawa: Yoro-zushobō.
- Kubota, R. (1998). Ideologies of English in Japan. *World Englishes*, 17(3), 295–

306. doi:10.1111/1467-971x.00105
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2015). Foreword. In A. Swan, P. Aboshiha, & A. Holliday (Eds.), (*En*) *Countering native-speakerism: Global perspectives* (pp. viii-xi). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mahboob, A. (2005). Beyond the native speaker in TESOL. In S. Zafar (Ed.), *Culture, context, & communication* (pp. 60-93). Center of Excellence for Applied Research Training and the Military Language Institute.
- Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. London: Macmillan Publishers.
- Mie, A. (2013). LDP plans expansion of JET program. *The Japan Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2013/04/24/national/ldp-plans-expansion-of-jet-program/#.V11WgSOLSM9> (Last accessed 12 June 2016).
- Moussu, L., & Llurda, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching*, 41 (03), 315-348. doi:10.1017/s0261444808005028
- Naka, K. (2006). “Ikita eigo” to bunretsuteki gengokan: “Gakusyū Shidō Yōryō” ni miru bogowasya shijō syugi to eigo no tayōsei [“Practical English” and disruptive language view: Native speakerism seen in the course of study and English diversity]. *Syakai Gengogaku [Sociolinguistics]* VI: 19-43.
- Nakamura, K. (1994). *Gaikokugo kyōiku to ideorogī* [Foreign language education and its ideology]. Tokyo: Kindai Bungeisha.
- Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(2), 1-8. Retrieved from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/june_2003_pn.pdf (Last accessed 29 April 2018).
- Nazary, M. (2008). The role of L1 in L2 acquisition: Attitudes of Iranian university students. *Novitas-Royal*, 2(2), 138-153. Retrieved from <http://www.novitasroyal.org/nazary.pdf>
- Neitibu. (n.d.). In *Digital Daijisen*. Retrieved from <https://dictionary.goo.ne.jp/jn/169632/meaning/m0u/%E3%83%8D%E3%82%A4%E3%83%86%E3%82%A3%E3%83%96/> (Last accessed 16 October 2017).
- Oda, M. (2012). Foreign language learners’ beliefs and public discourse as

How ‘Native Speakerism’ Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses

- “common knowledge”: A critical approach to the circular structure of discourses. *The Ronsō, Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters, Tamagawa University*, 53: 89–100.
- Oishi, S. (1990). *Eigo ideorogī o tou: Seiō seishin to no kakutō* [Questioning the ideology of English: Struggle with the Western mind]. Tokyo: Kaibunsha.
- Paikeday, T. M. (1985). *The native speaker is dead!* Toronto: Paikeday Press.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rivers, D. J. (2013). Institutionalized native-speakerism: Voices of dissent and acts of resistance. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (Eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan. Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*, (pp. 75–91). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ruecker, T., & Ives, L. (2014). White native English speakers needed: The rhetorical construction of privilege in online teacher recruitment spaces. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(4), 733–756. doi:10.1002/tesq.195
- Seargeant, P. (2009). *The idea of English in Japan: Ideology and the evolution of a global language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Selvi, A. F. (2010). All teachers are equal, but some teachers are more equal than others: Trend analysis of job advertisements in English language teaching. *WATESOL NNEST Caucus Annual Review*, 1, 156–181. Retrieved from <https://sites.google.com/site/watesolnnestcaucus/caucus-annual-review>
- Sugino, T. (2016). Eigo no fukyū ni dō mukiau bekika [How we should face the diffusion of English]. In T. Yamamoto & Y. P. Koda (Eds.), *Eigo detokkusu* [Detoxify English]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.
- Swan, A., Aboishiha, P., & Holliday, A. (Eds.). (2015). *(En) Countering native-speakerism: Global perspectives*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- The Council of Local Authorities for International Relations (CLAIR). (2015). JET programme leaflet. Retrieved from http://jetprogramme.org/wp-content/themes/biz-vektor/pdf/leaf/leaflet_e.pdf (Last accessed 12 June 2016).
- The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan (MEXT). (2003). “Eigo ga tsukaeru nihonjin” no ikusei no tame no kōdō keikaku. [An action plan to cultivate “Japanese with English abilities”]

- Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo3/004/siryō/04031601/005.pdf (Last accessed 5 June 2016), English translation: <http://www.gifu-net.ed.jp/kyōka/eigo/CommunicativeEnglish/Regarding%20the%20Establishment%20of%20an%20Action%20Plan%20to%20Cultivate%20the%20A1%20C8Japanese%20with%20English%20Abilities%20A1%20C9.htm> (Last accessed 19 April 2018).
- The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan (MEXT). (2013). *Gurōbaru ka ni taiō shita eigo kyōiku kaikaku jissai keikaku* [An execution plan for English education reform to respond to globalization] Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/kokusai/gaikokugo/1343704.htm (Last accessed 19 April 2016).
- Torikai, K. (2006). *Ayaushi! Syōgakkō eigo* [Beware! English education in elementary school]. Tokyo: Bunshun Shinsho.
- Tsuda, Y. (1990). *Eigo shihai no kōzō* [The structure of English domination]. Tokyo: Daisan Shokan.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377–389. doi:10.2307/3587438
- Williamson, J. (1978). *Decoding advertisements: Ideology and meaning in advertising*. London: Marion Boyars.
- Yamada, Y. (2003). *Gengo seisaku to shite no eigo kyōiku* [English language education as language policy]. Hiroshima: Keisuisha.
- Yamamoto, T. & Koda Y. P. (Eds.). (2016). *Eigo detokkusu* [Detoxify English]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.
- Yomiuri Shimbun. (2016, April 24). “Rettsu kokusai gakubu.” Ninki teichaku. Shinsetsu tsuzuku [“Let’s head to the Department of International Studies.” Still enjoying high popularity, new schools continue to be established]. *Yomiuri Shimbun*.

Appendices

Appendix 1. Coding Criteria for Nodes: ‘Description of English language education’ or ‘Terms used to indicate “foreign teachers”’

Description of English language education

- Explanations of the English language education/course(s)/programme(s)/lesson(s) were coded in this category.
- Even if the main purpose was to describe a department’s general education goals, mention of the goal(s)/purpose(s)/content(s) of English language education was coded here.
- Graduate comments that mentioned the English language education/course/programme/lesson were coded in this category.
- Explanations and descriptions of study abroad programmes were excluded.
- Alumni comments about study abroad experiences were excluded from the data.
- Descriptions of teacher training courses were excluded.

Terms used to indicate ‘foreign teacher(s)’

- Terms to indicate a certain group of people, such as teachers or staff members, were coded under this category, but terms to indicate general teaching staff were not. For example, the term ‘the native speaker teacher’ was coded, but ‘our faculty member’ was not coded here.
- Terms used in the description of English language education were coded, but those used in other parts that were not directly related to English language education were not. It might be possible that expressions used in the descriptions of Spanish language education (for example, those laid out next to the English language education section) in the same prospectus could have played an important role in imparting certain knowledge or meaning to readers; however, they were not coded in this project because of the complexity this task would have brought to the project (considering its scale) and the high possibility of its results being irrelevant.
- In cases where the term ‘native speaker’ (or its equivalent) was used to indicate anything but a teaching staff member in the English language education descrip-

tion, it was coded under this category in order to facilitate the study of the attributes allocated to it.

Appendix 2. Terms Used to Mean a Certain Group of People

University *1	School Faculty *2	Depart- ment *3	Terms used in Japanese	Romanized Japanese words	Literal translation into English	Fre- quency
1	0		ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher (as a noun in Japanese *4)	1
			外国人教員	<i>gaikokujin kyōin</i>	foreign teacher*4	3
1	1	1	ネイティブ・スピーカーの教員	<i>neitibu supīkā no kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher (as a noun phrase in Japanese*5)	1
			ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	3
			ネイティブ	<i>neitibu</i>	native*4	1
1	2	1	ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher*4	1
			ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	2
			ネイティブ先生	<i>neitibu sensei</i>	native teacher*4	1
1	3	1	ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher*4	9
			[大学名] から特別に招聘した教員	<i>[university name] kara tokubetsuni shōhei shita kyōin</i>	teacher(s) who has (have) been specially invited from [university name]	1
2	0		英語を母語とする教員	<i>eigo o bogo to suru kyōin</i>	teacher who has English as their mother tongue	1
			ネイティブスピーカーの教員	<i>neitibu supīkā no kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher	3
			ネイティブスピーカー	<i>neitibu supīkā</i>	native speaker*4	1
			ネイティブスピーカー教員	<i>neitibu supīkā kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher*4	1
3	1	1	ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher*4	1
4	1	1	ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher*4	1
			英語でサポートするスタッフ	<i>eigo de sapōto suru sutaffu</i>	staff members offering support in English	1
			ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	1
5	0		ネイティブ・スピーカーの先生	<i>neitibu supīkā no sensei</i>	native speaker teacher	2
			ネイティブ・スピーカー	<i>neitibu supīkā</i>	native speaker*4	1

How 'Native Speakerism' Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses

			英語ネイティブ・スピーカーの教員	<i>eigo neitibu supikā no kyōin</i>	English native speaker teacher	1
5	1	1	ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher* ⁴	1
			ネイティブ・スピーカーの先生	<i>neitibu supikā no sensei</i>	native speaker teacher	1
6	0		ネイティブ	<i>neitibu</i>	native* ⁴	1
			ネイティブの講師	<i>neitibu no kōshi</i>	native instructor	1
			ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher* ⁴	1
6	1	1+2	ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	2
7	1	1	ネイティブの講師陣	<i>neitibu no kōshi jin</i>	native instructors	1
			英語のネイティブスピーカーである講師	<i>eigo no neitibu supikā de aru kōshi</i>	instructor who is a native speaker of English	1
8	0		ネイティブスタッフ	<i>neitibu staffu</i>	native staff* ⁴	3
			ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher* ⁴	3
			ネイティブの教員	<i>neitibu no kyōin</i>	native teacher	1
			ネイティブのスタッフ	<i>neitibu no staffu</i>	native staff	1
8	1	1	ネイティブ	<i>neitibu</i>	native* ⁴	1
9	1	1	ネイティブスピーカーの先生	<i>neitibu supikā no sensei</i>	native speaker teacher	1
			ネイティブスピーカーのアドバイザー教員	<i>neitibu supikā no adobaizā kyōin</i>	native speaker advisor teacher	1
			ネイティブスピーカーの教員	<i>neitibu supikā no kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher	1
9	1	2	ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	1
10	1	1	外国人教員	<i>gaikokujin kyōin</i>	foreign teacher* ⁴	1
			ネイティブ	<i>neitibu</i>	native* ⁴	1
11	0		ネイティブスタッフ	<i>neitibu sutaffu</i>	native staff* ⁴	2
			ネイティブの先生方	<i>neitibu no sensei gata</i>	native teachers	1
11	1	1	ネイティブスピーカー	<i>neitibu supikā</i>	native speaker* ⁴	1
12	1	1	ネイティブティーチャー	<i>neitibu tīchā</i>	native teacher* ⁴	1
			ネイティブ・スピーカーの教員	<i>neitibu supikā no kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher	1
			ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher* ⁴	3
13	1	1	ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	1
			ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher* ⁴	2
14	1	1	外国人教員	<i>gaikokujin kyōin</i>	foreign-teacher	1
			ネイティブ	<i>neitibu</i>	native* ⁴	1

人間文化研究 第11号

			母語が英語の教員	<i>bogo ga eigo no kyōin</i>	teacher whose mother tongue is English	1
15	1	1	英語のネイティブ・スピーカーの先生	<i>eigo no neitibu supikā no sensei</i>	English native-speaking teacher	1
			ネイティブスピーカー	<i>neitibu supikā</i>	native speaker ^{*4}	1
			ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	3
16	1	1	ネイティブスピーカー教員	<i>neitibu supikā kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher ^{*4}	4
			ネイティブ	<i>neitibu</i>	native ^{*4}	1
			ネイティブスピーカーの先生	<i>neitibu supikā no sensei</i>	native speaker teacher	1
			英語のネイティブスピーカー教員	<i>eigo no neitibu supikā kyōin</i>	English native-speaking teacher	1
			ネイティブスピーカーの教員	<i>neitibu supikā no kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher	1
17	1	1	ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	1
18	0		ネイティブスピーカー	<i>neitibu supikā</i>	native speaker ^{*4}	4
			ネイティブスピーカーのスタッフ	<i>neitibu supikā no sutaffu</i>	native speaker staff	2
			ネイティブスピーカーの先生	<i>neitibu supikā no sensei</i>	native speaker teacher	1
18	1	1	ネイティブスピーカー教員	<i>neitibu supikā kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher ^{*4}	2
19	1	1	ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	2
			ネイティブ	<i>neitibu</i>	native ^{*4}	1
20	1	1	ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher ^{*4}	2
20	2	1	ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher ^{*4}	1
			ネイティブスピーカー	<i>neitibu supikā</i>	native speaker ^{*4}	1
			ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	3
20	2	2	ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher ^{*4}	1
			ネイティブスピーカー	<i>neitibu supikā</i>	native speaker ^{*4}	1
			ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	1
21	1	1	ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	1
22	1	1	ネイティブ	<i>neitibu</i>	native ^{*4}	2
			ネイティブスピーカー教員	<i>neitibu supikā kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher ^{*4}	2
			ネイティブスピーカーの先生たち	<i>neitibu supikā no sensei tachi</i>	native speaker teachers	3
			ネイティブスピーカー	<i>neitibu supikā</i>	native speaker ^{*4}	1

How 'Native Speakerism' Manifests in Japanese University Prospectuses

23	0		英語圏出身のスタッフ	<i>eigo ken syusshin no sutaffu</i>	staff member who comes from an English-speaking region	3
			ネイティブスタッフ	<i>neitibu staffu</i>	native staff ^{*4}	2
23	1	1	ネイティブの教員	<i>neitibu no kyōin</i>	native teacher	1
			ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher ^{*4}	1
			ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	1
24	1	1	ネイティブスピーカー	<i>neitibu supikā</i>	native speaker ^{*4}	1
25	1	1	英語ネイティブ教員	<i>eigo neitibu kyōin</i>	English native teacher ^{*4}	1
			外国人教員	<i>gaikokujin kyōin</i>	foreign teacher ^{*4}	1
26	1	1	ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	2
26	2	1	ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	2
			ネイティブスピーカー教員	<i>neitibu supikā kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher ^{*4}	6
			ネイティブスピーカー	<i>neitibu supikā</i>	native speaker ^{*4}	5
			ネイティブスピーカーの先生	<i>neitibu supikā no sensei</i>	native speaker teacher	1
			ネイティブの講師	<i>neitibu no kōshi</i>	native instructor	1
27	1	1	ネイティブ・スピーカー教員	<i>neitibu supikā kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher ^{*4}	1
28	1	1	ネイティブスピーカー	<i>neitibu supikā</i>	native speaker ^{*4}	5
			ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher ^{*4}	5
			ネイティブスピーカーの先生	<i>neitibu supikā no sensei</i>	native speaker teacher	1
29	1	1	外国人講師	<i>gaikokujin kōshi</i>	foreign instructor ^{*4}	1
30	1	1	ネイティブスピーカーの講師	<i>neitibu supikā no kōshi</i>	native speaker instructor	1
31	1	1	ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher ^{*4}	1
32	0		ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher ^{*4}	1
32	1	1	ネイティブの教員	<i>neitibu no kyōin</i>	native teacher	1
33	0		ネイティブ・スピーカー教員	<i>neitibu supikā kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher ^{*4}	1
33	1	1+2	外国人教員	<i>gaikokujin kyōin</i>	foreign teacher ^{*4}	1
33	2	1	ネイティブ・スピーカーの教員	<i>neitibu supikā no kyōin</i>	native speaker teacher	1
34	1	1	ネイティブ教員	<i>neitibu kyōin</i>	native teacher ^{*4}	4
			ネイティブの先生	<i>neitibu no sensei</i>	native teacher	2
TOTAL						175

- *¹ Figures in the leftmost column indicate the order of universities in the data set that used the term(s) to indicate a certain group of people in descriptions of their teaching staff member(s) in the English language education description.
- *² Figures in the second column from the left indicate the school or faculty. The number '0' indicates that the term(s) was (were) found in the .pdf file with only the name of the university.
- *³ Figures in the third column from the left indicate the department(s). '1+2' indicates that the .pdf file contains two departments from the school/faculty.
- *⁴ The translation here was conducted word for word. In order to show the subtle differences in the original Japanese, explanations about the Japanese expressions are provided in parentheses. For example, the Japanese expressions *neitibu kyōin* and *neitibu no kyōin* can both be translated as 'native teacher'. However, the former (*neitibu kyōin*) is used as a noun, and the latter (*neitibu no kyōin*) is a noun phrase. Hereafter, *⁴ indicates that in the original Japanese, the word(s) is (are) used as (a) noun(s).
- *⁵ Same as above. All the terms, except the ones with *⁴, indicate that in the original Japanese, the word(s) is (are) used as a noun phrase.