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Foreword

We are pleased to announce the publication of the second volume of the JACET ELF SIG Journal. We are delighted that the continuous publication of ELF SIG Journal represents our dynamic activity through the last two years since its foundation.

To note again, the JACET ELF SIG Journal is annual, peer-reviewed online publication for the ELF SIG of the Japan Association of College English Teachers (JACET). The journal seeks to publish research papers, articles regarding teaching practice, teacher reflection and pedagogy, book reviews and reports with reference to the ever-growing phenomenon and research field of ELF in Japan as well as a range of international contexts. Its aim is firstly, publishing selected papers from SIG regular meetings and ELF-related events, and eventually, more widely publishing peer-reviewed ELF-related articles. It strives to provide a forum for researchers and educators to share their expertise and experience with a wider audience, facilitating better understanding of English used as a common language to connect people of different linguacultural backgrounds.

The second volume includes four articles based on the JACET ELF SIG Symposium: *English as a lingua franca and native-speakerism in ELT* held at Waseda University on 29 April 2017. In publishing the volume, we invited Prof. Patrick Ng, the organizer of the symposium, as a guest editor. Preceded by the guest editor’s introduction, we have three academic articles written by Tomokazu Ishikawa, Nathanael Rudolph and Julie Rudolph and Masaki Oda. Short reports on some of the ELF-related events in the academic year of 2017 compiled by Gilner are also included at the end of this volume. The reports particularly focus on the illustration and critique of presentations given at the symposium. They are very informative and helpful, particularly for those who, for some reason, were unable to attend them.

Finally, we would like to express our greatest gratitude again to the chair (Prof. Kumiko Murata) and the vice-chair (Prof. Nobuyuki Hino), the guest editor (Prof. Patrick Ng), the members of the editorial board and the reviewers who gave their indispensable expertise needed for finalising this volume, *the JACET ELF SIG Journal*, Volume 2.
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Special Volume on ELF and Native-Speakerism in ELT
Introduction: English as a Lingua Franca and Native-Speakerism in ELT

Patrick Ng

The 1st JACET ELF Special Interest Group’s meeting in 2017 was held as a symposium on the 29th of April, 2017 at Waseda University. It has sent a strong signal that the JACET ELF SIG community is indeed ‘alive’ and ‘vibrant’. Despite being a very new SIG (established only in December 2016), the JACET ELF SIG has gained traction amongst teachers, researchers and educators who have long been interested in ELF research and pedagogy. Although it was held on the morning of the first day of the Golden Week Holiday, more than 50 people turned up for the symposium. The invited panel speakers—scholars and researchers engaged in various ELF-related research both at the theoretical and practical levels—included: Professor Masaki Oda (Tamagawa University), Dr Gregory Paul Glasgow (Rikkyo University), Dr Tomokazu Ishikawa (Waseda University-Part Time) and Dr Nathanael Rudolph (Mukogawa Women's University).

The Chair and founder of JACET ELF SIG, Professor Murata kickstarted the symposium with some opening remarks. The theme of the symposium was: English as a Lingua Franca and native-speakerism in ELT. Readers may ask: Why a symposium on English as a lingua franca and native-speakerism in ELT? Scholars in ELF research have long argued that the promotion of a monolithic model of English is untenable in today’s multilingual and transcultural world (Jenkins 2015; Baker 2015), where different constellations of speakers of diverse individual Englishes are constantly engaged in a conversation with each other (Meierkkord, 2004: 115). However, despite the plea by ELF scholars to embrace a variation of ELF use for international communication, the same old ideology of native-speakerism, coupled with a monolingual bias, still seems to perpetuate in Japan and elsewhere (Holliday 2006; Houghton and Rivers 2013).

As the status of English as a lingua franca continues to be an increasingly popular discourse in ELT, and with the 2017 JACET International Convention theme focusing on ELF pedagogy, ’I believe the time is ripe for us to have as symposium to flesh out the various hard issues relevant to native-speakerism and the teaching of ELF. Against the backdrop of current ELF research, the symposium provided a platform for ELF practitioners to discuss the negative consequences of the imagined and deeply entrenched native-speakerism in the Japanese educational context. Panelists were invited to share their views with regard to the following questions: (i) What are some of consequences of the imagined and deeply entrenched native-speakerism in the overall English language teaching in Japan? (ii) What can ELF practitioners do to articulate the pedagogical and linguistic strengths of
local/multilingual English teachers? (iii) How can local teachers resist or challenge the ideology of native-speakerism in their own teaching context?

Within the 3 hours of the symposium, participants were treated to an intellectual feast of stimulating talks and discussions. The lively debates regarding the various ELF pedagogical issues amongst the panelists, and the thought-provoking questions raised by the audience bore testament to the success of the symposium.

This volume of the JACET ELF journal features the three papers presented at the symposium. In his paper, ‘From English native-speakerism to multilingualism: A conceptual note,’ Ishikawa reminds us of the irrelevance of the native and non-native divide in discussing English as a global language. Providing an impressive account of the literature to endorse the role of English as a global lingua franca, Ishikawa emphasizes that global communication is no longer confined to interacting with monolingual native-English speakers. Ishikawa forcefully argues that a monolithic “standard” English is unacceptable and denounces the NES/non-NES distinction as inappropriate and instead supports the notion of English as a multi-lingua franca (EMF), where users are able to appropriate multilingual resources for the purpose of effective communication.

In their article, ‘ELF, “English” Language Teaching, and Criticality: Assumptions, Tensions, and Implications,’ Rudolph and Rudolph provide an overview of the critically-oriented literature in ELT and state that it is important to create space in the classroom for diversity. Adopting a respectful tone, but yet firm in their critique of what needs to be addressed, they also point out that within “criticality” there are divergent notions of “moving beyond” idealization. As a result of the emergent diversity of users, uses, functions, varieties, and contexts of “English,” Rudolph and Rudolph assert there is a need to address locally-globally constructed ideas of nativeness in English and essentialized notions of Japaneseness-Otherness in the Japanese educational context. Without a doubt, the article clearly provides a platform for fellow ELF researchers/practitioners to consider how to move forward in their efforts to challenge the inequities in ELT.

In his paper, ‘A Post-EFL Approach to the Administration of English Language Programs,’ Oda provides readers an insight into the administration of a multicultural ELF-aware program in Tamagawa University. Capitalising on his years of experience in establishing the CELF in Tamagawa University, Oda calls for greater attention when implementing a multicultural ELF-aware program. He also suggests that the administration of a multicultural ELF-aware English language program, the first of its kind in the educational context in Japan, needs to be optimized to run such a program effectively. The primary objective of Oda’s paper, as he explains, is to encourage ELT researchers to pay more attention to the underrepresented area in the administration of a multicultural English
programme administration. Oda dispels the notion that teachers with different linguistic backgrounds are the key issue in maintaining a multicultural English programme. Instead, he cautions that it is more important to create an environment to allow students to use English to interact with interlocutors from different cultures when implementing such a programme.

This is the first journal on ELF that I have guest-edited. I am grateful to Professor Murata and Professor Hino for the opportunity to organise the symposium. I would also like to express my gratitude to the editors of JACET ELF journal (Mayu and Yoko) for their editorial support in the production of this journal.

References
From English Native-Speakerism to Multilingualism: A Conceptual Note

Tomokazu Ishikawa

It annoys me when academic job advertisements in Japan often use the term “native speaker” synonymously with “native English speaker”. But in the first place, why should we be so indigenous to any particular speech community in this age of multilingual and multicultural communication? (Ishikawa 2016a: a Facebook post)

1. Introduction

On perusing academic job advertisements towards the end of my doctoral programme at a British university, I made the above post on Facebook and wondered why applicants for an applied linguistics position in Japan should be “native” English speakers (henceforth NESs) to be eligible for consideration. For example, one Japanese institution stipulated the first prerequisite for application for its English language teaching position in four words: “Be a native speaker” (T University, 10 February 2016). While there can be miscellaneous interpretations of the term NESs (e.g., Davies 2013), the target audience of those advertisements would probably associate this category with Anglophone or first language (L1) English speakers from the Inner Circle (Kachru 1985; Houghton and Rivers 2013).

As may be obvious from other contributions to this volume (Oda this volume; Rudolph and Rudolph this volume), native-speakerism in English-related education presumes Anglophone speakers as the custodians of English, through the assumptions of (1) monolingual competence (or rather, the competence of English as an insular vernacular) as well as (2) associated “correctness” (e.g., Seidlhofer 2018). However, Anglophone speakers amount only to less than one quarter of estimated more than two billion English users, and a great deal of linguistic diversity is observed even among Anglophone speech communities (e.g., Jenkins 2015a). In fact, a global encounter often involves no L1 English users either in “transient multilingual communities” (Mortensen 2013: 37, 39) or in relatively established “communities of practice” (e.g., Wenger 1998; Seidlhofer 2007). Against this contemporary English use as a global lingua franca, how are we to understand the aforementioned two assumptions, and what are we to consider as an alternative to native-speakerism with respect to the English language? To this effect, the present paper examines each of these assumptions with reference to English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) studies and complexity theory (e.g., Larsen-Freeman 2011) respectively. Following this, and before conclusion, it introduces current thinking which seems to coincide with the opening theoretical section of the first handbook of ELF (Jenkins, Baker and Dewey 2018). Overall, this paper aims to provide some
food for thought on the same old topic from the latest perspective.

2. Monolingual Competence?: ELF Perspectives

Monolingual competence is, in effect, the perceived linguistic integrity of an idealised monolingual Standard English. Even though many NES English teachers in Japan speak some Japanese, they are supposed to keep their English intact from this additional language (e.g., Galloway 2014). In this regard, what has been problematised in applied linguistics is “the traditional monolingual conception of bilinguals as being two monolinguals rather than different people from monolinguals in L1” (Cook 2013: 37-38).

In reality, given the current prominence of English communication across geographical boundaries and often with no close association to any physical communities, English is commonly observed to be situated along with multiple other languages. After all, those estimated over three quarters of the more than two billion generally use English as an additional language. Their linguistic repertoires are inevitably hybrid, embracing the influence of their diverse L1s (Mauranen 2012) and perhaps also a different degree of other non-English languages at their disposal. At the same time, their immediate or previous interactants’ linguistic repertoires may also be multilingual, and communication may occur in a local environment where one or a couple of languages/language varieties or multilingualism itself is predominant. All these conditions do not only have a potential influence on linguistic practices at any moment, but also bear relevance to how they develop their English in a long term (Mauranen 2018).1 Moreover, it is not just linguistic practices and development that inevitably feature hybridity. Heightened heterogeneity most probably applies to cultural backgrounds as well.

The research field of ELF targets a communication scenario involving diverse multilingual or multilanguaging speakers,2 but not excluding monolingual NESs from different origins. Not surprisingly, ELF description has documented omnipresent miscellaneous multilingual and cultural resources for communication, however covert they may be (e.g., Cogo 2016). Obviously, global communication scarcely ever consists of monolingual interactants alone, thereby standing in stark contrast with the monolingual assumption of English native-speakerism. So far, ELF studies have demonstrated that what is crucial to achieve interactional purposes are pragmatic strategies, particularly accommodation

---

1 Mauranen (2012, 2018) explains that contact languages between a diverse L1 and L2 English meet and mingle each other in social and communal networks. In other words, contact occurs, first at the individual cognitive level, and then at the interactional level as social practice. Accordingly, she regards ELF interaction as a higher-order or second-order language contact.

2 The term multilanguaging here refers to the capability “to engage in the dynamic exploitation of previously unfamiliar linguistic resources by adapting to a multilingual environment” (Ishikawa 2017: 38).
(e.g., Jenkins 2000, 2014), rather than specific linguistic features or cultural knowledge. Closely related to this is the empirically-based awareness that linguistic resources are variously adaptable (e.g., Seidlhofer 2011), and that Anglophone cultures are neither embedded nor inexorably linked to the language (e.g., Baker 2015). In turn, those who are skilful in both pragmatic strategies and the appropriation of linguistic and cultural resources in communication should be seen as capable users of English as a global lingua franca (see e.g., Cogo 2018: 360; Baker 2015: 95-97). It follows from this that monolingual competence is a deprived notion with a limited range of linguistic (and perhaps also cultural) resources, so long as English is considered to be a language for global communication.

No matter how prevalent a monolingual ideology may be in Japanese society, monolingual competence is simplistic and naïve in the face of the current complex world, which a global lingua franca is expected to bring closer together. So is its associated “correctness”, which is the focus of the next section.

3. Monolingual “Correctness”?: Complexity Theory

Apparently undergirding native-speakerism, Standard English ideology views the global expansion of English as the distribution of the “standard” language i.e., a particular dominant dialect (e.g., Trudgill and Hannah [2008] 2013) of an Inner Circle country (e.g., Ishikawa 2016b: 129-131). Problematically, monolithic “correctness” in this local English variety, particularly in terms of surface linguistic features, presupposes “an abstracted, idealized, homogenous” monolingual speech community comprising a selected social class (Lippi-Green 2012: 67). However, a global contact language is, by definition, not reliably attributable to any such stable communities. It would be hard or even impossible, therefore, to prescribe “correctness” as a priori for global encounters.

Given the possible tension between diversity and fixity in linguistic and cultural forms for global communication (see Pennycook 2007), complexity theory provides a metaphoric heuristic (e.g., Baird, Baker and Kitazawa 2014) or metatheory (Larsen-Freeman 2017) “as a perspective, not as a compulsory vocabulary or theoretical template” (Blommaert 2016: 249, emphasis in original). It allows us to conceive of language and culture as “complex, dynamic, open, adaptive, self-organizing, nonlinear systems” (Larsen-Freeman 2011: 52) which have been evolving diachronically and synchronically. To be more specific, language and culture may be considered as having been emergent from an aggregated amount of interaction between individuals in the context of other complex social systems (e.g., gender and generation). But as being nonlinear, none of these systems is reducible to any particular

---

3 Jenkins’ (2000) first monograph applies accommodation theory (e.g., Beebe and Giles 1984) extensively to ELF, and the term accommodation here refers to adapting and adjusting language to specific interactants in a given context.
individuals or communicative instances. Multiple complex social systems influence, respond and adapt to each other, making the boundaries between themselves fuzzy and never categorical. It is probably useful to account for different languages/language varieties and cultures as different smaller-scale complex social systems. However, the boundaries are, again, only blurred and unstable. Thus, languages/language varieties are more hybrid and fluid than countable and separable, and so are cultures. English that is used as a global lingua franca, then, may be seen as invoking a varying degree and different level of complex social systems in each communicative instance.

Complexity theory requires seeing that “what emerges from any [ELF] interaction is not fully predictable from its antecedents, but distinctive” (Jenkins 2015b: 66). Simply put, “every lingua franca interaction [is] anew and on its own” (Hülmbauer 2009: 324). To this effect, it is just irrelevant to make an acontextual distinction between an innovation and error (e.g., Larsen-Freeman 2018). Correspondingly, the legitimacy of English as a global lingua franca would rely on its users’ “dynamic, flexible, and locally contingent” ability (Kramsch 2009: 199) to communicate, and not on prescribed monolithic “correctness” or conventions within a particular speech community. This seems to allude to multilingualism (and transcultural communication) as the norm, to which the following discussion turns.

4. Multilingualism as the Norm

Seeing that the role of English as a global lingua franca embraces multilingual influence as the primary feature, Jenkins (2015b: 74) proposes the notion of English as a multi-lingua franca (EMF), whose users are able to appropriate contingent multilingual resources for the purpose of efficient and effective communication. While multilingualism has always been part of describing ELF (e.g., Seidlhofer 2017), it has not sufficiently been foregrounded as the theoretical raison d’être. Jenkins’ (2015b: 73) working definition of EMF is as follows: “Multilingual communication in which English is available as a contact language of choice, but is not necessarily chosen”. This means that the emphasis on multilingualism potentially involves English, rather than vice versa (cf. Cenoz 2017). Importantly, this definition does not exclude monolingual English speakers, so long as they are capable of multilanguaging. Indeed, as implied by the term “repertoires in flux” (Jenkins 2015b: 76, 79), multilingualism is not just the property of individual users. It is also the gross property of previous and actual interactants from diverse backgrounds coming together online or to a physical environment, with each environment likely to have one or more local languages/language varieties. In brief, multilingualism here may be regarded as broadly conceptualised translanguaging (e.g., García and Li 2014) “with multiple named languages” (Li 2018: 27) which emerges across

---

4 Kramsch (2009) attributes these qualities to what she calls symbolic competence, not to English as a global lingua franca.
individuals, time and space. Such emergent multilingualism agrees with some empirical argument of there being no abstract, immanent underlying set of rules for the use of each language (e.g., Vetchinnikova 2015).

In observing that what renders English global is multilingualism (as opposed to monolingual provincialism of a traditional Standard English), many ELF scholars would not see the NES/non-NES distinction as appropriate (Ishikawa in press). In agreement with Baker (2011: 210), it seems unreasonable to postulate that a global lingua franca in this multilingual world is “native to some and foreign to others”. More precisely, those scholars seem to endorse the notion of EMF, for which the distinction between monolingual and multilingual English users is far more relevant. To borrow Jenkins’ (2018: 73) words, “the language of the monolingual English user is marked in lingua franca settings, while that of the multilingual ELF user, regardless of whether English is their first or (more often) subsequent language, is unmarked”. To put it bluntly, NESs are “abnormal” or highly unusual in the current complex world, if they choose to stay monolingual.

Regarding culture, Baker (2015) illustrates how lingua franca communication among English-knowing multilinguals constructs and represents links through and across different types (e.g., conversational practices and food) and scales of culture (i.e., local, national and global), potentially involving different linguauctions (e.g., Risager 2012). At the same time, cultural differences among these multilinguals might not be perceived as being so relevant by any participants in the course of communication (e.g., Zhu 2014) or demonstrated significant by the researcher. In brief, EMF would accord with transcultural communication, which entails both the border-transgressing nature of culture and the possible transience of salient cultural categories (Ishikawa 2017). As a corollary, effective global communication is not just about putting contingent multilingual resources to work for efficiency and effectiveness. It is also about appreciating multifaceted, emergent and possibly fleeting cultural orientations and resources among interactants.

In terms of language pedagogy, the above multilingual, transcultural turn is likely to necessitate more focus on engaging in actual communication in a multilingual setting and reflecting on language and culture critically. Accordingly, in line with Dewey’s (2012) post-normative approach, teaching practitioners may want to place greater emphasis on promoting learning through use and reflection than teaching and testing prescriptive norms, even if it takes a long-term effort to redesign “the currently used all-purpose, large-scale

---

5 As García (2014: 2) puts it, translanguaging posits the following notion: “bilinguals [or multilinguals] have one linguistic repertoire from which they select features strategically to communicate effectively. That is, translanguaging takes as its starting point the ways in which language is USED by bilingual [or multilingual] people as the norm, and not the abstract language of monolinguals, as described by traditional usage books and grammars”. (emphasis in original)

6 The term linguacultures refers to cultures associated with particular languages/language varieties through the perception of individuals.
‘fit-for-all’ model of assessment” (Leung, Lewkowicz and Jenkins 2016: 69).

5. Conclusion

ELF as a field of enquiry is incompatible with English native-speakerism owing to the untenable assumptions of monolingual competence and associated “correctness” for the global language. Arguably, this field is developing into EMF in transcultural communication, according to which multilingualism is the norm.

It is true that ELF research is steadily taking root in Japan. For example, the latest issue of the *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* (Volume 6, Issue 2) at the time of writing includes four articles written in the Japanese context and/or by Japanese authors, and Murata’s (2016) edited book on ELF has won the Japan Association of College English Teachers (JACET) Academic Publication Award 2017. Notably, ELF was the conference theme of both the 2017 Summer Seminar and annual international convention organised by this association. However, I found the 2017’s last job advertisement on the JACET website requiring candidates for a teaching position to be a “[n]ative-speaker of English” (U University, 26 December 2017). Unfortunately, the same old employment practice still prevails in Japan, however ignominious and discriminatory it might be. As a final remark of the present paper, and with hope for the future, I cannot help echoing Jenkins (2015b: 79): Alas, *plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose* [the more things change, the more they stay the same].
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ELF, “English” Language Teaching and Criticality: Assumptions, Tensions and Implications

Nathanael Rudolph and Julie Rudolph

1. Introduction: ELF and ELT

The dynamic and heterogeneous field (Bowles and Cogo 2016; Jenkins 2012) or paradigm (Bayyurt and Akcan 2015) of English as a lingua franca (ELF) is united in its drive to destabilize dominant approaches to language ownership, learning, use and, more recently, instruction, predicated upon the knowledge, skills, behavior and thinking of an idealized “native speaker (NS)” (Jenkins 2015).¹ Scholars positioning themselves and positioned within the field² have increasingly drawn upon diverse conceptual frameworks to apprehend and approach the complexity of identity and interaction. This diversification has led to what Jenkins (2015: 51) characterizes as phases, during which ELF scholarship has increasingly shifted away from modernistic approaches to identity and interaction, such as approaching ELF as a variety and exclusively focusing on “non-native speaker (NNS)” interaction, to viewing it as “a means of communication between people who come from different first language backgrounds” (Jenkins 2012: 486). Scholarship in ELF is experiencing a multilingual turn, as with paradigm shifts in SLA, applied linguistics and English language teaching (ELT) (e.g., May 2014), leading to a third phase Jenkins (2015: 61) calls English as a multilingua franca: “for ELF users, English is only one language among others present or latent in any interaction. Its multilingual nature therefore needs to be given greater theoretical prominence than hitherto – a ‘more multilingual turn in ELF’, perhaps.” Jenkins (2015) and Cogo (2016) note that research into multilingualism in and beyond the field of ELF, though it initially focused on highlighting the use of separate languages or codeswitching, is now exploring and calling for attention to translanguaging, or the notion that “linguistic resources are not separated or treated as distinct systems, they are instead creatively transformed into new linguistic realities” (Cogo 2016: 5). Cogo (2016: 14) asserts that, “[e]ven when on the surface we may be dealing with English only, ELF always relies on multilingual resources and multilingual transformations, which also require a multilingual understanding.” ELF researchers are thus increasingly drawing upon postmodern and poststructural theory to apprehend identity and interaction as dynamic, fluid, sociohistorically situated, and

¹ Throughout the article, we place “native speaker” and “non-native speaker,” and other corresponding terms (e.g., “native English speaker teacher” and “non-native English speaker teacher”), in double quotations, to emphasize how they are problematized within ELF and ELT scholarship.

² When we refer to the “fields” of ELF and English language teaching (ELT), we are conceptualizing them as dynamic, sociohistorically, locally-globally and contextually constructed (Pennycook 2007).
discursively and contextually negotiated (e.g., Cogo 2016; Baird et al. 2014; Galloway 2017; Jenkins 2017).

ELF scholars are also contributing to the field of ELT, and to the destabilization of approaches to language policy, hiring practices, teacher education and classroom practice grounded upon essentialized\(^3\) and idealized nativeness in English. Such work is contributing to the problematization of the monolingual teaching of English, and the exclusivity or primacy of the “E” in ELT. This is part of a call, in and beyond the field of ELF, for trans-/pluri-/multi-lingual-cultural education that both reflects and prepares students for the complexity of Global Englishes, including the use of English as a multilingua franca, and of identity and interaction (Galloway and Rose 2015; Galloway 2017; Jenkins 2015). Originally focused on “informing” ELT (Jenkins 2012) via cultivating “ELF awareness” (e.g., Sifakis and Bayyurt 2015) in teacher education programs (Dewey 2012), ELF scholarship is now directly addressing approaches to the teaching of English (see e.g., Bayyurt and Akcan 2015; Bowles and Cogo 2015; Galloway 2017; Jenkins 2017; Vettorel 2015). Thus, the work of ELF scholars is implicitly and explicitly contributing to a reconceptualization of the bounds of who individuals “are,” and “can” and/or “should” be or become, as owners, learners, users and teachers of English.

2. Destabilizing Assumptions

In their article *The complexity of ELF*, Baird et al. (2014: 172), posit that

> it is important for ELF scholars to acknowledge the necessity of continual theorisation and reflection, particularly regarding the complexity of the subject matter. Only by engaging with wider theory and considering the subject matter of the field can we adequately account for “ELF” as a field of enquiry, a phenomenon, and/or a use of language, while at the same time appreciating the complexity and variability of language and its integrated roles in human communication more generally.

In the spirit of this call, we would like to draw attention to what we assert is a dominant, normalized critical “assumption” (Pennycook 2001: 10) within current ELF scholarship contributing to transforming approaches to language ownership, learning, use and instruction in ELT, relating to the conceptualization and problematization of “standard English

---

\(^3\) We apprehend *essentialization* as the discursive construction (and/or acceptance and promotion) of “borders” relating to language, culture, place, and identity, that seek to define Self-Other, Us-Them, purity-impurity, correctness-incorrectness and valuable-not valuable (Rudolph 2016a; 2016b; Rutherford 1990).
ideologies” and “native speaker ideologies.” This critical assumption, we would argue, involves the notion that the privilege and marginalization language learners, users and instructors experience, corresponds with juxtaposed categories of identity embedded within binaries (e.g., “NS”/“NNS”; “native English speaker teacher” (NEST)/“non-native English speaker teacher” (NNEST)).

Referring to the field of applied linguistics, Pennycook (2001: 9) describes criticality as the questioning, and destabilization, of “assumptions” of any kind:

[Criticality] involves a constant skepticism, a constant questioning of the normative assumptions of applied linguistics. It demands a restive problematization of the givens of applied linguistics and presents a way of doing applied linguistics that seeks to connect it to questions of gender, class, sexuality, race, ethnicity, culture, identity, politics, ideology, and discourse. And crucially, it becomes a dynamic opening up of new questions that emerge from this conjunction.

We contend that the destabilization of this assumption will contribute to enhancing efforts within ELF scholarship towards cultivating equitable, contextualized practice that draws upon and attends to the dynamic complexity of identity and interaction negotiated between individuals from differing backgrounds (e.g., Galloway and Rose 2015; Galloway 2017; Jenkins 2015). Our aim is to prompt ELF scholarship towards conceptual consistency (Rudolph 2016a), not homogeneity, a concern expressed by Baker and Jenkins (2015), when engaged in heated exchanges with O’Regan (2014, 2015), regarding O’Regan’s (2015: 129) contention that ELF scholarship is marked by “theoretical incommensurability and epistemological contradiction.”

In this paper, we begin by providing an overview of the critically-oriented literature attending to identity and experience, and addressing inequity in the field of ELT. This includes the postmodern and poststructural problematization of binary-oriented apprehensions of inequity. Next, we situate approaches to apprehending and addressing inequity in ELF scholarship, within these corresponding conceptual lenses. Finally, we discuss the implications postmodern and poststructural apprehensions of inequity might hold for ELF, in attending to who individuals “are,” and “can” and /or “should” be or become, in and beyond the classroom.

3. Criticality and ELT

The sociohistorical negotiation of privilege and marginalization in ELT is the result of the field’s emergence in and through the British and American colonial agendas of linguistic,
cultural, economic, political, religious, educational and ethnic imperialism (Pennycook 2010). ELT served as a means to privilege colonizers, and produce colonial subjects modeled in their likeness (Kumaravadivelu 2003; Pennycook 2010). ELT was thus founded on binaries of category, including colonizer/colonized and “NS”/“NNS.” Individuals and institutions employed these categories to assign authority and “superiority” to select individuals whose characteristics corresponded with that of the idealized “NS.” Individuals facing the epistemic and actualized violence of colonialism found themselves simultaneously Othered, with their identities juxtaposed against the “NS” (see Kumaravadivelu 2016). A further binary -“NEST”/“NNEST”- appeared as local teachers entered the classroom. The *monolingual principle* (Howatt 1984), or teaching (and learning) of English exclusively, through English, served to Other use of “local” language in the classroom to cultivate learning. These binaries collectively privileged “NESTs,” in a field underpinned by the goal of idealized nativeness.

Chomsky’s (1965) idealized native speaking/hearing member of a homogenous speech community, a linguistic abstraction, became a means to further entrench idealized nativeness in ELT. This abstraction, appropriated and inscribed with essentialized knowledge, experiences, behavior, skills and thinking by influential scholars and practitioners, came to underpin key frameworks for communicative competence in the field. Critical scholarship has generally apprehended this essentialized, idealized “NS” as Caucasian, Western, middle to upper class, urban, male, and monolingual (e.g., Cook 1999; Kubota 1998; Motha 2006). The idealized “NS” thus functioned as a measuring stick by which to assess learner, user and instructor ability and value, while affording continued assignment of the ownership of English, and corresponding authority, to select individuals. The discourses contributing to the construction of the idealized “NS” thus shaped mainstream apprehensions of, and approaches to, theory, research, teacher education, materials creation, instruction, assessment and hiring practices within the field of ELT (Leung 2005).

Global flows of people, technology, goods, information and finances (Appadurai 2000), preceding, characterizing, and following the colonial period, in concert with discourses of neocolonialism and neoliberalism, have contributed to ongoing innovation, in terms of being and becoming around the globe. This includes the ownership, learning, use, instruction and spread of English (Pennycook 2007). New users, varieties, functions and contexts of English, have thus emerged in the dynamic, fluid, discursive interaction of “local” and “global” (e.g., Canagarajah 2007). Such innovation has been accompanied by critical problematizations of idealized nativeness in the field of ELT, and attempts to apprehend and approach the dynamic complexity of identity and interaction. “Criticality” is marked, however, by conceptual diversity, leading to differing conceptualizations of identity, experience, (in)equality, agency and interaction (Yazan and Rudolph 2018). This, in turn, has resulted in divergent, fluidly
critical-practical implications for theory, research, policy, teacher, education, professional activities, materials development and classroom practice.

### 3.1. Critical Approaches to Identity and Experience

One conceptual approach to addressing inequity in the field of ELT juxtaposes the native speakerhood of “NESTs” against the local nativeness and idealized non-nativeness of “NNESTs” (e.g., Medgyes 1992, 1994, 2001), contending that both “NESTs” and “NNESTs” possess strengths and weaknesses, and can therefore complement each other in the profession. “NNESTs” can draw upon their language learning experiences, and their “own/native/first/local” language, which is purported to give them the ability to better connect with students. This lens of what Yazan and Rudolph (2018) term *juxtaposed nativeness*, apprehends identity and experience categorically. The juxtaposed categories of “NS/NEST” and “NNS/NNEST” are left largely undertheorized. Additionally, this scholarship refers both implicitly and explicitly to a “local NNEST,” when discussing local language practice in the classroom, though the consequences of a binary distinction between local/non-local and/or local NNEST/everyone else, are left unaddressed.

A second approach, labeled the *NNEST lens* (Mahboob 2010: 1), problematizes deficit apprehensions of identity. Scholarship situated within this approach draws upon postcolonial, postmodern and poststructural theory and research, aiming to

- explore and account for the dynamic, sociohistorical and contextualized negotiation of trans-/multi/pluri- linguistic and cultural identity and interaction (e.g., Cenoz and Gorter 2013; Higgins 2011; Kubota 2013; Lin 2013);
- reconceptualize language ownership, learning and use, in order to account for movement, diversity and hybridity, and therefore problematize decontextualized ELT (e.g., Canagarajah 2006, 2007; Kramsch 2012, 2014); and
- advocate for cultivation of classroom practice accounting for and drawing upon learners’, users’, and instructors’ negotiations of identity and interaction (e.g., Canagarajah 2013; Creese and Blackledge 2010; May 2014).

The NNEST lens, however, does not do away with categorical apprehensions of identity. Instead, through this lens, the “NNEST” category is exclusively assigned “multilingualism, multiculturalism, and multinationalism” (Mahboob 2010: 15), and is the category of individuals in ELT who experience marginalization, as Aslan and Thompson (2016: 2) contend, “it is NNESTs who are discriminated against in the profession.”

Scholarship employing the NNEST lens draws upon Holliday’s (2005, 2006)
conceptualization of *native speakerism*, or the idealized *NS construct* as an actualized discourse, to account for manifestations and perpetuations of privilege and marginalization. Native speakerism, according to Holliday, is a universalized and largely stable discourse originating in the West, which leads to the personal-professional privileging of “NSs/NESTs” whose identities correspond with the NS construct, and marginalization of the identities and abilities of “NNSs/NNESTs,” in contexts around the globe. Native speakerism is linked to the *NS fallacy* (Phillipson 1992), or the idea that “NS” teachers whose identities align with the idealized NS construct, are assumed to be better, and therefore more desirable, teachers. Through the NNEST lens, therefore, privilege and marginalization are experienced categorically.

Scholars employing the NNEST lens have thus called for critical attention to the “NNEST experience” in globalized ELT, in the interest of cultivating a more equitable ELT profession (e.g., Braine 2010; Kamhi-Stein 2016; Mahboob 2010). This approach to equity, at times including scholarship employing upon the lens of juxtaposed nativeness, has been termed the “NNEST movement” (e.g., Selvi 2014: 576). Such scholarship seeks to imagine teaching beyond the idealized “native English speaker,” which includes contextualizing language teaching, attending to the complexity of interaction, and accounting for and celebrating learners’ and “NNESTs’” identities in the classroom (e.g., Mahboob and Lin 2016). Work employing the NNEST lens thus values “NNESTs’” use of local language in classroom practice. As with the lens of juxtaposed nativeness, the ownership and use of local language is both implicitly and explicitly assigned to “local NNESTs” (e.g., Mahboob and Lin 2016; Tatar and Yildiz 2010).

Additionally, there is an increasing collection of literature referencing postcolonial, postmodern and poststructural theory and research, and yet retaining essentialized, categorical approaches to identity when apprehending and addressing (in)equity in ELT (e.g., Appleby 2016; Lowe & Kiczkowiak 2016; Swan et al. 2015). We locate this scholarship within the scope of the NNEST lens.

Recently, scholars drawing upon postmodern and poststructural work attending to identity and interaction have posed a theoretical and empirical challenge to binary apprehensions of being and becoming. Though first positioned within the critical scholarship of the “NNEST movement” (e.g., Rudolph et al. 2015; Selvi 2014, 2016) this ever-increasing body of theory and inquiry is, in fact, serving to destabilize categorical approaches to conceptualizing and attending to identity, experience and (in)equity. Inquiry has highlighted teachers’ (e.g., Aneja 2016; Houghton and Rivers 2013; Park 2017; Yazan and Rudolph 2018) and learners’ (e.g., Rudolph 2016b, 2017) dynamic, sociohistorical, contextual and discursive negotiations of identity, noting that who individuals “are,” and “can” and/or “should” be or
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become, as owners, learners, users and instructors of English, simultaneously relates to notions of community membership in the context in which the ELT is constructed and situated (Rudolph et al. 2015). Regarding ELT in Japan, for instance, this may result in the professional limitation and elimination of space for individuals whose identities do not correspond with dominant constructions of idealized nativeness in English and idealized Japaneseness (Rivers 2014; Rudolph 2017; Toh 2016) though this does not manifest uniformly in and across contexts (Yazan and Rudolph 2018). Researchers have thus contended that individuals may experience degrees and combinations of fluid privilege-marginalization, in and across “categories” of being, both in and beyond the classroom (e.g., Houghton and Rivers 2013; Park 2017; Rivers 2014; Rudolph 2017; Toh 2016). Likewise, individuals may assert agency to (in often fluid and seemingly contradictory ways) problematize, resist, affirm and perpetuate how they are positioned by others, and how others are positioned, discursively (Rudolph 2018). Through such a lens, the NS fallacy is also apprehended as a dynamic and contextualized construction, and may pertain to idealized nativeness in local language/s, as well as to English (e.g., Rivers 2016). Rudolph (2017: 164) therefore contends that, “apprehending and addressing constructions of ‘nativeness’ in ‘English,’ and manifestations of privilege-marginalization, requires broadening the conceptual scope of criticality beyond ‘moving beyond the idealized NS of English.’”

Critical scholarship underpinned by diverse postmodern and poststructural commitments thus problematizes the categorical apprehension of identity, experience and inequity for a few key reasons. First, the essentialization of identity and experience may strip individuals of voice, in terms of narrating their lived experiences negotiating identity and interaction, and privilege-marginalization. Binary-oriented approaches to identity lump teaching experiences at all levels, in and across contexts, together, stripping the field of ELT of complexity, and potentially hampering critical efforts at addressing contextualized manifestations of inequity. Additionally, the de facto assignment of the ownership and use of local language to “local NNESTs,” results in the reification of the idealized nativeness that binary-oriented critical scholarship is seeking to problematize. Categorical apprehensions of privilege and marginalization may also prompt stakeholders in ELT to avoid attending to their own positionality, and corresponding fluid privilege-marginalization. Lastly, we contend that however well intended, critical, binary-oriented approaches to identity in ELT may be discursively co-opted within communities and societies, to reinforce essentalized and idealized constructions of Self-Other. We therefore assert that “criticality,” as conceptualized via the use of binaries of identity, is inscribed with palpable conceptual tension.

3.2. ELF Approaches to (In)equity in ELT
Within the ELF literature, inequity is, at times, left undertheorized, and treated implicitly and explicitly as the product of “standard English ideologies” and “native speaker ideologies.” This was an observation expressed by Holliday (2009) in a chapter examining identity politics, inequity, and ELF. For a number of prominent researchers whose work touches upon ELF, ELT, and criticality, however, the NNEST lens appears to serve as the conceptual foundation for apprehending and approaching inequity. Sifakis and Bayyurt (2015), for instance, reference Holliday’s (2005: 385) native speakerism, and the corresponding NS fallacy (Phillipson 1992) when discussing the “non-native” teachers in their study struggling with confidence. In problematizing inequity in globalized ELT, Galloway (2017: 21) refers to the “native speaker episteme” underpinning the field, and cites Holliday’s (2005) conceptualization of “native speakerism” as the episteme, actualized. In approaching the issue of addressing inequity in ELT, Dewey (2014: 22) draws upon binary-oriented approaches to experience and inequity:

One very important way language ideologies and notions of prestige operate in ELT can be seen in the relative levels of value ascribed to nests (native English speaking teachers) and nnests (non-native English speaking teachers). Despite nnests comprising the large majority of English language teachers worldwide, in many contexts teachers continue to report experiences of discrimination in current recruitment practices and quite widespread inequity with regard to conditions of employment. nnests’ knowledge, expertise, professionalism and qualifications can become undermined by what has been termed the “myth of the native speaker” and ideologized notions of NES competence.

When interviewed for the TESOL NNEST Interest Section NNEST of the Month Blog (Reis 2011), Jennifer Jenkins re-affirmed her use of Holliday’s conceptualization of native speakerism in her previous work (Jenkins 2007). Prompted by interviewer Davi Reis (2011: online) to answer the question, “What do you think still needs to be done in order to bring about greater equality between NS and NNS in ELT?” Jenkins responded, “This is a very big question. But in my view, if ELF was more widely accepted, non-native English speakers would gain substantially in status — and the opposite for native English speakers.”

The retention of the NNEST lens in scholarship theorizing experience and inequity, we assert, has resulted in subsequent work in the field of ELF wherein the postmodern and poststructural complexity of identity and interaction are found side-by-side references to binary-oriented apprehensions of inequity (e.g., Fang 2016; Li 2016). An additional issue relates to researchers conflating scholarship underpinned by divergent conceptual frameworks
(e.g., work by Holliday 2005 and Houghton and Rivers 2013), leading to further conceptual dissonance (see Yazan and Rudolph 2018). The critically-oriented normalization of the NNEST lens, we would argue, presents ELF researchers with an issue of conceptual incongruity that necessitates addressing.

4. Conclusion and Implications for ELF as/in ELT

ELF scholarship is increasingly prompting the field of ELT to attend to the fluid, dynamic, and contextually negotiated and situated complexity of identity and interaction occurring in and across linguistic, cultural, ethnic, national, political, geographic, religious, academic, professional, and gender-related “borders” of identity. We contend, however, that the retention of binaries militates against complexity, as binaries serve to essentialize identity and lived experience.

Additionally, as ELF scholarship continues to destabilize the “E” in ELT, and the monolingual principle therein, scholars are faced with a dilemma regarding the ownership of local language, translanguaging, and English as a multilingua franca. The NNEST lens, as mentioned above, may result in 1) the implicit and explicit assignment of “local nativeness” to “local NNESTs,” and 2) the assignment of multilingualism to “NNESTs” in general, resulting in reification of the very kinds of binaries ELF seeks to challenge. This may additionally result in the limitation or elimination of space, or the necessity, for learners, users, and teachers to attend to their positionality, in terms of their negotiations of privilege-marginalization, and those of others. As such, we would assert, the discursive power of ELF scholarship to contribute to the problematization of contextualized manifestations of essentialization and idealization is diminished.

In closing, we would like to briefly highlight Baker’s (2015) discussion of critical approaches to challenging essentialized constructions of “culture” in the classroom. Baker (2015: 23) notes that learners and teachers might be “encouraged to both explore and challenge dominant discourses.” For ELT, Baker argues, this includes destabilizing both dominant discourses relating to essentialized and idealized nativeness, as well as that of localized notions of culture and identity (Baker 2015: 23). We believe that taking a like-minded step towards contextually attending to experience and addressing inequity, will aid in bringing increased conceptual congruity to ELF scholarship, therefore enhancing its potential to transform educational discourses in and beyond the field of ELT.
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A Post-EFL Approach to the Administration of English Language Programs

Masaki Oda

1. Introduction

As English language programs at Japanese universities are, at least, gradually shifting from EFL programs to more English as a lingua franca (ELF)-aware programs, the administration of these English language programs also needs to be optimized accordingly.

In the past few years, I have discussed the necessity of the shift from traditional EFL programs, in which the students are expected to attain “native speaker” proficiency, to more ELF-aware programs at Japanese universities (Oda 2015, 2016). In order to organize a multicultural ELF-aware English language program at an institution, there are several areas we need to add to our further research agenda. One such area is administration of a program. Since the early 1980s, program administration in ELT has been dealt with by some scholars in relation to course design (e.g., Dubin and Olshtain 1986), curriculum (e.g., White 1988), professionalism (Farmer 2006) or ELT project management (Kennedy 1988). However, very few, if any, studies directly addressed English language program administration at universities.

Studies on the administration of English language program are essential for organizing multicultural English programs at Japanese universities, yet they are somewhat under-explored in applied linguistics. Therefore, I would argue that outcomes of the studies exclusively on program administration would potentially give us an additional dimension to the management of English language programs at universities, and thus they should be encouraged more.

The primary objective of this paper, therefore, is to encourage ELT professionals to pay more attention to this underrepresented area, particularly in the context of higher education. A good administration is a pre-requisite for successful transition of programs from EFL to more ELF-aware programs, which would be more relevant to the Japanese context. I hope that this short paper would allow readers to identify the problems in administration of English language programs which needs to be further explored in order to establish multicultural ELF-aware programs at Japanese universities.

2. English Language Programs in Japanese universities

With very few exceptions, English has been the most dominant foreign language as a subject in Japanese higher education institutions. Whether it is a big university or a small college, English is taught at most of the institutions and thus it is important for us to pay
attention to how these English programs are administrated within each of them. If we look at universities composed of faculties belonging to different academic disciplines, English programs are typically administrated in one of the following ways.

The first way is that each faculty, for example, humanities, social sciences and/or natural sciences faculties, has a number of English language teaching (ELT) staff. Depending on the size (as well as financial status) of the faculty, they may be full-time tenured staff or a composition of part-time teaching staff. With the exception of faculties in the disciplines such as English or education in which the specialties of those ELT staff are likely to overlap with subjects offered by the faculties, it is difficult particularly for those mid-sized or smaller institutions to hire ELT staff exclusively for the faculty. This issue has become more significant with the decrease of the populations of 18 year-olds, which has resulted in downsizing of some faculties. As a consequence, smaller non-language faculties can no longer afford to maintain positions of full-time English teaching staff.

The second way is to have an English language program as an independent unit within an institution. The status of English language program can be part of a bigger foreign language program or of an even bigger general education program. While this type of the English language program is administratively more flexible for the institution of different sizes, it often creates a gap in coordination between the program and other faculties. It is not unusual in many Japanese universities that, for example, engineering students are required to read classical literature texts in English language classes as part of liberal arts program while the engineering faculty expects the students to have mastered skills such as making presentations in English before taking upper level courses in their majors. In relation to the above example, it should be noted that in some universities such liberal arts programs and/or independent English language programs are not considered as a full academic unit, partly because most of these units do not have students who are registered as their own. As a result, their faculty members are often considered as peripheral members within the institutions. Although the ELT staff does not teach specialized content subjects, it does not mean that they are not qualified to teach in “main-stream” faculties.

As we can see, English has been considered an important subject in many institutions, yet the status of English language programs is not established well. While I do not expect the programs to be controlled as with the cases of secondary schools, we need to realize that the programs should be constantly optimized to meet the needs of the society as the students of the higher education institutions will join the workforce in a society as soon as they graduate.

3. From EFL, WE to ELF, and then

In order to design a university English language program, it is important for us, ELT
professionals, to pay close attention to what we mean by English they teach. As I discussed elsewhere (Oda 2016), the goal of ELT in Japan has been to attain “native speaker” competence. Whether it is realistic or not, teachers have been working hard to help their students achieve the goal without critically questioning the prevailing assumption.

In the discipline of applied linguistics in general, there has been an increased recognition of the varieties of English(es) over the past decades. The paradigm of World Englishes (WE) had already received attention from many scholars in Japan (e.g., Honna 1991), and Chukyo University was the first university to establish a university English language program reflecting the notion of WE. The contribution of the studies in WE has been significant to the ELT professionals in Japan in that it enabled them to realize the multicultural nature of English(es) which many learners in Japan would encounter in daily life (see Honna 2005). As a matter of fact, book chapters dealing with the varieties of English began to appear in several English language textbooks for secondary education. Nevertheless, the discussions on linguistic varieties in the ELT profession have still been referred exclusively to “geographical” varieties such as Englishes in India, Singapore or the Philippines. In addition, WE still presupposes the native speaker (NS) and non-native speaker (NNS) dichotomy which is a major obstacle for managing a multicultural English language program.

The emergence of the notion of ELF in the early 2000s (e.g., Jenkins 2000; Seidlhofer 2011) has given an additional dimension to what the goal for English language programs at Japanese universities should be. Considering the contexts in which students are likely to use English for communication, setting the attainment of a particular variety as the goal of an English language program is not practical. Instead, ELF, defined as “any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice” (Seidlhofer 2011: 7), reflects the communicative needs of many Japanese university students.

ELF, as defined by Seidlhofer (2011) above, has led us to identify the potential goal of English language programs at Japanese universities. However, we should continue to move further to optimize the programs to the specific needs of our students while taking various institutional constraints into account. As discussed above, many universities are downsizing their faculties, and foreign language programs are hit hard in particular. Many smaller universities now have to give up offering foreign language programs other than English due to low enrollment and difficulties in recruiting qualified teachers. Therefore, we may need to carefully design an English language program to make sure that teaching about ELF would never discourage our students to make a commitment to learn other foreign languages. Instead, it is important for the institution to make their English program as opportunities for their students to be exposed to different varieties of English, and thus developing a multicultural
nature of English program can be a possible solution.

4. Multicultural English Language Programs for Japanese Universities

In order to establish a multicultural English language program in a Japanese university, the first thing the university can do is to create an environment in which the students are constantly exposed to different varieties of English. A possible strategy is to hire English teachers from a variety of linguistic backgrounds. More specifically, a teacher’s first language should not be used as a qualification for hiring, though language is not the only variable which characterizes diversity of the teachers’ backgrounds. By eliminating “native-language” requirement from hiring criteria, the students will be exposed to the qualified “ELF teachers,” who will be able to effectively train the students to be ready to interact in an ELF environment with the different types of interlocutors as they are likely to be exposed to in their daily lives, until they complete the program. However, this does not mean that the institution simply needs to provide the students with the teachers with different linguistic backgrounds. Instead, the priority is to place the students in an environment in which they need to use English to interact with interlocutors from different culture as well as individual backgrounds.

This kind of multicultural English language program is an ideal example for Japanese universities, and the Center for English as a Lingua Franca (CELF) at my institution (Tamagawa University) has been following such hiring practice of teachers since its foundation in 2014. In terms of the instructional program it provides, we are able to reflect and further improve the program by taking advantage of numerous applied linguistics studies. However, we now realize that there are very few, if any, studies on administration of an ELT program available in applied linguistics. While the studies in this area do not appear to be related to the learning of English, no program would be successful without a good management of teaching and administrative staff. Therefore, we needed to constantly reflect on our experience in managing a program as a multicultural organization and gradually accumulate our experience to support the multicultural team of English teaching and staff.

What is, then, the primary concern of administrators who manage multicultural English language programs at Japanese universities? In “EFL” programs, teachers are typically divided into two groups: native English speaking teachers (NESTs) and Japanese teachers of English (JTEs), regardless of the fact that the two groups are not necessarily mutually exclusive. The distinction is still intact in many aspects with a strong prevailing assumption that NESTs refer to those from “Inner Circle” countries (cf. Kachru 1992). In multicultural English programs, on the other hand, the administrators have to take into account that it is impossible to group teachers based on first language and/or where each one is from.

Very often, administrators are preoccupied with the traditional meaningless dichotomy
between NEST and JTE, or a slightly more reasonable, yet soon-to-be out-of-date dichotomy between NEST and non-native English speaking teacher (NNEST) when they plan to deal with various communication problems in the program. The priority for administrators is, therefore, to get rid of such pre-occupations. In order to build up a solid multicultural English program in which collaborations among teachers with a variety of experiences and cultural backgrounds, however, I would suggest that the administrators should not expect any model to follow. Instead, they should continuously be building up their experience and optimize them to the program step by step.

As Bayyurt and Sifakis (2017: 8) discuss in the context of ELF-aware teacher education, the most effective way to change teachers’ perspectives is to follow the three phases: 1) exposure, 2) critical awareness, and 3) action plan. This can also be applied to the administrators involved in the implementation of ELF-aware programs. As a team of multicultural English teachers is now considered as the de facto norm at CELF in Tamagawa University, teachers, students as well as administrators (the director and the administrative staff) are constantly exposed to a dynamic ELF environment. Therefore, we need to consider how we should proceed to the second and third phases of the implementation of ELF-aware programs.

5. Conclusion: Suggestions for Further Research

As I have discussed in earlier sections, program administration plays an important role in sustaining multicultural English language programs at Japanese universities. Even though an institution may have established a well-prepared program with sufficient human and material resources, and successfully provides the students an optimal ELF-aware learning environment, the institution needs to continuously reflect on how the program is run in order to critically review various aspects of the program for further improvements (e.g., Farrell 2015). In this respect, it is apparent that the role of administrator is crucial.

Deutsch’s (2006) discussion on conflict management gives us an important framework for managing organizations including English program administrative units, especially when we need to deal with various types of conflicts. He argues that a conflict can be resolved not by competition, but by cooperation between the parties involved, and the latter would give the parties a win-win relationship. Therefore, the parties should follow Deutsch’s (2006: 35) suggestions summarized below:

1) To place the disagreement in perspective by identifying common ground and common interests.
2) To address the issues, no personal attacks.
3) To seek to understand the other’s view from his/her perspective.
4) To emphasize the positive in the other and the possibility of constructive resolution of the conflict.
5) To be responsive to the other’s legitimate needs.
6) To empower the other to contribute effectively to the cooperative effort; solicit the other’s views, listen responsively, share information.

While there is no ultimate strategy for conflict resolution, these suggestions would certainly help administrators optimize their programs.

Everyone would agree that it is important for us to accumulate examples of similar types of English language programs from other institutions in order to design their own programs. One way of achieving it is to accumulate narratives of administrators as well as those of teachers and students and find out how multicultural English language programs are administrated. More researchers have paid attention to the value of narrative studies recently and a number of book-length volumes on multicultural organization (e.g., Ishiguro 2012), and anthologies on language teacher identity (e.g., Barkhuizen 2017) have been published. While no one have yet suggest an optimal solution for each program, these narrative studies provide the administrators important clues for planning how to proceed to the next phase of making their own multicultural English language programs more meaningful to their learners. The more experience we have with an English language program involving multicultural staff, the more resource becomes available. We will be able to accumulate enough information to draw clear guidelines for how to make the best out of the groups of multicultural teachers. This is certainly a pre-requisite of a program which provides its students with an optimal ELF-aware learning environment in Japanese higher education.
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Part II

Short Reports on ELF-Related Events
Shorts Reports on Five ELF-Related Events in the Academic Year of 2017

This section introduces the following five ELF-related events held in the academic year of 2017:

2. JACET 44th Summer Seminar Announcement (August 26th and 27th, 2017)

The reports were originally circulated through the English as a Lingua Franca Research Network (ELF ReN) member’s’ network.

1. JACET ELF-SIG Special Symposium (by Leah Gilner)

The first JACET ELF-SIG event for the academic year 2017 was held at Waseda University on April 29th. The large number of participants can be seen as reflecting the ever-increasing interest that ELF has sparked among researchers and educationalists in Japan. The SIG has grown to over 60 members since being established in April 2016.

The theme of the symposium, organized and chaired by Prof. Patrick Ng (University of Niigata Prefecture), was “English as a Lingua Franca and Native-speakerism in ELT”. Four speakers discussed issues related to pedagogy from diverse and informative perspectives.

Prof. Masaki Oda (Tamagawa University) shared his experiences as an applied linguist and administrator. He enumerated some of the challenges that he has faced in trying to encourage a ‘post-EFL’ approach to program management. The need for patience and perseverance when confronting long-held beliefs and well-entrenched approaches was evident. Prof. Oda suggested that a respectful and subtle disposition was a central component to negotiating change at the administrative level.

Dr. Gregory Paul Glasgow (Rikkyo University) highlighted some of the complex and systemic repercussions of a native-speaker ideology. Dr. Glasgow observed that native-speakerism tends to trivialize and call into question the professional competencies of teachers by essentially reducing individuals’ experiences and expertise to a vague and ill-defined notion of ‘nativeness’. It was proposed that such practices impede collaborative equilibrium. Ideological influences were cited at various levels of the educational system ranging from government documents to curriculum planning to hiring practices.
Dr. Tomokazu Ishikawa (Waseda University) and Dr. Nathanael Rudolph (Mukogawa Women’s University) each addressed raising student awareness of the institutionalized, societal, and personal ideologies that shape views toward language. Dr. Ishikawa pointed out that in Japan English is still largely perceived and associated with geographically-bounded Inner Circle varieties. These doxic beliefs, it was observed, develop throughout one’s lifetime as individuals are inculcated into society. Data from interviews with Japanese university students suggested that raising awareness of the reality of English as lingua franca can have an impacting, and perhaps liberating, effect.

Dr. Rudolph described his approach to promoting student development through reflective activities that encourage students to consider internal and external tensions which shape identity construction. Potential benefits of contemplating the local and global forces influencing the ways in which we categorize and essentialize lived experiences, ourselves, and others were proffered.

All in all, the presentations and subsequent discussion suggest that a shift toward a multicultural, plurilingual approach to language pedagogy in Japan is likely to be a gradual one, seeded by individual teachers in the classroom and cultivated by students’ personal trajectories.

2. **JACET 44th Summer Seminar**

**Theme:** English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) in the globalized world: research and implications for practice

**Venue:** Waseda University (Main Conference Room, 4th floor, Bldg.11 Waseda Campus); 1-6-1 Nishi-Waseda, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 169-8050

**Invited speakers & Lecture titles:**

Dr. Barbara Seidlhofer (Univ. Prof. of University of Vienna, Austria)
- Lecture 1 Taking stock: English and globalization: the challenge of change
- Lecture 4 Looking ahead: prospects for the study of English as a lingua franca

Dr. Henry Widdowson (Hon. Prof. of University of Vienna, Austria)
- Lecture 2 What does the E in TESOL stand for?
- Lecture 5 Lingua franca and lingual capability: the pedagogic implications of ELF

Dr. Kumiko Murata (Prof. of Waseda University)
Lecture 3 The realities of the use of English in the globalised world and the teaching of English: a discrepancy?

For more details, please visit: http://www.jacet.org/news/summer-seminar/2017-2/
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