2022 年 9 月期
関西大学審査学位論文

Exhuming Ghosts: A Critical Consideration of Linguistic Hegemony and Native-Speakerism in Japanese English Education

Peter Joun

Faculty of Letters, Kansai University, Osaka, Japan

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of English Linguistics

September, 2022

Abstract

This dissertation explores issues of educational policy and hegemony in Japanese English education from a sociohistorical and critical pedagogic perspective. The findings indicate that the key historical event in this context was the occupation of Japan by US forces in the wake of World War II from 1945 until 1952. Within those seven years, the United States government initiated a massive program of social engineering through which "the Americans were presented as the model human beings, and the Japanese were taught and encouraged to become like them" (Kitahara, p. 23), in order to "'effect changes in certain ideologies and ways of thinking of the individual Japanese' by using 'all possible media and channels'" (Tsuchiya, 2002, p. 194), so that ultimately a situation would be created wherein "Japan clearly acts as the junior partner in the US-Japan relationship…and almost always accommodates the United States on issues of central importance" (Nye, 1993, p. 2). Direction emanated from a document prepared by John D. Rockefeller III created specifically for American interests in Japan titled "United States-Japanese Cultural Relations," which emphasized that an extensive English language teaching program was to be included in the effort to achieve "the most elusive of human acts- changing someone else's mind" (Dizard, 2004, pp. 1-3, p. 5, p. 22). Playing a key role in this process, as a consequence English education in Japan supports elite interests in a pro-US capitalistic economic system, wherein (1) standardized English testing determines the content of secondary instruction and, (2) white English instructors from western countries receive and exercise privileged status, which has enabled a west-centric teaching approach known as native-speakerism to take hold. Interviews with university instructors and students considered together with results from surveys issued to university students indicate that these two factors are problematic regarding student motivation as well as the overall English classroom learning environment, and need to be addressed if there are to be improvements in Japan's English education system.

Acknowledgements

This project has been a collaborative affair involving the efforts of family, friends, academic acquaintances, as well as fellow musicians and table tennis players in Tokyo.

I would particularly like to thank my advisor Dr. Fred Anderson for guiding me through and being patient with me.

Chris Banister for helping to edit this paper and Dr. Graham Crookes, the external examiner. Professors Nabeshima and Iwata for their work on my doctoral committee.

The participants for being so courageous and committed, and giving so generously of their time, energy, and insight.

Moon-ki Chai, without whose assistance I would not have been able to enroll in the Kandai doctorate program.

My sister Julia and my mother, for their tireless concern and support.

In memory of my father, whose spirit unites those both south and north of the border.

The shore break at Sandy beach, and waterfalls in Okutama.

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 Impetus for the research

The impetus for this study comes from a number of Japanese students and people confiding their dissatisfaction over the years to me (I've taught in Japan for over a decade and a half) with English education in Japan. Initially I supported the narrative that the students themselves were mainly at fault for their lack of diligence and application, which was the default position of many of the other foreign instructors who I worked with. Later I became aware that Japanese English teachers in secondary education focused mainly on grammar and reading in order to prepare students for standardized exams, and added this to the list of why Japanese learners were not able to develop communicative fluency.

From this way of viewing things, foreign instructors were providing opportunities to practice and develop 'real' English, while the Japanese side found ways to let them slip through their fingers, owing perhaps to some deep-seated fears and anxieties rooted in a collective mass psychosis (Rivers, 2018b). The turning point in my perspective came when it dawned on me that the majority of the learners I was simultaneously teaching in language schools, high schools, and company classes were mainly at the beginner level in terms of their communicative ability, and therefore lacked the basic fundamentals to adequately follow what foreign instructors were saying, as for the most part we were instructed to adhere to an 'English-only' policy. In order to keep the 'English-only' policy, instructors often had to model what they wanted students to do, which under ideal circumstances worked fine with simple repetition exercises, but lacked depth and variation. In less than ideal situations, the modeling failed to register with one or two students, which could lead to a chain reaction of confusion resulting in an inordinate amount of effort and time being spent on explaining the

directions to the lesson's activities; as foreign instructors were constrained to only using English, one might even be driven to resort to utilizing gestures in an improvised desperate ode to the parlor game known as charades in order to get the point across.

Owing to this, I decided to go 'rogue,' and began experimenting with using some Japanese language to expedite student comprehension of the lesson's directions and key words. When I began to do so, I noticed an immediate transformation in the students' demeanor and level of initiative. Knowing what was being asked of them in real time (rather than the delayed time of having to guess at the instructors' modeling or wait for a fellow learner who was more proficient in English to relay the instructor's intent) meant all the students could act in unison and start the lesson's activities immediately. As I explored the use of Japanese in the class further, I found it was extremely useful in establishing rapport, lessening student anxiety, encouraging engagement, confirming comprehension, and resolving misunderstanding- in short, it greatly aided in transforming the personage of a foreign, incomprehensible authoritative alien intruder into an approachable, relatable presence in the classroom (see also Masutani, 2021).

Admitting the student's native language (L1) into the lesson appeared to act as a conduit to the Japanese learners' deeper sense of self, and seemed to allow the students to act and express themselves more freely, resulting in a higher level of engagement (Auerbach, 1993; Berger, 2011; Cotsworth & Medlock, 2013; Masutani, 2021). Witnessing the dramatic transformative effect of this led me to question why 'English-only' was adhered to so strictly as a rule for foreign instructors, where this idea had come from, and how it had become established. Owing to this, I began to investigate how historical and political events may have influenced the formation of English language education policies in Japan.

1.2 Overview

The questions guiding this dissertation are as follows:

1. What are the specific actions, policies, and agendas which served to install and consolidate the hegemony of American English in Japan?
2. How are Japanese students affected by native-speakerism?
3. How clearly are political agendas related to English language education in Japan?
4. What possible solutions are there to help improve English language education in Japan?

This thesis consists of 10 chapters. Concerning the remainder of the present chapter, I will first clarify the purpose of this dissertation, provide the historical background of English in Japan, and state the problem which this thesis seeks to address along with its attendant questions. The chapter will continue with a consideration of conventional western English language teaching (ELT) methods and Japan's level of English proficiency, then will proceed to a brief discussion of the business and political aspects of Japan's English education system, before concluding with a personal narrative.

In Chapter 2, the lens of critical theory and critical pedagogy which this thesis utilizes to investigate its topics will be clarified, leading to a delineation of how a critical view of language and power necessitates historical awareness. I will then utilize source materials to illustrate that although critical pedagogy is not unknown in Japan and throughout East Asia, it is still in its incipient stages. Considering English education in Japan through the lens of critical theory will be covered next, and is followed by a comparative critical look at English education in South Korea.

Chapter 3 will begin by exploring the proposal that the English language has been used as a tool for imperialist expansion, and then considers some counter arguments. Following on from this, evidence will be presented that seems to point to a conscious attempt by the US to utilize the English language as part of its massive campaign to influence public opinion in post-war Japan through an approach to foreign policy known as 'soft power.' To support the viability of this supposition, after defining the concept of soft power, I will provide documented facts related to the history of soft power in the US as well as statements of the US' employment of soft power strategies in Japan.

At the start of chapter 4 I will track the US' rise to prominence from the late 19th century among the world's nations as the most powerful geopolitical entity. By doing so it will be revealed who some of the main actors were, along with their motives and manner of thinking, how they viewed other countries and races in the first half of the 20th century, what the essence of American power consists of, and how they identified Anglo English-speaking people as destined to rule the world. Prominent among the powerful Americans was the oil magnate John D. Rockefeller, whose grandson would play a major role in promulgating American English in post-war Japan. After introducing his background information I will discuss how John D. Rockefeller created the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) philanthropy as a way for Rockefeller to simultaneously consolidate his power along with the US government and other American elites in the domestic arena by developing projects such as eugenics, public relations/psychological warfare, and standardized testing, while also developing US interests abroad through funding academic groups that advocated for war and establishing a medical college in China that stipulated that all instruction was to be conducted only in English. In the latter half of chapter 4 I will relate how Rockefeller's grandson worked closely with US officials to apply what they had learned in the first half of the 20th century to post-war Japan, and were thereby able to deeply socially engineer Japan, with the

promulgation of American English taking a leading role. I will also provide evidence which points to a eugenics-derived rationale which justified this in the minds of US administrators, and relate how this post-war environment has resulted in the bureaucratic enshrinement of native speaker norms as the goal of the Japanese government's English language curriculum.

Chapter 5 will discuss the shortcomings of Japan's English education system. I will begin this chapter by reviewing the salient points of chapter 4, and then will relate how Japan's English education system prioritizes profit, which thereby benefits the privileged class, who are more comfortably able to afford the costs involved in a capitalist-oriented model of education. After this I will initiate an involved look at the phenomenon known as 'native-speakerism' (the concept that a 'native speaker' personifies not only the English language, but also a superior Western teaching approach), and examine the evidence which supports and refutes the notion that native-speakerism has taken root in Japan due to measures which were initiated by outside actors. The chapter will continue with a consideration of accusations that native-speakerism has propagated grave levels of discrimination against native speaker English instructors and includes an anecdotal telling of my own experience. I will then present the findings of scholars who argue for the need of cross-cultural understanding in the classroom, as the lack of attention to the specific nuances of a Japanese learner's sociohistorical cultural identity may result in misunderstandings or even a breakdown of classroom relations.

In chapter 6 I describe an interview study I conducted with both tertiary level English language instructors as well as university students. The purpose of these interviews was to gather data on how university English language instructors and students view the state of English language education in Japan. I will introduce the methodology and research design which I utilized for my interviews with university instructors and students. I will also discuss the approach which I decided upon for data analysis and transcription. Although it is more

common for interviews to be conducted face-to-face, I opted to conduct them online. The rationale for doing so will be explained, as will the other choices which I made regarding methodology and research design.

Chapter 7 presents narratives based on the interviews discussed in Chapter 6 for the five university instructor participants, and is followed by the narratives themselves. The four major themes which emerged from the instructor participant narratives will be presented next. These themes are as follows: (1) The negative impact of standardized testing (2) The importance of L1 in the classroom (3) The impact of western instructors' privileged position (4) The role of school administration in setting and adhering to non-progressive policies.

In a similar manner, Chapter 8 will present narratives based on the Chapter 6 interviews for the five student participants. The five major themes which emerged from the instructor participant narratives will be presented next. These themes are as follows: (1) The lack of motivation to study English from junior high school (2) A preference for non-native foreign English speaking teachers (3) The necessity of private paid instruction in order to compete (4) The negative impact of a native-speakerist approach in the classroom regarding language usage (5) The desire for a basic change to Japan's English education system.

At the beginning of chapter 9 I will explain why I decided to administer questionnaire surveys to college and university students. The methodology which I employed will be described next, and will be followed by a description of the data which these surveys produced, including a table to aid clarification. I will then present the findings of the questionnaire surveys, which converged upon four themes: (1) L1 related (2) TOEIC-related (3) Content-related (4) Instructor-related. After relating the details of these four themes, I will conclude chapter 9 by discussing how the questionnaire survey results corroborate relevant issues brought up in chapters 7 and 8 by the university student and instructor participants.

In chapter 10 I will make recommendations for the field of teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and conclude this investigation. Chapter 10 will begin by presenting the perspective that invokes the need to recognize that EFL is still permeated and biased by native speaker norms, and therefore requires an approach which takes into greater account the learner's sociohistorical background and recognizes the fact that the majority of the world's English speakers are from non-western countries. After this I will present the argument that the pedagogical ideology known as English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) addresses these concerns, and represents a progressive approach to teaching the English language that has the potential to enable non-western, non-native English speakers to develop ownership of the English language. Chapter 10 will continue with an evaluation of the current state of ELF in Japan, progress to a comparison to ELF in Europe, before ending with some concluding remarks as well as additional data from relevant literature in chapter 11.

1.3 Purpose

This project is an inquiry into how the current English education system in Japan came into being, and how it affects both expatriate instructors and students. As with my previous study on South Korea (Joun, 2015), I am also interested to see what structures are in place to either help or hinder the adoption of critically reflective teaching approaches, and am also concerned with how greatly the US hegemony and neoliberal globalist policies which it supports influences the learning environment within which Japanese students compete to acquire a measurable level of proficiency in English. The goal again is to gain more insight into what actions or approaches could be employed to help students improve their English fluency when engaged in the classroom with expatriate English instructors, so that rather than attempting to coerce students into pursuing the unrealistic goal of speaking like a native speaker, instructors would encourage Japanese students to customize their English into a

user-friendly multinational tool comfortably situated within a learning environment securely within the students' own cultural matrix, outside of the specter of an externally-imposed hegemony.

I refer to the fact that it was through the study of critical reflection in my MA adult education studies at St. Francis Xavier University in Canada that I became conscious of the hegemonic structures which exist throughout social systems and guide the neoliberal policies of globalist institutions. Becoming aware of the great changes and developments which have been initiated by the efforts of educators such as Paolo Freire and Myles Horton has continued to impress upon me the great possibilities which are inherent within education to effect positive transformations on both a personal and systemic level. As one of the objectives of this project was to see if there are any similarities between how English behaves and affects people in South Korea vs Japan, the same view of critical theory as well as the same design for methodology and data analysis which were utilized for my MA are also employed here. This thesis seeks to shed light on what forces were significant agents in shaping the current state of English education in Japan (in particular those forces which enabled American English to become accepted as the standard version of English in Japan), and the resultant effects these forces have had on the Japanese English education system. Analyzing the forces which have impacted Japanese English education necessitates some familiarity with the history of English education in Japan.

1.4 Historical background

After over two hundred years of self-imposed isolation, Japan was given a rude awakening when the US utilized gunboat diplomacy to impose trade negotiations on Japan via the Perry Expedition of 1863 and 1864 (Beasely, 2002). Owing to the perception that it was necessary to create a workforce that was familiar with western technology and thought in

order to avoid being colonized, in the Meiji era (1868-1912) Japanese government policy dictated that educational institutions were to be created for this purpose, with the five imperial universities (Tokyo, Kyoto, Hokkaido, Tohoku, and Kyushu) set up to produce bureaucrats and government officials, as well as the elite educators whose task it was to train teachers who would then disseminate information to the general population through lower-tier schools (Poole, 2010). In addition to modernizing Japan in a manner which was influenced by western conventions, these two tracks of education served to preserve and fortify the existing hierarchy. This objective was enforced through the declaration that primary education was to be compulsory and the establishment of middle schools across the country, with the result that by 1905 it could be said that most young Japanese citizens had received at least five years of schooling (Inagaki, 2007; Goodman, 2009).

As the focus was on western subjects, foreign experts were brought in to teach at the imperial universities, and classes there were conducted in the mother tongue of these instructors. Western civilization was considered to be superior, which was reflected in the fact that in 1885 the Minister of Education (Arinori Mori) lobbied for English to replace Japanese as Japan's national language (Ota, 1994). Such sentiments led to a backlash amongst those who felt the Japanese language and culture (along with the Japanese people's sense of identity and well-being) were being compromised (Ike, 1995), with the result that in 1883 Japanese became the official language of instruction at the University of Tokyo (with the other imperial universities following suit), which in turn led to a rapid decline in the overall English communicative proficiency of the educated elite, as foreign instructors were replaced with Japanese teachers. The renowned novelist Natsume Soseki (1867-1916), who studied in England and was employed as an instructor at the University of Tokyo (replacing the renowned British Japanologist Lafcadio Hearn), was amongst those who criticized

Japan's aping of Western culture, and called on Japanese literature to "defy rampant Westernization and defend Japan's native character" (McClellan, 1959; Hoffman, 2011).

Reading comprehension of English remained extremely high, however, as foreign textbooks were still widely used in the curriculum (Ota, 1994), a state of affairs which persisted until 1911, when the Ministry of Education decided to replace foreign textbooks with Japanese publications (Ike, 1995). This led to a great debate being held on whether or not English should be kept on as a compulsory subject, and led to the conclusion that the study of English was useful as an aid to broaden one's worldview, stimulate the intellect, allowed for a better comprehension of the Japanese language, and also was a means through which to cultivate a deeper appreciation for Japanese culture. A grammar-translation method known as *yakudoku* (Hino, 1992) was employed in the Meiji era by Japanese English teachers. *Yakudoku* is not merely a pedagogic technique but has been identified as forming the very basis for the Japanese conception of language, as it was first introduced over a thousand years ago to interpret and translate the Chinese language, and still exerts a tremendous influence over the pedagogy utilized by both Japanese English instructors as well as Japanese instructors of Japanese, owing to fact that the reading of classical Chinese is a mandatory component of the senior high school curriculum in Japan (Hino, 2012; Chang, Grafton, & Most, 2021).

Therefore, from the initial impetus to study it as a practical communicative tool through which one became immersed in a course of western subject matter, English became transformed over the years into a liberal arts course which would enable Japanese people to better appreciate their own sociohistorical background, as well as provide intellectual subject material through which to screen students' entry into secondary and higher education (Ota, 1994; Ike, 1995; Kitao & Kitao, 1995). According to Ike (1995), this is the primary reason why in the post-war era the objective of Japanese English education was not to produce

proficient speakers, but rather to encourage intellectual development along with a deeper comprehension and appreciation for Japanese language and culture via awareness of linguistic and cultural differences, an attitude which has been identified as contributing to the formation of the concept of *Nihonjinron*, the outlook which states that Japanese people are distinctly unique from other people (Turnbull, 2017). Regarding the style of English which was to become prevalent during the postwar era, it is important to note here that the American Occupation (1945-1952) authorities determined that the form of English to be taught in Japanese schools was to be changed from British English to American English (Wray, 2000; Erikawa, 2002). This action is significant in light of the importance of the role that US power brokers and authorities have linked to American English in their foreign policy for East Asia since the early 20th century, which will be described in Chapters 3 and 4. It also foreshadowed the intensive effort the US put forth in the postwar era to encourage the spread of American English throughout Japan as part of a soft power approach to establishing hegemony, which will also be delineated in Chapters 3 and 4.

1.5 Statement of the problem

In the forty years since Koike (1978, iv-v) described English education in Japan as deficient in developing English proficiency amongst Japanese people, the popular sentiment that on the whole the Japanese are still doing poorly (Tsuboya-Newell, 2017; Newman, 2020) has the support of testing data (Fujiwara, 2018) as well observations of academics (Stanlaw, 2004, p. 276; Seargeant, 2009; Morita, 2017; Tsuneyoshi, 2017), with an official of a Swiss-based international language education organization which measures global English proficiency venturing that, “The gap between Japan and other countries is growing relatively wider” (Fujiwara, 2018). This appraisal is also reflected in the observation that Japan’s English skill

level has fallen "below the world average" and was placed "in the 'low' category, which is the second-to-bottom group, alongside Russia, Vietnam and Iran" (Japan Times, Nov. 9, 2019). Data gleaned from the TOEFL exam in 2019 shows that out of twenty-two Asian countries Japan ranked 19th with a score of 72 out of 100, which was only better than Tajikistan and Laos (https://e-dokumen.id/dokumen/86d_toefl-ibt-test-and-score-data-summary-2019.html).

Despite the Ministry of Education (incorporated into The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, or MEXT) declaring in 2014 that all English classes at the upper secondary level were to be conducted in English in order to foster English communication skills (MEXT, 2014), these measures have "mostly failed" (Jones, 2019; see also Kikuchi & Browne, 2009; Goto Butler, 2015). Researchers have come up with a litany of explanations for Japan's apparent low level of oral communicative competence in English. Perhaps the most cited culprit is Japan's reliance on the university entrance exam-obsessed *yakudoku* grammar-translation method for secondary school education (Kubota, 2011b; Horiguchi, Imoto & Poole, 2015; Rosenkjar, 2015; Mock, Kawamuara, & Naganuma, 2016), with others citing the Japanese people's relatively high level of social anxiety affecting their ability to speak in front of others (Matsuoka, 2015). Regarding language testing, Kubota (2011b) links its extensive implementation with the heavy influence that linguistic instrumentalism has had on Japan's English language policies, as well as with proliferating the language teaching and testing industry in Japan, noting that in-depth interviews with company workers and managers do not confirm the value of linguistic instrumentalism for career success, and rather suggests that its main role is increasing the demand to learn English. Additional analyses state that the Ministry of Education in Japan is inclined to emphasize

English as a means to increase Japan's economic/political stature in the world (thereby framing it as essentially an elite technical business or diplomatic tool) while simultaneously boosting its citizens' sense of exclusive national identity, rather than wholeheartedly encouraging English communicative competence as a basic skill useful for promoting understanding between Japanese and western as well as non-western people from diverse backgrounds, one which has the potential to promote critical consciousness and social transformation (Kubota, 1998; Kubota, 2011b; Seargeant, 2009; Toh, 2016; Kubota, 2017). MEXT's policies regarding English language education have been characterized as nearly always politically and/or economically motivated, heatedly debated and mostly ineffective (Butler & Iino, 2005; Kikuchi & Browne, 2009; Tahira, 2012; Goto Butler, 2015). It has also been noted that American English occupies a hegemonic position within the English-language environment of Japan (Konakahara & Tsuchiya, 2020), and my initial investigation into how this occurred implied striking similarities to how American English became hegemonic in South Korea (Joun, 2015).

1.6 Conventional Western ELT Methods and Japan's English proficiency

As noted above Japan's low level of English proficiency is in direct contrast to the exorbitant amounts of time and money which are allocated to its study. Further, there are indications that students harbor a deep resentment towards its enforced study (Reesor, 2003; Whitsed & Wright, 2013; Japan Times, 2015). Part of the problem may be due to the fact that English as a Foreign Language (EFL) methodology often is perceived as ignoring context (Burden, 2000; Bax, 2003; Burden, 2004; Kubota & Lin, 2009; O'hara-Davies, 2011; Fallon & Weyand, 2015) due to its active enforcement of western hegemonic power relationships (Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1998; Burden, 2000; Miyagi, Sato & Crump, 2009), and a

general lack of critical analysis of the situation on the part of instructors (Bax, 2003; Kubota & Lin, 2009; O'hara-Davies, 2011). Kubota (1998, 2017) has been especially explicit in detailing how western hegemony is manifested in the Japanese educational environment, which may play a major role in a class taught by a westerner if the instructor is unaware how at odds western approaches to language acquisition are with those of their Japanese students (Hino, 2012, p. 160). The resultant power structures and attitudes enabled by the EFL industry have been described as being very much driven by western governments' foreign policy to enforce western hegemony throughout the globe (Phillipson, 1992; Canagarajah, 1999; Erling & Seargeant, 2013), as part of Churchill's prophecy that "the empires of the future are the empires of the mind" (Pennycook, 1994, pp. 130-1).

Canagarajah (1999) noted how a lack of multiple perspectives has impacted the EFL classroom, stating that:

> a debilitating monolingual/monocultural bias has revealed itself in the insistence on 'standard English' as the norm, the refusal to grant an active role to the students' first language in the learning and acquisition of English, the marginalization of 'non-native' English teachers, and the insensitive negativity shown by the pedagogies and discourses towards the indigenous cultural traditions. (p. 3)

It is precisely this attitude which characterizes a teaching approach to English which has been prevalent in Japan amongst western instructors and is referred to in the literature as native-speakerism (Holliday, 2013; Oda, 2017; Ishikawa, 2018), a conception of English instruction in which 'proper' English is often equated with people who are white and from the US, UK, or affiliated commonwealth countries (Holliday, 2013; Kubota, 2019). A fundamental problem

of Japanese English education has been identified by Hino (2012, 2020) as the gap which exists between indigenous Japanese values and the Anglo-American cultures brought in by both western instructors as well as English Language Teaching (ELT) materials. In Japan, American English is more often than not accepted as the 'standard' (Honna, 2009; Hino, 2018). Why this should be so is a primary focus of this study.

1.7 The Business and Politics of Teaching English in Japan

Teaching English in Japan is big business (Reesor, 2003; Hagerman, 2009; King, 2013; Muramoto, 2015) as an outgrowth of the Japanese government's policy of *kokusaika* (internationalization) which dictates that Japanese students receive compulsory English education from elementary school (Sawa, 2020). The fact that English has been made a core component of the university entrance exam (Reesor, 2003; Ikegashira, et al., 2009) along with the reality that Japanese companies emphasize the importance of obtaining good marks on standardized English exams as part of their evaluation of current and potential employees (Chapman, 2003; Rudolph, 2013) ensures that demand for English instruction remains high and that Japan (site of the 2020 Olympics) remains a primary target destination for foreigners hoping to live abroad while making a living teaching English. English proficiency in Japan "has become a very expensive commodity" (Goto Butler, 2015, p. 305). In 2019 the size of foreign language market was estimated to be worth 872.6 billion yen (Yano Research Institute, 2019), which is roughly $7.8 billion. However, despite the prominent position given to the study of English in Japan, the results as reflected in Japanese learners' English proficiency (King, 2013; Aoki, 2016; Aoki, 2017) has been less than stellar, giving rise to a number of questions as to why such a "wealthy, well-educated country that invests so much

time and money in English education is compared so unfavorably in standardized tests?" (Hagerman, p. 55).

Some observers argue that standardized exams such as the widely disseminated EIKEN and TOEIC (administered by the US-based ETS organization) are themselves problematic (Chapman, 2003; Hagerman, 2009), with one researcher going so far to overtly declare the TOEIC to be a "scandal" through which private companies have reaped immense financial benefits via the interested parties collectively being "more concerned with benefitting itself than with the English ability of the test-takers" (McCrostie, 2010, p. 1). Further, it has been said there is a fundamental dissatisfaction with English education in Japan (Ikegashira, Matsumoto, & Morita, 2009; Ushioda, 2013; Nuttall, 2019), so much so that "It is no wonder that so many students end up hating the subject" (Torikai, 2020).

The fundamental issues at the heart of Japan's English educational system appear to be systemic, and intimately related to the political environment. A thorough examination of the relevant political background is necessary to understanding the character and shape of Japan's English education system:

> The most basic reality of postwar East Asian order has stayed remarkably fixed and enduring; namely, the American-led system of bilateral security ties with Japan, South Korea, Taiwan and countries to the South. This "hub-and-spoke" security order remains the single most important anchor for regional stability. Around it has grown a complex system of political and economic interdependencies. East Asian countries export goods to America and America exports security to the region. East Asian countries get protection, geopolitical predictability, and access to the American market and the United States gets front-line strategic partners, geopolitical presence

> in the region, and (in recent years) capital to finance its deficits. This liberal hegemonic order has survived the end of the Cold War. (Ikenberry, 2004, p. 353)

It is a well-documented fact that the US maintains unequal power relations with the East Asian 'spokes' which revolve around it. Less investigated, or called into question, is whether truly democratic systems beneficial to the general populace were installed, and how in Japan the lack thereof may have impacted English education.

The weight of US hegemony in Japan was set down in a very unambiguous manner. Japan was bombed with nuclear weapons by the US in armed conflict, occupied by a US military government, and has since been subject to considerable enforced influence down to the present day, both via activities conducted from the continued presence of numerous US military bases, as well as by a government whose administrative staff was initially handpicked and supported by US officials. Exactly how an arguably undemocratic system was installed will be explicated in detail in Chapter 3.

1.8 The Researcher: A Narrative

In this section I will introduce some relevant background information on myself to delineate how my perspective has been informed and shaped. As a Korean-American with more than 20 years of teaching experience abroad (in addition to Japan I taught for four years at South Korean universities), I have seen my share of dedicated and less than stellar expatriate instructors, and am also well-acquainted with the quandary of teaching in trying circumstances. Prior to teaching in South Korea I was employed in Japan for 14 years at various institutions ranging from kindergarten to university, with the majority of my time spent working at public high schools, Japanese companies, and community centers, where members of local neighborhoods would congregate for lessons. It is after obtaining an MA

that I returned to Japan and started teaching at the tertiary level. Being both Asian and western at the same time has allowed me to consider both the perspective of expatriate instructors as well as that of the students and administration. The following narrative therefore allows me to share elements of my teaching experience which are intimately related to the themes explored in this dissertation and also helps to clarify my positionality as a researcher.

I first encountered the EFL industry when I was an undergraduate university student. Visiting relatives in Seoul for the summer, I was interested in securing a part-time job for some pocket money, so I arranged to sit in on a class in-progress at an English conversation school. An American instructor was attempting to teach university-age students how to decline an offer. Visibly frustrated by the lack of a response, and perhaps flustered that I was witness to this state of affairs, he decided to bring up a topic guaranteed to catch everyone's attention: he said that after work he was often accosted on the street and had to decline propositions from prostitutes. He proceeded to ask each student whether their friend, sister, or mother was in this line of work in a friendly, joking tone of voice, attempted to role play a scenario with different students in which he pretended to be a prostitute, and then asked the students to role play the situation, with one student as a prostitute and the other as a potential customer.

The initial reaction from the students was one of confusion; was this really happening? As the instructor continued to explain what he wanted the students to do in a joking tone, the students attempted to confirm the situation by conferring with each other in Korean. The instructor loudly reminded the class that only English was allowed in class, and again reiterated what he wanted the class to do, using the occasion to further explain the term 'prostitute,' teach related slang, and throw in jokes which he considered to be amusing. Some students attempted to lessen the tension in the air by playing along with the 'crazy' foreigner,

which the instructor appeared to take pleasure in; this prompted more ‘jokes’ from the instructor as other students stumbled through the role play nervously, and then there were those who just sat with downcast eyes in stunned silence, barely managing to mumble something when the instructor cheerfully asked them if they understood.

How, one may ask, could such a situation ever arise? In the wake of the Korean war, as a result of the US’ insistence on establishing and maintaining military bases on the peninsula for geopolitical considerations, large industries of prostitution were created to cater to US soldiers and personnel (Shorrock, 2019). This, in turn, led to a situation which an official at the US embassy recalls in the following terms: “’There was kind of a joke’ where guys ‘would take out a $20 bill and lick it and stick it to their forehead.’ They said that’s all it took to get a girl” (Vine, 2015). Naturally, white western male English instructors would become cognizant about such things, and in the case cited above, it’s painfully obvious that this topic did occupy the attention of the instructor. We are reminded of the neo-colonial, imperialistic aspect of the spread of English referred to by researchers such as Phillipson (1992), Canagarah (1999), as well as Pennycook, who wrote that he has “constantly sought ways of trying to understand the position of English in the world…the deaths of children, the poverty and starvation, the pointless consumption and thoughtless pollution, the discriminations against people because of their color” as it has become clear to him that “…over the years, I have become increasingly sure that these are connected,… it is essential…to work out the relationships between my work as an English teacher and what I see around me in the world (Pennycook, 2017, pp. 2-3).

What I had witnessed in that conversation school was on the one hand very shocking, and yet not entirely surprising. I had grown up as a Korean-American in Hawaii and been raised to believe that Asia and the rest of the non-western world have basically been trying to catch up to the ‘advanced countries’ since the onset of the Industrial Revolution, and were

therefore irrevocably lower on the totem pole in virtually every aspect. This perspective was formed when I graduated from my public elementary school and entered a private secondary school which was founded by American businessmen who had worked together to overthrow the Hawaiian monarchy, an event which led to the illegal annexation of Hawaii (Kameʻeleihiwa, 2004). Unbeknownst to me at the time, the school buildings, halls, and Christian chapel which we were obligated to attend were adorned with the names of these men. One of these men was Lorrin Thurston. He was the grandson of one of the first missionaries to Hawaii, who collectively were instrumental in banning the hula and the Hawaiian language (Hale, 2002). After World War I Thurston called for formal legislative government restrictions on Japanese language schools (rejected by the US Supreme Court) and acquired a newspaper which he passed on to his son which made it a practice to refer to Japanese people as "Japs" (Chaplin, 1998). Although Thurston himself was not roaming the halls when I attended the school he helped to found, the emphasis on Anglo-American superiority at this school was in such evidence that President Obama was moved to note that after he was denigrated and referred to as a "coon" in the 7th grade (The Dailey Item, 2014 August 5) while at this school, he made the decision to ignore the only other African-American in his grade and "win white friends" (Harris, Moffitt, & Squires, 2010, p. 138). The inclusion of these details here is to illuminate how hegemonic ideas favoring native-speakerism may be established and passed on to future generations within educational institutions, as it is the "colonialist myth of the 'autonomous,' 'organized,' 'inventive'… 'civilizing' Man Friday (who) is implicit in the native-speakerist 'moral mission' to bring a 'superior' culture of teaching and learning to students and colleagues" who are "perceived not to be able to succeed on their own terms" (Holliday, 2006, p. 386). So although while attending this school I had also occasionally been targeted with blatantly racist derogatory remarks (and struggled with the realization that there seemed to be no alternative but to go along with the status quo),

having no other source of information of similar stature in that pre-internet age and parents who were focused more on academic achievement than social consciousness, I held the view that one simply had to adapt oneself to ‘reality.’

So it was that even after viewing that instructor’s performance, despite the confusion and disappointment which coursed through me, I did not feel there was any meaningful recourse action available to an undergraduate student that would address this issue. Eventually the distaste and memory faded, and a few years after graduating from my university I found myself teaching at a conversation school in Japan. Being a newcomer and eager to meet the criteria of the three month probationary period written into my one year contract, I naturally did my best to fit into the system that was in place. Although I had no formal teaching qualification, with merely an undergraduate degree in a totally unrelated field I had secured a position in a large conversation school, and quickly learned that a primary consideration was how much the students liked the instructor, as quarterly evaluations written up by the students determined one’s salary, work schedule, and future employment. Keeping and attracting new students was what kept a conversation school afloat in a very competitive business. This initial orientation was followed later by a shift to reflecting upon how much overall merit and value our (expat western instructors) efforts actually had for the learners and their families. Key episodes which prompted me to critically reflect on the conversation school ethos were the recurring episodes of students inquiring as to why their proficiency was not improving despite considerable investments of time and money. In fact, the students who seemed to make significant progress were those who had the additional time and money to study abroad for a few months or a year. I noted that the strictly enforced English-only policy appeared to hamper beginner level students, and also observed that on the few occasions when I was able to furtively use some Japanese to clarify a difficult word or explain

directions to a student who was having trouble following the lesson, it often proved to be extremely helpful.

Seeing how the majority of the students were actually not improving their proficiency in a meaningful way, and that instructors generally focused on being liked (especially at staged events such as the Halloween or Christmas conversation school parties) more than seriously improving the level of the students' English in this environment, I made my way out of the conversation school business into teaching Japanese high schools, corporate classes, and eventually universities in South Korea. What I found was that in situations involving a staff of expatriate instructors, the same general rule of evaluations favoring those who were most charismatic and 'fun' greatly impacted teaching methodology as well as hiring practices. This made sense within the context of the heavy burden hanging over students' heads regarding standardized testing, which plays a prominent role in determining university and job placement (Park, J. K., 2009); the students were often relieved to engage in light-hearted games and exercises, and came to expect them to be incorporated as a prominent part of the curriculum. In addition to witnessing an educational system which emphasized an almost drone-like adherence to studying for standardized tests rather than developing the capacity for independent, critical thought processes, in Korea I also observed that there were high rates of cheating on exams and suicide amongst students who weren't able to attain desired marks (Card, 2005; Jung, M., 2013; May, 2008; Oh, 2013). In contrast to the Korean universities I interviewed and worked for, I have found that the Japanese universities I have been involved with are more conscientious and stringent regarding pedagogy and classroom management. It does however need to be pointed out that the majority of the time I spent teaching at the tertiary level in Korea was prior to obtaining my MA, and I was therefore not granted interviews with the higher-tier institutions during that

period of my life. Having said that, it should also be pointed out that the majority of learners in any given country do not gain admission to higher ranked universities.

The basic tenet drilled into all expatriate instructors at every conversation school I have ever worked for is that the instructor must use English at all times, regardless of the students' level of fluency or any difficulty they may be encountering in the class. The first major turning point for me regarding this policy occurred when I started to work at a South Korean high school in Tokyo. I entered the school in the middle of the term, as the previous expatriate instructor had suddenly been let go when it was found out that he had forged his university diploma. Searching to discover why the students expected high marks for minimal effort, I interviewed students and honed in on the primary factor: both the previous instructor and I had only rudimentary Korean language skills, and were therefore unable to negotiate very effective classroom relationships. Whenever it was to their convenience the students simply pretended to not understand, and the previous instructor had awarded all the students with good grades so long as they praised him as an effective teacher in their evaluations (this came to light later when I developed closer relations with the students). In this environment the hallowed English-only policy led nowhere.

The solution I came up with was (1) speaking with the administration to get a Korean-speaking assistant, who happened to speak English with a Korean accent; (2) making attendance and active participation mandatory prerequisites for a passing grade. With these measures in place, we managed to turn the English program around. It became obvious that being able to directly communicate with the students was a pivotal factor, as well as allowing the students to use Korean in class as they collaborated on various exercises and projects. Rather than a foreigner who they could barely communicate with passing them through on the barest of requirements, together with the students we created an atmosphere where active participation was set into motion because each and every student understood what we were

saying in real time and felt included in the class activities on an equal level, rather than having to wait to be instructed by elite students whose understanding of English was superior to theirs. The students also very often vigorously interacted with my Korean-speaking assistant to resolve misunderstandings regarding my American perspective. An important factor in swinging the pendulum was the use of drama exercises in the classroom, which enabled the students to move about and express themselves through stories they created themselves (with no stigma attached if their English was inflected with a Korean accent), which they said they enjoyed far more than the previous instructor's approach of having them simply memorize phrases or rudimentary conversations. I began to see how the injunction that all students be required to strive to become fluent in a westernized version of English (Kachru, 1985, 1992; Kramsch, 1993; White, 1997) can appear as a dehumanizing force, something that discourages students from situating themselves in their own sociocultural history and traditions as they help each other learn a foreign language. Upon leaving the South Korean high school, I applied what I had learned to teaching in Japanese high schools and company classes (see above).

After seeing the tangible improvements in student engagement and progress which were enabled by a critical pedagogic approach, I gradually became more committed to ferreting out structures and influences which appear to hamper both the capacity of expatriate instructors to teach effectively as well as their students' capacity to learn. Having learned in detail about seldom disclosed aspects of the Korean War/the US post-war occupation in Japan, as well as being raised in a family deeply impacted by the Korean War conflict, my basic assumption has been that the teaching approaches of expatriate instructors would not exhibit evidence of being deeply aware of the residual effects those historical events may have had on the students' upbringing, and may not be well-versed in the fundamental yet subtle differences in their students' outlook. That such factors may play a key role in the

classroom has been pointed out by Professor Hyun-Sook Kang of Illinois State University, who has noted that "Endeavors to transplant Western language teaching methodologies without giving due attention to the local pedagogical ecology have not met with expected success" (Clavel, 2014). Beyond being familiar with the residual effects of war, there is the important factor of being familiar with other sociohistorical elements, namely the students' perspective based on differing ideologies, personal biases, different interpretations of history, codified ways of thinking and behaving based on one's upbringing and cultural environment (Anderson, 2009), and living memories of past English language instruction classroom experiences.

2 Critical Theory and Critical Pedagogy

Critical theory is derived from the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research's analyses of cultural criticism. Seeking to understand the root causes of the economic, political, and social inequities which caused a debilitating economic depression in post-World War I Germany (Kincheloe, 2005) and the unfulfilled aspirations of the working-class revolution in western Europe, from the inception of the institute in 1923 researchers such as Horkheimer, Adorno, Fromm and Marcuse focused their efforts on the pressing issues of the day. Great upheavals were rippling through various parts of the world at this time (Marks, 1986), leading to waves of unrest and revolution (Katz, 1997). Held (1980) sees the Frankfurt School theorists as being influenced mainly by anti-positivist sociology and the writings of Marx and Hegel, as well as existential philosophy and psychoanalysis, in their efforts to forge an alternative path of social development beyond the confines of Soviet socialism or capitalism.

In order to realize emancipation, the individual must utilize a self-conscious social critique which unveils the agencies and structures within society as well as oneself which function to justify or rationalize the domination of people by instruments of capital, such as consumerism and technology (Marcuse, 1991). By virtue of its goal to realign the social environment and free people from the paralyzing effects of tyranny, critical theory stands opposed to ideology as well as all forms of positivism, and seeks to employ a dialectic method of inquiry in order to liberate the individual from "the historical character of the object perceived and... the historical character of the perceiving organ. Both are not simply natural; they are shaped by human activity" (Horkheimer, 1976, p. 213). To circumvent becoming a caricature of its own ideology, critical theory is "last, but not least, critical of itself and of the social forces that make up its own basis" (Bronner & Kellner, 1989, p. 72). Honneth (1979) invokes Habermas's critique of Adorno to illustrate how Habermas redefined the Frankfurt School to include linguistics and thereby enlarged its outlook beyond the limits

of Hegelian dialectics. Recognizing that an individual's identity is culturally and socially formed, critical theory has always aimed to transform the individual and one's social environment as a "reflective theory which gives agents a kind of knowledge inherently productive of enlightenment and emancipation" (Geuss, 1981, p. 2).

Critical pedagogy is the basis for a type of education which empowers students to evaluate their classroom experience/broader systemic issues in an insightful manner and participate in meaningful ways to encourage personal and social change (Shor, 1992; Giroux, 2011). It is through this process that "students learn to critically appropriate knowledge existing outside of their immediate experience in order to broaden their understanding of themselves, the world, and the possibilities for transforming the taken-for-granted assumptions about the way we live" (McLaren, 1989, p. 186). Although the majority of researchers who endorse a critical pedagogical approach allocate copious amounts of discourse to the analysis of what critical pedagogy is, in contrast there is relatively little said about translating the idea into actual classroom practice. Shor (1992) suggested a curriculum created by the Adult Learning Project (ALP), which locates critical study in student culture and incorporates students as co-developers and co-researchers of programs "while democratically absorbing expert knowledge as well" (p. 210). For Kincheloe (2005), this expert knowledge ought to include perspectives drawn from areas such as indigenous knowledges, African American studies, phenomenology, feminist epistemologies, psychoanalysis, semiotics, queer theory, and postcolonial studies. Yet in the application of critical pedagogy, Morrow and Torres (2002) opt to settle upon a nondirective approach "explicitly based upon a rejection of teachers providing political direction; the learners themselves must construct their transformative practices" (pp. 124-125). This hands-off approach results in scholars producing sizeable amounts of theory and relatively little

practical action (Carragee & Frey, 2012), thereby ultimately aiding in the corporate takeover of higher education (Apple, 2013; Bowles & Gintis, 2011).

In the Foreword to Allman's (2001) consideration of critical education, McLaren notes how Allman's analyses uncover a series of "uncomfortable truths" about the manner in which neo-liberal politics "is beginning to root itself in educational policy-making and camouflage itself under a radical leftist posturing" (p. xv). Today's postmodernist emphasis upon the relativity of truth ultimately serves to support the propagation of the dominant ideology. From Allman's perspective, the only way that critical pedagogy can begin to effectively address the inequities which continue to prevail across a rapidly globalizing planet is if educators unconditionally prepare people to take part in a revolutionary social transformation. Such a critical/revolutionary praxis "begins when we critically grasp the dialectical, or internally related, nature of our material conditions and social relations and develops in full as we seek to abolish or transform these conditions and relations" (p. 7). For Allman current popular expositions of Marx and Freire as mistaken, and the Left's emphasis on supporting various social movements lead to the dissipation of the focus necessary to overturn the structures which integrate people's labor into the capitalist surplus value production process. She identifies surplus value as the quintessence of capitalism and therefore the root of modern society's pervasive inequities; a progressive transformative consciousness can thereby only begin to emerge when educators clearly comprehend the fallacy of a postmodern relativism, cultivate a coherent self which affirms basic core truths, and then transmit these realizations in the classroom, "to do everything we can to insert coherency into the radical agenda" (p. 236). Of equal necessity for Allman is the disavowal of capitalist material and social relations, as this would enable us to see beyond the mirage that a liberal democracy has the capability to hold capital accountable and furnish a palpable, practical foundation upon which to "create a socially and economically just society" (p. 7).

2.1 Critical view of language and power necessitates historical awareness

A noted scholar who applied a critical analysis to the relationship between language and power is Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu views language as a tool which is utilized by powerful entities to facilitate the creation of dominant structures in society which lead to certain patterns of cultural reproduction through which individuals affirm, legitimate, and replicate the social forms of domination (Bourdieu, 2018). Being able to speak a certain language in a certain way has a variable level of cache depending on how much cultural capital is associated with it in a specified milieu (Bourdieu, 1987; Weinenger & Lareau, 2007). Dominating a given milieu either openly or surreptitiously in a direct or proxy manner will therefore allow an actor to unduly influence the means of social reproduction by determining "what is and what is not regarded as acceptable and valuable" (Zotzman, 2013, p. 253). Owing to this, one arguably risks creating empty or transient theories of the role that language plays in a given environment if they do not take into account the historical events which have enabled certain actors and forces representing a particular country's language to insert themselves into the local process of creating cultural capital, especially if this has occurred at both the macro (enforced by outside actors with the aid of insider collaborators on an institutional level) and micro (occurs when local actors accept the prescribed narrative as natural, desirable or inevitable; see Bourdieu, 1977, and Bourdieu, 1991). This dissertation will therefore incorporate a substantial amount of historical data to help shed light on how American English rose in prominence and positioned itself to become the standard of English accepted throughout Japan.

2.2 Critical pedagogy in East Asia and Japanese English language education

English language instruction, once popularly viewed as a politically neutral endeavor (Kubota, 2011b) done exclusively for the sake of citizens who desired to reap the benefits of associating themselves with certain affluent, entitled western nations (Crystal, 1997), is now also understood to function as a tool which is used by western governments to promote their political and economic interests as an integral component of the neoliberal agenda currently advancing rapidly across the globe (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 2009; Hyland, 2019; Iino, 2020; Mohammed, 2020). In order to defend social justice and aid local citizens resist the intrusion of western-aligned elites, it is essential to examine how hegemonic forces have been operational through the institution of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). As power is unjustly and inequitably allocated throughout society and reproduced through intimidation and consent (Auerbach, 1995), it is recognized that institutions of learning are not neutral but are rather a primary site for the augmentation and replication of asymmetrical power relations amongst succeeding generations of students (Giroux, 2001). Second language teachers are encouraged to take into consideration that language is a social construct and is engendered by "the ways language learners understand themselves, their histories, and their possibilities for the future" (Norton & Toohey, 2004, p. 1).

Although there has been more activity recently, until now there has been a dearth of reports documenting the use of critical pedagogy in East Asia relative to the academic environment in US or Europe, as such approaches have been deemed culturally inappropriate (Crookes, 2010), owing perhaps to a misrepresentation of culture in Japan (Kubota, 1999) or, in the case of South Korea, an educational culture so bent on attaining high marks on standardized exams and emulating native English speakers that when it comes to English education, concerns for social justice take a back seat to cheating one's way to a higher TOEIC score while white native instructors are often hired more for their appearance than for

their qualifications (Joun, 2015; Appleby, 2017). Zhong (2018, p. 63) meanwhile has noted that the democratic pre-conditions necessary for a meaningful implementation of critical pedagogy do not currently exist in China. Roughly a decade ago Crookes (2010) argued that "critical EFL is conceptually possible and do-able in all parts of the world" and has merely been "wrongly disputed" in East Asia (p. 146). Regarding recent developments, Ooiwa-Yoshizawa (2018) supports Crookes' proclamation in her declaration that in Japan "there are EFL teachers who actively promote and practice critical and radical topics such as gender education, radical feminist pedagogy, global issues, and critical thinking, as seen among members of some Special Interest Groups of Japan Association for Language Teaching" (p. 27). In a similar vein, H.K. Kim (2017) has been able to report that recently there have been more cases of a critical pedagogic approach being used in South Korean classrooms. Having said that, the overall tone present within these studies is that critical pedagogy as a teaching approach within these environs still has a long way to go (Crookes, 2010, p. 139; Kim, H.K., p. 52; Ooiwa-Yoshizawa, p. 24, p. 27).

2.3 Viewing English education in Japan through the lens of critical theory

Scholars have noted how English education in Japan has become a packaged commodity which distorts the aims of progressive pedagogy (Ritzer, 1996; Martin, 2006; Seargeant, 2009; Piller, Takahashi, & Watanabe, 2010; Kubota, 2011a; Rivers & Ross, 2013) and has lent itself to English being studied for the social status it confers in aligning the learner with the stereotypical Anglo-Saxon representative of 'proper' English-speaking Centre countries (Kubota, 2011a; Rivers & Ross, 2013; Galloway & Rose, 2018), who preferably speaks American English (Igarashi, 2018). Numerous studies have in fact been conducted with the intent of shedding light on the nature of Japan's struggles with English. The Japanese government's response has been to further prioritize the study of English as a

necessary requirement of *kokusaika* (internationalization), which although popularly referred to as a consequence of foreign entities pressuring Japan to open its markets in the 1980s (Seargeant, 2009), has been an aim of Japanese higher education since the end of WWII (Ninomiya, Knight, & Watanabe, 2009), and in fact stretches back to the first two decades of the Meiji era (1868-1912), when "a large number of Japanese were sent overseas at government expense to the United States and Europe, and between three and four thousand Western experts-- known as *oyatoi*--were invited to Japan" (Mock, Kawamura & Naganuma, 2016, p. viii). The Japanese government has decided that the study of English should be approached as a practical tool (*jitsuyo*) targeted towards competing within the hustle and bustle of globalization rather than being conceived as part of a broader means of "intellectual and personal self-cultivation" (*kyoyo*), a notion "similar to the concept of *Bildung* in German" (Yamamura, Kimie, Gakutani, Karpinska, Tanojiri, Gally, 2019, p. 51).

In essence, Japanese students and workers are regarded as potential global human resources (*gurobaru jinzai*) for the government and business elite to utilize in order to optimize the state's "global competitiveness" (Seargeant, 2009; Kariya, 2010; Burgess, 2012; Horiguchi, Imoto & Poole, 2015; Toh, 2016; Miyashita, 2017). The state requires such candidates to be able to "take on the burden of globalizing Japanese companies' business activities and take an active part in global business" (Burgess, 2012, p. 86), and should not only be conversant in business-friendly English, but also obedient in the traditional Japanese manner (p. 91). MEXT's (The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sport, Science and Technology) 2012 University Action Reform Plan was hatched with the aim of transforming Japan's allegedly inward-looking youth to autonomous problem-solving students "capable of corresponding with globalization" (MEXT, 2012). Also in 2012, five universities said to be Japan's "most international" entered into a formal agreement to collectively foster *kokusai-jin ikusei,* which translates roughly to, "international people" (Burgess, 2012, p. 92). In

anticipation of the 2020 Summer Olympic Games, MEXT decreed that certain specified levels and scores on standardized proficiency tests would become a formal goal for secondary school students as well as a minimum requirement of English proficiency for Japanese English teachers, although Japanese English teachers themselves question how well such tests reflect true communicative competence (Kondo, 2015, p. 25). In 2018 MEXT doubled down and announced that in 2020 new standardized university entrance exams would include privately administered English tests, including the TOEFL and TOEIC (Mainichi, 2018, March 18); the Japanese operator of the TOEIC (the Institute of International Business Communication) later announced in 2019 that it had decided to not make the TOEIC available (presumably the TOEFL is still part of the framework) for the entrance exams as "the process of accepting test applications, holding the tests and providing results would be far more complex than we had expected" (Japan Times, 2019, July 2). A survey indicated that "Two-thirds of universities and 90 percent of high schools viewed the planned introduction of private-sector English language tests for a new standardized college admission exam as 'problematic,'" as this measure is seen as putting students from less privileged backgrounds at a distinct disadvantage, and has even prompted the National Association of Upper Secondary School Principals to take the "unusual step of asking the education ministry…to 'postpone' the introduction of the new system" (Masutani, 2021). Equally unusual (for Japan) was the organization of a formal demonstration outside of the Education Ministry buildings (Masutani). The sustained outcry over this issue led to the Japanese government's decision to accede to the request to postpone implementing private sector-issued exams as well as a retraction of the education minister Koichi Hagiuda's remarks on a television program that students should compete for university admission "in accordance with their (financial) standing" (Japan Times, 2019, December 6). The push for and attainment of *gurobaru jinzai* status in itself ironically does not necessarily guarantee stable employment in a post-Bubble,

neoliberal economic environment which emphasizes outsourcing and part-time contracts in order to reduce labor costs (Kubota, 2011b, p. 249; Emmott, 2020).

In Japan, as globalization is equated with the English language (Kubota, 2002; Sasaki, 2008; Seargeant, 2009; Toh, 2016), such government-driven measures concerned with *kokusaika* as those outlined above serve to stimulate the demand for educational materials and instruction related to English, and in fact the foreign language learning market (mostly geared to the study of English) as noted above generated 872.6 billion yen (US$7.8 billion) in sales in 2019 (Yano Research Institute, 2019). Such massive amounts of taxable capital are supplemented in turn by the revenue streams government-related business elite receive via their relationship with standardized testing agencies such as the US-based ETS, who issue the omnipresent TOEIC and TOEFL exams (Yoshida, 2003; McCrostie, 2010; Kubota, 2011b). As the study of English in Japan as it is presented in schools and spoken of by officials appears to be very technocratic (especially in terms of what its stated objectives are), an examination of the relationships between ETS, the US government, Japanese bureaucrats, and the type of business people and organizations who intimately work with the state may help shed light on the past, present, and future behavior of English education in Japan. It will therefore serve to better acquaint us with its inherent nature, given its present form.

Occupying a very central place within the English language study market is the TOEIC exam (Chapman & Newfields, 2008; Bresnihan, 2012; Toh, 2013a; Toh, 2016). The TOEIC was conceived of and brought to fruition by a Japanese businessman named Kitaoka Yasuo (1928-1997), who after attempting to break into the field of marketing English textbooks, turned his attention to standardized testing (McCrostie, 2010). Kitaoka, having no formal background in education, enlisted the aid of a retired Japanese professor (Saegusa Yukio) who was a former colleague at Time magazine ((McCrostie, 2009a), and whose background was in publishing textbooks (Saegusa, 1983, p. 71). It should be noted that Time

magazine along with Newsweek were the first English-language magazines permitted by the MacArthur-led US authorities (SCAP) to be published in Japan as part of SCAP's Civil Information and Education (CI&E) bureau's mission to not only spread "information on America and democracy," but to insure "they also became attitude-forming media for the US government in Japan" (Matsuda, 2007, p. 25, p. 29). Time magazine was confirmed to have had a very deep relationship with the CIA through the congressional Church Committee investigation, which revealed that US media outfits such as Time harbored staff who worked for and were paid by the CIA (Bernstein, 1977, October 20; Crewdson, 1977, December 27). It was Time magazine-affiliate Saegusa who suggested Kitaoka to enlist the services of the US-based testing organization ETS. After being told by ETS that a non-profit partner was required, Kitaoka attempted to get the support of the Ministry of Education, but was rebuffed as that ministry was already endorsing a local Japanese English proficiency exam known as the Eiken exam. Kitaoka finally succeeded after he was able to gain the confidence of a friend named Watanabe Yaeji, who then used his influence as a former high ranking government official in MITI (the Ministry of International Trade and Industry, which is currently known as METI, the Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry) to set up a TOEIC steering committee which included members of other retired MITI bureaucrats and elite business leaders from companies such as Matsushita (now known as Panasonic) and Fujitsu. ETS then started to develop the TOEIC in 1977 and produced the first series of exams in 1979; Matsushita and Fujitsu were among the first companies to force their employees to take the exam, and their influence as industry leaders led other Japanese companies to do the same. Once the TOEIC got a foothold in corporate Japan, the TOEIC steering committee created a for-profit organization (International Communications School) to sell the exam to new customers in 1983 (Ihara & Tsuruoka, 2001; Watanabe, 2003; McCrostie, 2009a; McCrostie, 2010).

Subsequent to the formal creation of the TOEIC exam in 1979 Saegusa published an article in a US-friendly Japan-based Applied Linguistics journal in 1983 extolling the virtues of the TOEIC (pp. 71-89). Saegusa's article included no references for several of the charts and graphs he used to argue for the validity of the TOEIC, and did not include a bibliography. The issue of the journal in which his article was published was scattered throughout with advertisements for US companies selling English language study materials, TOEIC study materials, and endorsements for an intensive English study course at a US university as well as for JALT, the Japan-based English teachers organization supported by the US embassy which caters to expat English language instructors (Saegusa, 1983; JALT, 2019b). The journal in question, *Cross Currents: A Journal of Communication/Language/Cross-Cultural Skills*, was published by an organization named the Language Institute of Japan, which despite its name has only published articles related to English, and whose members conceived JALT (Language Institute of Japan, 2003b; JALT, 2019a). It is also important to note that the Language Institute of Japan originated in 1968 as an "experimental school that prepared (Japanese) college students to study in the US" (Language Institute of Japan, 2003c), and that it was founded as a division of MRA House, a non-profit educational organization active in philanthropic work related to post-war US-Japan relations (Language Institute of Japan, 2003a; JCIE, 2019).

Researchers active in Japan who are intimately familiar with the ETS-produced TOEIC have concluded that it is a project propagated in Japan as a "mercantile entity" (Toh, 2013a, p. 223) which also functions as an important enabler of ideology for its elite Japanese shareholders (Kubota, 2011b; Toh, 2013a). It has also been observed that ETS exams lack credibility on the grounds that they can be 'coached' for those who can afford to pay for it (Owen, 1983; Elesser, 2019; Gates, 2019; Soares, 2021), and are not a valid measure of what their purported aim is, which in the case of Japan would be English proficiency (Gee, R., 2015).

Perhaps more serious is the finding that ETS-administered standardized tests have their origin in theories of eugenics (Bachman, Davidson, Ryan, & Choi, 1995) and the Immigration Restriction Act of 1924, which was influenced by the interpretation that standardized tests measure innate intelligence, and that lower scores therefore indicated that "Catholics, Greeks, Hungarians, Italians, Jews, Negroes, Poles, Russians, Turks, and a great many others were innately less intelligent than people whose ancestors were born in countries that abounded in natural blonds" (Owen, 1983, p. 32); other "racially inferior races" who were deemed a threat to "native" American Anglo-Saxon stock included "Asiatics" (Leonard, 2005, p. 210).

The contention by researchers that ETS-issued exams favor a certain demographic on account of their being biased toward a particular ideology within ETS' domestic distribution area is echoed by investigations which find that the ETS abroad is a major agent of American linguistic hegemony as it uses a vast international network greater than the US Department of Defense (Nairn & Nader, 1980) to "maintain(s) and deliver(s) US norms and values via the medium of American standard English proficiency tests" (Yoo & Namkung, 2012, p. 224), and is enabled by the US government via tax laws which allows ETS to classify itself as a non-profit organization and therefore avoid paying federal corporate income tax on a significant portion of its enterprises, despite the fact that ETS has many for-profit subsidiaries and that the majority of ETS' overseas activities are for-profit (Yoo & Namkung, 2012, pp. 235-238). Yoo and Namkung delineate how the policies and actions of the US government, ETS, non-profit philanthropic organizations, bureaucrats and their business associates serve to benefit each other by securing a position for and then promoting ETS exams in a foreign locale, similar to how the TOEIC came to prominence in Japan as detailed above. The astounding adoption, depth of penetration and omniscient spread of the TOEIC, symptomatic of an English education system in Japan which emphasizes the profits of elite stakeholders at the expense of the learning experience of its citizens, could only have been made possible by a number of political developments which occurred far in advance of its

creation and led to the enshrinement of a particular brand of English, as will be described in detail below.

That an Anglo-American native speaker is still regarded as the ideal model of an English speaker has been noted as a general phenomenon (Crystal, 1997; McKay, 2002; Holliday, 2005), one pertinent to East Asia (Jenkins, 2009; Yoo & Namkung, 2012; Chang, 2016), as well as one which occurs in Japan (Seargeant, 2009; Appleby, 2017; Konakahara & Tsuchiya, 2020). The deliberate global spread of English as an instrument of western hegemony has been argued for by researchers such as Phillipson (1992, 2009), Pennycook (1998) and Canagarajah (1999). Viewed within this context, it is apparent that the spread of American English throughout Japan is neither unique nor accidental. Striking parallels of how English language education behaves in South Korea exist. In order to better perceive the structures and mechanisms of the English language education system in Japan within the wider East Asian context, it may be instructive to consider the South Korean situation.

2.4 In Korea

As in Japan, teaching English in South Korea is a huge industry. South Korean governmental agencies, companies, universities, as well as selective secondary schools require South Korean citizens to provide scores from standardized English exams (TOEIC, TOEFL) produced by the US-based Educational Testing Service (ETS) in order to apply to institutions of learning or for job interviews. South Koreans interested in studying abroad are also obligated to take the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language exam (TOEFL). In addition to the exam fee, students often attend test preparation courses to improve their score; those who can afford it pay large sums of money to attend schools which provide the actual test questions (Chosun Ilbo, 2013, February 2; Chosun Ilbo, May 2013). Rather than cultivate a fluency in English which meshes with the learner's cultural history, the target language is

taught within the framework of test-taking techniques as well as phrases and structures unique to the world of Educational Testing Services. From this perspective, the study of English within a system that affixes high value to standardized examination scores is bereft of any significant inherent meaning for the language itself. It is merely a subject in which all that matters is the ability to demonstrate a semblance of proficiency by replicating and attuning oneself to formal standardized western patterns of English. This stands in sharp contrast to the latest research which demonstrates that effective and useful language acquisition occurs when the target language is localized and situated within the learner's social and cultural background (Shin, H.; 2007; Kubota & Lin, 2009; O'Hara-Davies, 2011; Erling & Seargeant, 2013). Both the literature and the participants who I interviewed during my MA research correlated the high value associated with attaining optimal test scores with a low motivation to learn productive language skills, as South Koreans actually rarely use English as a separate linguistic code in their daily lives (Choi, W.H., 2011; Song, J.J., 2011; Fayzrakhmanova, 2016).

Researchers have reported a litany of negative consequences in South Korea related to the spread of English. The current model of American English has become a tool that replicates structures buffering a deeply-rooted, rigidly-set social order, as opposed to fulfilling expectations of ushering in a new globalization-engendered social order. English actively operates as a mechanism which cements inequality in South Korea (Song, J.J., 2011; Smith, M.D., 2019) via an educational framework which remains firmly controlled by the government (Jeon, 2009; Kim, T., 2008, 2013; Lee, Wha Han, & McKerrow, 2010; Crookes, 2017). Compelling evidence strongly supports the interpretation that the elite maintain a policy of Americanization through English (Lee, I., 2011; Smith, M.D., 2019) which reflects the reality of a colonized nation trapped within the confines of a survival-of-the-fittest social Darwinism (Lee, Wha Han, & McKerrow, 2010; Choon, 2021). The desperate struggle to

avoid becoming a casualty of this system (Park, J.K., 2009; Choon, 2021) has provided a fertile breeding ground for an extensive array of social ills amongst the less-privileged members of society who cannot afford to enroll their children in high-end language schools either domestically or abroad (Sorenson, 1994; Lee & Brinton, 1996; Seth, 2002; Song, J.J., 2011; Yoon, 2014). The widespread insistence on the primacy of English also feeds into a general avoidance of critical inquiry into the damaging costs incurred via the acceptance of neoliberal language policies (Piller & Cho, 2013; Smith, W., 2021).

In today's South Korea, ordinary citizens wrestle with the incessant calls to develop into 'globalized' citizens while their government continues to opt for further privatization and deregulation so as to accommodate western business interests (Baca, 2011; Park, J.S.Y., 2011; Business Korea, 2014, March 11; Pederson, 2019). Yet it has been demonstrated that the crazed pitch at which English is pursued as though it were a national religion in South Korea (Lee, J.S., 2011; Curran, 2018) has warped an understanding of what is actually necessary to efficiently compete economically with other nations, and in real terms doesn't make good economic sense for all of the tremendous amounts of resources which are invested into it (Song, J.J., 2011). So exaggerated and mislaid is the obsessive quest for English (Park, J.K., 2009; Song, J.J., 2011), particularly American English, that arguments have been advanced to the effect that English is utilized to indoctrinate South Koreans in order to "propel a vast political economy related to English" (Baca, 2011, p. 16; see also Smith, M.D., 2019) and "conserve the hierarchy of power relations already established in Korean society" (Song, J.J., 2011, p. 35; Smith, M.D., 2019). Indeed, if one were to seriously accept the argument that to generate a counter hegemonic space requires one to explicate current neo-colonial discourses (Shin, H., 2006), then it becomes imperative to contemplate how in South Korea the discourse of English is inextricably bound up with Korea's political history. As H. Shin notes, in South Korea the English language plays a role not dissimilar to the one it

performs in former colonies of western English-speaking countries. Within the context of a divided Korean peninsula, we can observe the military tension between Seoul and Pyongyang, which serves to reify the dominance that the US has had over South Korea's economic, and political life, despite the recent ascent of certain pop music acts and other media phenomenon. Therefore, any criticism of the continued presence of US military installations in the South, including criticism of the US military's involvement in trafficking young South Korean coeds to US massage parlors (Hughes, Chon, & Ellerman, 2007), can be interpreted by conservatives as a menace to national security. The fervid desire to develop fluency in English can be seen reflected in the inordinate number of South Koreans who arrange to separate from their family for a number of years in order to study English abroad in western countries (Yoon, 2014), and "is related to the neo-colonial role of the US in Korean history and not just to the status of English as a global language" (Shin, H., 2006, p. 153; see also Low & Ahn, 2017).

3 English Language Policy as a Tool for Colonialism

3.1 Findings of Phillipson and other scholars

Within the last 30 years there has been an in-depth consideration within EFL literature regarding how the spread of western culture and language throughout the globe has been directed by deep-seated convictions. Phillipson (1992) delineates the nature of western/Centre-driven imperialism as well as the role that language plays in the process by observing that in

> present-day-colonialism, the elites are to a large extent indigenous, but most of them have strong links with the Centre. Many of them have been educated in Centre countries and/or through the medium of the Centre language, the old colonial language. (p. 52)

Through his research Phillipson has discerned that international organizations are also very active in working with and coordinating the indigenous elite to their agenda. These organizations include major players from the cultural (film companies, book publishers), economic (private or governmental transnational organizations), communication (shipping and air companies, news agencies), and military (various systems of alliances) spheres. To boost the interaction the indigenous elites have with these entities and further Centre objectives, saturating target countries with English is imperative- "Language is the primary means for communicating ideas. Therefore an increased linguistic penetration of the periphery is essential for...neo-colonialist control by means of ideas" (pp. 52-53).

Phillipson (1992) notes how this state of affairs has manifested itself in the EFL classroom in a number of ways, namely: (1) an insensitive attitude on the part of pedagogies and discourses towards indigenous cultural traditions, (2) the relegation to inferior status of 'non-native' English teachers, (3) a refusal to allow an active role for the students' first

language in the study of English, and (4) a monolingual/monocultural bias which insists upon 'standard English' as the norm. Phillipson supports his statements with researched documents that serve to shed light on some of the primary driving mechanisms behind the scenes:

> Government policy-makers have been well aware of the significance of English... The Chairman has drawn these threads together very neatly and explicitly (*British Council Annual Report* 1983-1984: 9): 'Of course we do not have the power we once had to impose our will but Britain's influence endures, out of all proportion to her economic and military resources. This is partly because the English language is the lingua franca of science, technology, and commerce…Our language is our greatest asset, greater than North Sea Oil, and the supply is inexhaustible; furthermore, while we do not have a monopoly, our particular brand remains highly sought after. I am glad to say that those who guide the fortunes of this country share my conviction in the need to invest in, and exploit to the full, this invisible, God-given asset. (pp. 144-145)

The "invisible" aspect of how English education carries with it certain selected values which leverage a 'native speaker' discourse from Centre countries and permeates the work of powerful organizations including the US-based Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) is noted by Holliday (2005, 2010), who examines how "technologizing" professional discourses and ideology are so comprehensively inculcated in everyday language that EFL practitioners are not fully cognizant of the comprehensive impact these factors have in terms of how they interact with and view people from non-Centre countries.

Holliday (2005) views the hegemonic aspects in TESOL as so deeply rooted that any dissemination of educational tenets invariably ends up cementing a western discourse through the Centre-biased ideological elements installed within the core of TESOL. Due to its largely unquestioned sway over English instructors, learner-centeredness has become "*control-constructed* and fails to address the persons of students and teachers. By control-construction I mean the bureaucratization and technicalization of liberal democratic principles such as learner-centeredness by professional discourses so that they can be controlled and accounted for" (2005, p. 11). So complete is the partisanship in western views of a "demonized non-Western Other" (Holliday, 2010, p. 259; see also Appleby, 2017) that extreme measures are necessary to loosen the grip of ideologically constructed distorted views of other cultures. Phillipson's (1992) presentation of an official government report produced in 1954 during the pitched tumult of the Cold War holds back little regarding the ultimate objective in Asia of promoting English language education from the Commonwealth perspective:

> We need to build up our export trade and to protect our overseas investments, which are increasingly threatened by the extreme nationalism in many parts of the world. In our opinion the Information Services can help in this regard by…maintaining an atmosphere of goodwill…and by increasing the use of English as the common language in the East…In the long term we have no doubt that the work of the British Council, especially in regard to the teaching of English in Asia, will be highly beneficial to our overseas trade (p. 146)

In a joint conference convened in June 1961 in Cambridge entitled "Anglo-American Conference on English Teaching Abroad" organized by the British Council and imbued with

"a strong American presence," the stated intent is even more ambitious, as the "teaching of English to non-native speakers may permanently transform the students' whole world…If and when a new language becomes really operant…the students' world becomes restructured" (Phillipson, 1992, p. 166). Although dated, these conferences that Phillipson discusses set down conventions whose depth and degree of influence are even now in the process of being clarified. To sum up his findings in even more lucid terms, Phillipson states that, "What is at stake when English spreads is not merely the substitution or displacement of one language by another but the imposition of new 'mental structures' through English" (1992, p.167).

There is in fact no question that substantial efforts to engineer the global spread of English were made by the US and England in the 20th century. In this endeavor, philanthropic institutions played a major role. More specifically, in 1934 the US-based Carnegie Foundation sponsored a conference in New York titled "The use of English as a World Language," which was "the first ever international (UK-US) conference to bring together experts on English as a Foreign Language teaching. It involved…an explicit intention of spreading English 'as a world language' on a basis of UK-US collaboration" (Smith, N., 2003, p. xx). This conference was notable for bringing to New York US and UK English language instructors who had extensive experience teaching in Japan (Harold Palmer), China/Japan (Lawrence Faucett), and India (Michael West). The conference established an awareness of the instruction of English in foreign countries as "a serious pedagogical enterprise with its own separate identity" (Smith, N., 2003, p. xxxi) and presaged the Carnegie-sponsored follow-up conference in London a year later, as well as the first ever year-long EFL training course at the Institute of Education in Department of Colonial Education; the Institute of Education went on to play a pivotal role in the subsequent development of EFL, ELT, and TESOL (Phillipson, 2013, p. 8). These activities in their turn

foreshadowed the huge support that corporate-based philanthropic foundations would give to the intentional effort to spread English throughout the world (Phillipson, 1992, pp. 160-163, 226-230, 235-238) in conjunction with government entities such as the British Council and the United States Information Service. The US government's efforts in conjunction with closely allied corporate foundations to propagate the English language was "greatly abetted by the expenditure of large amounts of government and private foundation funds in the period 1950-1970, perhaps the most ever spent in history in support of the propagation of a language" (Troike quoted in Phillipson, 2013, p. 117).

Notwithstanding the attention brought about these disclosures (Levine & Phipps, 2012; Hawkins, 2011) and the endeavors of educators such as Wang (2011) to earnestly implement critical pedagogic practices, numerous ELT instructor training programs continue to be administered on the presumption that preparing teachers to strive for social justice can be sufficiently handled by having them convene in university classrooms and participate in reading and discussion (Zeichner, 2011). This may be the case in part owing to the neoliberal wave that has swept over educational systems globally (Clarke & Morgan, 2011), as well as the fact that second language acquisition (SLA) researchers who engage in interactional analysis have overall been reluctant or claim to be unable to deeply engage with ideological forces that act upon classroom discourse (Brenner, 2012; Duff, 2019), even as deliberation of relations of power and sociocultural practices have made their way into recent SLA research (Clarke & Morgan, 2011; Duff, 2019). The move to neoliberal policies has resulted in the predominance of a human-capital based positivist view that places student performance and efficiency over student needs, and views language as "both tool and commodity in the service of a globalized economy" rather than as "an inherently social phenomenon that is constructive of...social relations and identities" (Clarke & Morgan, p. 66). Clarke and Morgan further maintain that language education is particularly susceptible to the ontological,

epistemological, and ethical assumptions of neoliberalism, and thus "run[s] the risk of 'simply adopt[ing] the label of social justice without challenging or changing existing practices'" (in McDonald & Zeichner, 2009, p. 606).

3.2 Refutation of linguistic imperialism

In response to the findings discussed above, scholars such as Blommaert (citing Pennycook) countered that the spread of English is "not just a flat distribution of cultural forms but a layered distribution in which local forces are as important as global ones" (Blommaert, 2010, p. 19), a sentiment which created a new appraisal which was then echoed by Seargeant's proclamation in 2011 that in Japan "English often exists as part of a native style repertoire" (p. 203) as "the influences of globalization can be felt at the most local level, and semiotic resources that operate at a global level can be appropriated (and adapted) for use by local communities" (p.191). These statements are in line with Pennycook's critique of Phillipson's theory of linguistic imperialism in 2007 when he used the various permutations of hip-hop music around the world to put forth the idea that English becomes regenerated at the local level and thereby engenders a new localized vernacular. Apparent as these assertions are, Phillipson at no point stated that these manifestations did not exist, and in fact in his response to Pennycook made it clear that "the two levels, micro and macro, global and local, do not exclude each other, quite the opposite. A valid approach to the analysis of English must do justice to both the micro and macro levels and their interlocking" (Phillipson, 2013, p. 16). Implicit in Phillipson's rejoinder is that there has not been an adequate understanding of the magnitude of how English has been used to further the geopolitical interests of Anglophone countries, and to what degree English is spread through various media (Phillipson, 2013, pp. 83, 91, 126, 152). These types of influences on non-western countries at the grassroots level are arguably self-evident in the spread and adoption of an American

music art form (hip-hop) which stimulates the production of alternate forms of English, as opposed to non-western youth developing the musical traditions of their native culture. With respect to Japan, Saeki (2007) notes that in post-war Japan the US "did not hesitate to use various cultural materials such as films, books in translation…and music" to "indoctrinate Japanese" (p. 55). Such findings as this contradict Pennycooks's assertion that Phillipson's thesis is an overstated "dystopian assumption of linguistic imperialism" (Pennycook, 2017, p. X). The rise in recent years of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) with its emphasis on the need to de-center native-speakerism in English instruction (Jenkins, 2015) and the fact that it has resonated (Jenkins, Baker, & Dewey, 2017) would seem to indicate that that there is an affirmation of a need to further explore the issues that Phillipson raises, while simultaneously continuing to "develop a multifaceted understanding of the power and politics of ELT" which can adequately account for "the ways in which English is resisted and appropriated" (Pennycook, 2017, p. X) .

3.3 Language policy embedded within intercultural and educational exchanges as a pillar of Soft Power

The rationale behind the concerted effort to export English across the globe as part of a neo-colonialist agenda is reflected in the emphasis on influencing the outlook of non-western countries through embedding English within policies of foreign policy which aim to entice, attract, and convince via such vehicles as cultural diplomacy and promises of economic advancement. This type of approach of influencing people through seduction rather than force has been termed soft power, a process which "co-opts people rather than coerces them" by "getting others to want the outcomes that you want" (Nye, 2008, p. 95). The roots of the US' government use of soft power at the institutional level is commonly located in President Woodrow Wilson's establishment of the Committee of Public Information (CPI) in

1917 a week after the US entered World War I (Vaughn, 2017). By the time the CPI's activities came to a close with the signing of the Armistice with Germany in 1919, the CPI had unleashed what was regarded at the time as the largest public relations campaign in history and shed light on the massive potential to influence public opinion through the employment of soft power (Wilcox, Cameron, Reber, & Shin, 2013, p. 49). President Roosevelt invoked the importance of soft power in the late 1930's with his statement that "America's security depended on its ability to speak to and to win the support of people in other countries" (Pells, 1997, p. 33), a sentiment which was mirrored in the State Department's creation of the Division of Cultural Relations in 1938, which led in turn to Roosevelt's commissioning of the Office of Wartime Information (OWI) in 1942 (Nye, 2008, p. 98) to use Hollywood as well as a multitude of newspapers, posters, photographs, documentary films, radio broadcasts such as the Voice of America, and other forms of media to influence the outlook of millions of people both domestically and abroad (Winkler, 1978).

The OWI then was recast by President Eisenhower in 1953 as the United States Information Agency (USIA). Eisenhower's rationale was that audiences would be more receptive to American ideology if rather than obviously propagandistic in character or appearance the same ideas were presented by seemingly independent/neutral actors or materials (Osgood, 2008). Utilizing this approach, the USIA sought to "Bring the benefits of international engagement to American citizens and institutions by helping them build strong long-term relationships" (Chodkowski, 2012) through such things as "personal contact, radio broadcasting, press motion pictures, …English-language instruction, and others" (United States Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, 1971, p. 277). In terms of Japan, Joseph Nye, Harvard professor and federally-appointed (by Secretary of State John Kerry) member of the Foreign Affairs Policy Board, remarked in his article on soft power that "the third dimension of public diplomacy is the development of lasting relationships

with…individuals over many years," specifically noting that "Japan has developed an interesting exchange program bringing six thousand young foreigners from forty countries each year to teach their languages in Japanese schools, with an alumni association to maintain the bonds of friendship that develop" (Nye, 2008, p. 102). In contrast to the readers of the political and social science journal whom Nye wrote the article for, people who are familiar with the English language education situation in Japan know that Nye is referring to the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) program, which is dominated by English-language instruction and is overwhelmed by a decidedly American presence (Borg, 2018; https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/JET_Programm#cite_note-20).

It is interesting to note here that although Nye refers to JET as an 'exchange program,' in terms of language it is decidedly one-way, with the emphasis on teaching English to Japanese students. Although it may be construed that Japan created the JET Program initially to project its own soft power, the reality is that Japan felt compelled to consolidate this project as a concession to US pressure, as JET was "Conceived during the height of the US-Japan trade war in the mid-80's" and was "presented as a 'gift' to the American delegation" at the 1986 summit between US President Ronald Reagan and Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone (McConnell, 2008, p. 19). This "gift" was simply the latest in a massive process emphasizing the incorporation of American culture and ideals in Japan that began in earnest with the onset of the US Occupation in 1945, when the US took its first steps towards influencing and changing the mindset of the Japanese people with President Truman's endorsed General Order No. 183 (September 22, 1945), which empowered MacArthur to exercise "control over Japanese education, religion, and media of expression" (Matsuda, 2007, p. 20). After plans had been solidified to replace the previous rule of law (the Meiji Constitution of 1890) with a new US-authored national charter, the State Department's George Atcheson commented at the beginning of 1946 that "this was the

dawn of 'the age of Japan's imitation of things American—not only of American machines, but also American ideas,'" which was "what condescending American and British analysts had been arguing all along: that the Japanese had an 'ingrained feudalistic tendency' to follow authority" (Dower,1999, p. 400).

For MacArthur, the Japanese surrender created a vacuum into which could flow "American democracy," an institution which contained the seeds for "Japan's salvation…and therein lies the hope of all the peoples of the East for a better civilization," as Japan was "'the world's great laboratory for an experiment' in which a 'race, long stunted by ancient concepts of mythological training,' could be lifted up by 'practical demonstrations of Christian ideals'" (Nishi, 1982, p. 42). To MacArthur's consternation, however, by early 1947 student and worker strikes started to shift the Japanese people's interpretation of democracy to a decidedly anti-capitalist, un-American socialist and communist orientation (Dower, pp. 259-263, 267-273). In response to these developments, at a press conference in March 1947 MacArthur stated that "'Democracy is a relative thing. It is a question of the degree of freedom that you have…If you believe in the Anglo-Saxon idea, you will believe this will stay here'" (Nishi, p. 42). Despite these pronouncements, continued resistance and growing popular support for the student and worker movement prompted MacArthur in 1948 to withdraw the right to strike from public employees, and "occupation authorities worked diligently behind the scenes to promote the emergence of a virulently anticommunist 'democratization' (*mindo*) movement within organized labor" (Dower, p. 272).

The urgency to ensure that Japan would remain within the US' sphere of influence rose dramatically when the American-funded Nationalists led by Chiang Kai-shek began to lose their influence in China. Seeing the writing on the wall, the US shifted their hopes of containing communism in East Asia to Japan and in 1948 revised their original policy of demilitarization in Japan to instead include Japan on America's national security team in Asia

(Saeki, 2007, p. 88). In line with this abrupt about face (termed the "reverse course"; see Matsuda, pp. 43-46) came the release from prison and restoration to power of military-friendly accused war criminals (Seagrave & Seagrave, 2003) as well as the depurging of prominent political and business leaders who had formerly been purged due to their support for militarism and ultranationalism during the war, which led to the rearming of Japan (Cumings, 1993, p. 40; Matsuda, pp. 44-45); this was done so that the US planners could "situate Japan structurally in a world system shaped by the United States so that Japan would do what it should without having to be told," (Cumings, p. 34). As part of its efforts to ensure that this would be the case after the Occupation ended, the Truman administration put into motion a soft power program of utilizing cultural exchange as a "human weapon" (Saeki, p. 107). Emphasizing the establishment of educational exchange programs, the State Department sought to sway public opinion in Japan to a pro-US outlook by establishing deep and lasting relationships between US and Japanese citizens (Matsuda, 2007; Saeki, 2007).

Another facet of the strategy was to intentionally encourage the involvement of private and non-governmental agencies such as the Rockefeller foundation (who in reality had a long history of covertly working closely with the US government; see Bermen) in order to give the appearance in Japan that these efforts were free from the "underlying fear of foreign governmental intervention in foreign affairs" (Saeki, p. 117). Substantial funding from these sources led to extensive programs of cultural and educational exchange (Matsuda; Saeki), such so that "Nowhere have such efforts been more successful than in Japan" (Crowell, 2008, p. 208), one that continues to be ongoing as "The US public diplomacy program in Japan is among the most extensive and complex the US government conducts worldwide" (Crowell, p. 210). Further details of how the Truman administration-appointed cultural emissary John D. Rockerfeller III and the USIA specifically used English teaching in Japan as part of its post-war soft power cultural diplomacy are detailed below.

4 Rise of America and the Rockefeller Family Leading to Hegemony of American English in Japan

A primary focus of this study is to penetrate to the roots of how English education has taken its present form in Japan. As alluded to above, America has been extremely active in using the resources at its disposal to sculpt Japan into a shape amenable to US interests. To better understand how American hegemony has influenced English education in Japan, it may be instructive to examine how the US was able to rise to a level of prominence which would enable it exert such influence, what attitudes and actions are equated with "success," who the main actors were, and the manner of thinking through which American planners felt justified in subjecting Japan to that influence.

4.1 Rise of America and Rockefeller in the 19thth and early 20thth century

The US' relentless march to global dominance following the end of the second World War was foreshadowed by President Teddy Roosevelt's impassioned speech at the turn of the 20th century, in which he opined that,

> If we are to be a really great people, we must strive in good faith to play a great part in the world. We cannot sit huddled within our own borders... The twentieth century looms before us big with the fate of many nations. If we stand idly by, if we seek merely swollen, slothful ease and ignoble peace, if we shrink from the hard contests where men must win at hazard of their lives and at the risk of all they hold dear, then the bolder and stronger peoples will pass us by, and will win for themselves the domination of the world. (Roosevelt, 1910, pp. 3-22)

Roosevelt's exhortations coincided with the meteoric rise of the US' level of domestic manufacturing and international trade prowess (Kennedy, 1987, pp. 242-245), developments which shook noted foreign observers to their core (p. 243), and led the influential British

journalist W.T. Stead to title his 1902 publication, "The Americanization of the World." The US in real terms replaced England as the preeminent world power following World War One (p. 273), and the die was cast for the US government to flex its muscle along with major US industrialists/captains of industry such as Andrew Carnegie, J.P. Morgan, Andrew Mellon, John Ford, and John D. Rockefeller. Although the overt manifestations of the US government's designs on dominating the global stage did not become readily apparent until after World War Two, the seeds for the US to do so were sown prior to the outbreak of that massive armed combat, and were very much impregnated with the involvement of prominent business figures such as the aforementioned personages.

4.1.1 Rockefeller and his Social Darwinist, 'God-sanctioned' approach to doing business

Perhaps foremost amongst the major American industrialists was John D. Rockefeller, who became the richest person in the world at the beginning of the 20th century, and still ranks as the wealthiest person in the modern era (Metcalf, 2019). Rockefeller rose to prominence by consolidating the production and refinement of oil via the establishment of one of the world's first major international corporations, Standard Oil, in 1870 (ExxonMobil, 2019). Rockefeller was able to rise above the competition through a ruthless Social Darwinist approach to business. The first son of a con artist snake oil salesman father who was indicted for rape (James, 2013) and intentionally lent money to farmers who were not able to pay in order to take their properties through foreclosure (Hawke, 1980), Rockefeller stated that, "The growth of a large business is merely a survival of the fittest…This is not an evil tendency in business. It is merely the working-out of a law of nature and a law of God," (Hofstadter & Foner, 2006, p. 45). In practical terms, this translated into undercutting oil refinery competitors by colluding with the railroad operators to charge other refineries exorbitant transport rates (twice more than what Rockefeller's group paid) while rewarding Rockefeller's group with part of the monies gleaned from the inflated tariffs (Josephson,

1934), a tidy arrangement which "garroted all opposition systematically" (Josephson, p. 116) and allowed Standard Oil to control 88 percent of all refined oil flows in the US by 1890 (Yergin, 2009).

Compelling evidence and analysis points to a policy of blatant bullying and nefarious practices to destroy the competition (Gross & Forbes, 1997; Crane, 2012). Having said that, it must also be pointed out that Rockefeller consolidated such ill-gotten gains by systematically integrating the different areas of the oil industry both horizontally and vertically into a trust, thereby achieving an airtight level of centralized control which translated into optimal efficiency and drastically lower prices for the consumer (Gross & Forbes, 1997). Rockefeller's innovations established the template for professional business management and set the foundation for the rise of the large corporation in the American economy (Chandler, 2002). Pinpointing key areas to dominate in order to overcome opposition were to become hallmarks of how the ideology of industrialists such as Rockefeller later lent itself to achieving objectives of US domestic (Arnove, 1980, pp. 75-78) and foreign policy (Berman, 1983, p. 11)

4.1.2 Popular opposition to Rockefeller and Rockefeller's response

The alarm was raised against Rockefeller by the activist-writer Ida Tarbell, who managed to track down a copy of a book which chronicled Rockefeller's collusion with railroad companies entitled, "The rise and fall of the South Improvement Company" (1873) in the New York Public Library, despite Standard Oil's attempts to eliminate all available copies (Conway, 1993). Although the South Improvement Company had its charter suspended by the state of Pennsylvania in 1872 due to its unsavory practices (Churella, 2012), Tarbell was able to prove that Rockefeller's Standard Oil was still adhering to chicanery in 1904 when an office boy at Standard Oil passed on documents to Tarbell

through a mutual acquaintance (the boy's Sunday school teacher, who happened to also work for an oil refinery) which were records of railroads providing advance notice about competitors' oil shipments, information which enabled Rockefeller's outfit to undercut those refiners (McCully, 2014). Rockefeller in fact not only doubled down on setting up secret deals with the railroads shortly after the dissolution of the South Improvement Company (Josephson, p. 265), he and Standard Oil engaged in a variety of high pressure tactics to put competitors out of business, which if not effective in bringing about complete submission then gave way to intimidation and outright terrorist violence involving dynamite (Josephson, pp. 268-270). Once Rockefeller reached a certain stature, he simply resorted to bribing congressmen and senators to have his way (Parmar, 2012, p. 42). Tarbell's 1904 exposé (the book "The History of the Standard Oil Company" was the culmination of 19 magazine articles published from 1902 by *McClure's*) created a sensation and galvanized opposition to large monopolistic corporations, and influenced the passage of the Hepburn Act (1906), the Mann-Elkins Act (1910), the Clayton Anti-Trust Act (1914), as well as the creation of the Federal Trade Commission in 1914 (Conway, 1993). Most pertinent to Rockefeller was the US government declaring Standard Oil to be a monopoly engaging in illicit practices which warranted its dissolution (Weinberg, 2008).

In response to Tarbell's investigation, Standard Oil first attempted to threaten *McClure's* financial status with one of Rockefeller's banks (Conway, 1993, p. 209). Failing to stop Tarbell's portrayal from being published, Standard Oil became one of the first US corporations to employ public relations executives and even supported the efforts of a Harvard student who wrote a pro-Rockefeller thesis which became published as a book; Standard Oil bought up quantities of the book as well as pamphlets produced by the PR outfits and distributed them to school teachers, preachers, journalists, and other opinion leaders throughout the United States to shore up the image of its founder (Weinberg, 2008).

4.1.3 General public unrest and the US establishment

Rockefeller, despite (or perhaps on account of) becoming the richest man in the world (Hanson, Levine, & Rockefeller, 2000), had along with other industrialists and their organizations become a public target for criticism (Fellow, 2008) requiring vigorous action to sway popular sentiment. The swell of antitrust sentiment which coincided with growing opposition at the turn of the 20th century to the US government's imperialist endeavors in the Philippines and Latin America led to large activist movements during what has been termed the Progressive Era period (1890s-1920s) of American history (Buenker, Boosham, & Crunden, 1986). Particularly alarming to the US establishment at this time was the growing power of workers' unions and the strong interest amongst citizens to create communal forms of society (Quint, 1964) which are distinct from the capitalist model, a system which invariably results in the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few at the expense of the toiling masses (Shaanan, 2017). During the Progressive Era, vociferous calls for more equal representation led to measures such as the 17th Amendment to the Constitution, which allowed for the direct election of senators, as "the Senate was seen as a "millionaire's club" serving powerful private interests" (*17th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution: Direct Election of U.S. Senators, n.d.*), as well as the aforementioned laws enacted to reign in corporate trusts and monopolies (Fellow, 2013). Out of this boiling cauldron of unrest emerged a fundamental recasting of how American Progressive leaders projected their mission in guiding the nation forward.

4.1.4 US 'democracy' vs. 'republic,' and the transformation into an administrative state

American leaders have often made a large display about how concerned they are for the welfare of common people, be it during a US president's inauguration speech (Shabad, 2017, January 20), or when elected officials express their concern for another country's

citizenry as justification for a full-scale military invasion (*George Bush's address on the start of war*, 2003, March 20). However, not only have such pronouncements ultimately rung hollow (Ghilarducci, 2019, April 11; Fifield, 2013, March 18), the United States government has arguably enacted a huge case of fraud in attempting to convince both its constituents as well as foreign observers that US government policy is based upon democratic principles (Rockhill, 2017, December 13; Mounk, 2018, January 31). In fact, the US Constitution itself contains no reference to the term 'democracy,' but instead defines the United States of America as a 'republic,' whose equal rights were never intended for the majority of its citizens, and has in reality always been an institution which has privileged the class of the land-owning elites and their associates who established the terms of the United States of America (Rockhill, 2017, December 13; Landis, 2018, November 6). To state things plainly, "Since the founding of the nation, a minority of wealthy white men has always ruled, using legal and extralegal strategies to deny representation to women, people of color, immigrants, poor people and indigenous Americans…this was by design" (Landis). Thus, it was inevitable with the rise of popular anti-Establishment Progressive Era movements that Progressive U.S. leaders adjusted their interpretation of the U.S. Constitution from one which upheld the natural rights of the individual to a view which espoused the need to aid the individual in attaining his or her potential (Marini & Masugi, 2005). In what has been termed the first wave of liberalism (Marini & Masugi, p. 13), the U.S. began to transform into an administrative state which emphasized the need to abolish previous limits on government power; enlightened 'experts' who had been schooled at the top universities familiar with the most up-to-date scientific information were deemed the only people fit to lead society (Schambra & West, 2017, July 17). Such a person was Madison Grant (1865-1937), a descendant of one of the first Puritan settlers in New England who became known as a Yale and Columbia-educated lawyer, historian, and physical anthropologist (Spiro, 2009; Zubrin,

2013). Grant was well-connected to other Ivy League elite leaders such as Theodore Roosevelt, Elihu Root, and Henry Fairfield Osbourne, and worked closely with Harry H. Laughlin and members of Congress to pass the 1924 Johnson Reed Immigration Restriction Act (Samaan, 2013), which prohibited people from Southern Europe and "excluded all Asians" (including Japanese) from immigrating to the US (Immigration Act of 1924 [The Johnson-Reed Act]).

4.1.5 The US establishment's view of other races and intention to "rule [over] the less advanced nations"

Within the Social Darwinian climate of the times, Grant's assertion that it was imperative to separate, quarantine, and eventually eliminate "undesirable" traits and "worthless race types" from the human gene pool while proactively supporting the restoration of desirable traits and "worthwhile" Nordic "race types" in the U.S. and globally to ensure a positive evolution for the human race in his book, "The Passing of the Great Race" (Grant, 1901), was immensely popular both domestically and abroad and prompted Hitler to personally write a letter to Grant and proclaim, "The book is my bible" (Spiro, p. 357). Following from this, it is not surprising that Progressive leaders believed the scientifically educated elite from advanced nations (i.e. the U.S., England, and France) "should not hesitate to rule the less advanced nations in the interest of ultimately bringing the world into freedom," as the "Teutonic races must civilize the politically uncivilized…Barbaric races…may be swept away…On the same principle, interference with the affairs of states not wholly barbaric, but nevertheless incapable of effecting political organization for themselves, is fully justified," sentiments which were unambiguously supported by President Theodore Roosevelt ("every expansion of a great civilized power means a victory for law, order, and righteousness") and reflected in President Woodrow Wilson's plan for a western-centric "League of Nations, under whose rules America would have delegated control over the

deployment of its own armed forces to that body" (Schambra & West, 2017, July 17). In a similar vein, Massachusetts Senator Henry Cabot Lodge in the late 19th century was observed noting that, "The great nations are rapidly absorbing for their future expansion and their present defense all the waste places of the earth. It is a movement which makes for civilization and the advancement of the race," and in regards to this further made it clear that, "As one of the great nations of the world the United States must not fall out of the line of march" (Zinn & Damon, 1998, *A people's history of the United States Chapter 12: The empire and the people*).

4.1.6 International eugenics conferences, the Rockefeller Foundation's funding of Nazi eugenics research, US eugenics legislation, "consent of the governed"

That the sentiments expressed throughout Grant's book were taken seriously is reflected in the fact that prominent physicians, biologists, policy-funders and politicians such as Dr. E.G. Conklin of Princeton University, Dr. T.H. Morgan of Columbia University, Major Leonard Darwin (Charles Darwin's son), Henry Fairfield Osborn, Winston Churchill, The Carnegie Institute of Washington, Alexander Graham-Bell, and Rockefeller-associate and U.S. Secretary of Commerce (and later U.S. President) Herbert Hoover attended and presented at the First and Second International Eugenics Conferences held in 1912 and 1921 (Pearl, 1912; Little, 1922; Keith, 2003; Clements, 2014; Domhoff, 2019; Dyrbye, n.d.). The Second (1921) and Third (1932) International Eugenics Conferences were held in New York City's American Museum of Natural History, with the US State Department involved in mailing out invitations (Black, 2012). The Rockefeller Foundation heavily funded eugenics programs (Black) and in 1925 awarded $2.5 million to support the eugenics research program at the Munich Psychiatric Institute (Grant, 2018), which was run by Hitler's racial hygienist Ernst Rudin (Joseph & Wetzel, 2012). Rudin argued for the mass sterilization and extermination of adults and children and was funded by the Rockefeller Foundation until

1939 (Eckart, 2006). The world's first eugenics-based compulsory sterilization law passed in Indiana (1907) in fact predated the activities noted above, and led to the passing of eugenics legislation in 30 other states, which resulted in the forcible sterilization of over 64,000 individuals in the US between 1907 and 1963 (Lombardo, 2011, p. IX; Lombardo, n.d.). US leaders justified empire-building based on a eugenics view of race. Before he was elected president, Princeton political science professor Woodrow Wilson made a pronouncement in 1900 that the concept of "consent of the governed" is irrelevant to "the affairs of politically undeveloped races, which have not yet learned the rudiments of order and self-control." For Wilson, then, the "'consent' of the Filipinos and the 'consent' of the American colonists to government, for example, are two radically different things" (Hannigan, 2002, p.11), which was reinforced by the Supreme Court in its 1901 ruling that citizens living in U.S. territories had no guarantee of the rights spoken of in the Constitution (Levinson et al., 2005).

4.1.7 The joint US government and Rockefeller Foundation's (with the Carnegie Corporation et al.) effort to 'uplift American society' through social engineering, the Walsh Commission

Through the dramatic shift which saw the U.S. government change its position from one which advocated supporting the original Constitution's emphasis upon respecting the liberty of the individual to a policy which espoused the need to intervene even to the extent of advocating for the removal of certain citizens from the gene pool (Spiro, 2009; Samaan, 2013), American Progressive leaders implemented policies which dictated that the government take an active role in reforming every facet of society (West & Schambra, 2007), as they viewed the constitutional system as outdated and felt that it had to "be made into a dynamic, evolving instrument of social change, aided by scientific knowledge and the development of administrative bureaucracy" (Schambra & West, 2017, July 17). Arguably a significant component driving this quest to uplift society were philanthropic foundations

funded by leading industrialists. The Rockefeller Foundation eventually became a systematic force in programs deeply intertwined with U.S. government interests (Slaughter & Silva, 1982, p. 71; Berman, pp. 3-4, 58-59; Parmar, pp. 48-49) after Rockefeller met Frederic T. Gates (a Baptist Christian minister, educator and administrator who helped Rockefeller found Chicago University as a Baptist educational institution), as "it was Gates who conceptualized, extended, and implemented the principle of scientific benevolence for which Rockefeller became so famous" (Howe, 1982, p. 27).

The stated aim of the Rockefeller Foundation was to develop human potential and find solutions for America's and the world's most pressing problems- illness, conflict, lack of freedom, political and economic mismanagement, underdevelopment, poverty, and ignorance (Parmar, pp. 40-41). It also sought to "move charitable activities away from treating the symptoms of social problems toward…eliminating the underlying causes" through an "embrace [of] a scientific approach and to support the work of experts in many fields" in order to realize in society the elite Progressive values of "efficiency, integration, systematization, regularization, and professionalization" (Parmar, p. 60), and essentially amounted to a form of social engineering by and for the elite at the expense of "the majority, who…have little or no voice in determining the nature of the society in which they live" (Berman, p. 33). Towards this end Gates, Rockefeller, and Rockefeller's son John Rockefeller Jr. sought to secure a charter from the U.S. Congress in 1909 but had to settle for an endorsement from the State of New York in 1913 due to growing popular opposition to Rockefeller (Howe, pp. 29-30). The concurrent rise of similar industrialist-funded institutions such as the Carnegie Institution of Washington, the Carnegie Corporation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Russell Sage Foundation, the Baron de Hirsch Fund and the Cleveland Foundation (Howe, p. 34; Parmar, p. 40) raised concerns amongst the American public that

these ‘altruistic’ organizations were merely the latest means through which the elite could consolidate and strengthen their dominant position, especially in light of how workers’ movements had been violently repressed by Carnegie and Rockefeller (Howe, pp. 33-34; Parmar, p. 34). Popular outcry over the violent deaths of striking workers and their family members (Ludlow Massacre) at a Rockefeller coal mine in 1914 and ensuing conflict (Colorado Coalfield War) led President Wilson to call in federal troops (Norwood, 2002) and essentially forced a Congress-sponsored citizens’ Commission on Industrial Relations (CIR) to conduct in-depth congressional investigations and hearings (the Walsh Commission) on the philanthropic foundations noted above (Howe, p. 34). The resultant 11,224 page Final Report and Testimony in 1916 concluded that the foundations were a serious “menace” to society due to the immense wealth and influence which were concentrated in the hands of foundation leaders, and recommended legislation which would allow Congress to accurately investigate the finances and activities of the foundations, called on Congress to increase federal spending in order to match and counter balance foundation activities, and take measures to tightly control foundation activities (Howe, pp. 46-47). Despite the recommendations of the Walsh Commission, no related actions were taken until after World War II, and even so the New York State charters received by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation precluded them from federal censure in significant areas of operation (Howe, pp. 47-48).

4.1.8 Suppression of labor unions and continued work of the foundations

Thus, although on the face of things the US government appeared intent on reigning in the abuses of the elite and answer the public’s cry for reform, the reality is the foundations remained intact while the US government raided the offices of labor unions across the country in 1919 and 1920, arrested (mostly without warrants) and detained for months (without evidence of wrongdoing) more than 5000 people, then promptly deported hundreds

of immigrants who were deemed too extreme and "began compiling files on thousands of Americans suspected of holding radical political ideas" (Foner, 2017, p. 803). Meanwhile, domestically the foundations continued their work on eugenics, developed standardized tests to justify racial profiling, worked to pass legislation in 1924 banning immigrants who were associated with the aspirations of worker unions (Levin, 1976; see above), and funded campaigns in 1923 "which emphasized the urgent need to train 'the right type of colored leaders' who would help make the Negro a capable workman and a good citizen" (Berman, p. 22). It was through the foundations' work overseas in the Far East during the Progressive Era that the depth of their involvement in insuring "the private sector's dominant position in public-policy formulation" (Berman, p. 18) in advancing policies which were overwhelmingly in favor of western Anglo elite interests became readily apparent and laid bare their agenda.

As has been discussed, it was during the Progressive Era that America's pre-eminence as the de facto global economic power took shape. Concurrent with the rise of the US' commercial activities was a push to extend its political influence overseas (Brown, 1982, p. 129), which began in earnest after the US won concessions as a result of the Spanish-American War of 1898 (Perez, 2007). One of those concessions was the Philippines, which the US state viewed as a key position from which to develop their largely China-centric interests in Asia at the turn of the 20th century (Sklar & Hauser, 2017). The McKinley administration in 1900 essentially dictated that China would be spared being divided into different colonies (save for Hong Kong) as Africa had been via the enforcement of the Open Door Policy in order to place checks on competing European powers' much larger spheres of influence in China and allow the US to conduct business there on an equal footing (Hu, 1995; Sugita, 2003).

4.1.9 The Rockefeller Foundation and the profitable "light of the English-speaking people" in China and "heathen lands"

The stage was therefore set for American foundations to become involved in Chinese affairs. In 1908 John D. Rockefeller agreed with his adviser Robert Gates' suggestion that a commission headed by University of Chicago theology professor Edward D. Burton should be sent to China to explore founding a major Christian university in China, as for the first time in history, all nations "are actually open and offer a free field for the light and philanthropy of the *English speaking people*…Christian agencies…have thoroughly invaded all coasts," and, further, "Quite apart from the question of persons converted, the mere commercial results of missionary effort to our own land is worth…a thousand fold every year of what is spent on missions…viewed solely from a commercial standpoint, (missionary activity) is immensely profitable" (Brown, 1982, p. 127). So that his message would be unambiguous, Gates continued to stress that, "our import trade, traceable mainly to the channels of intercourse opened up by missionaries, is enormous. Imports from heathen lands furnish us cheaply with many of the luxuries of life… and many things…we now regard as necessities," with the further boon that "Our export trade (of American goods to those same countries) is growing by leaps and bounds. Such growth would have been utterly impossible but for the commercial conquest of foreign lands under the lead of missionary activity" (pp. 127-128).

It is interesting to note how Gates feels it is important to refer to their mission as the work of the "English speaking people," as if those who speak English are distinguished and made exceptional by virtue of being able to converse in English. His sentiments echo those of Founding Father John Adams, who proclaimed in 1780 that American English should be spread throughout the world, and insisted that the US "consider political and economic forces critical to the spread of American English" (Heath, 1983, p. 237). Also noteworthy is that

Gates and Rockefeller apparently viewed a university (as opposed to a church) as a more effective institution through which to influence people in the ways of Christian doctrine. Unfortunately for them, the newly-installed Nationalist Chinese republic authorities, who had come to power with the support of Chinese citizens via a platform that emphasized the need to address the exploitation of China by foreign entities, did not share their vision and blocked the project from becoming realized (Bowers, 1972).

4.1.10 The Rockefeller Foundation's consolidation of power and support to establish a 'Trojan Horse vehicle' in order to train Chinese leaders "who will do the things we wish to see done"

Displaying the tenacity which characterized his conquest over the oil industry, far from conceding Rockefeller doubled down and with the formation and charter from the state of New York in 1913, the Rockefeller Foundation (see above) brought to bear upon China a focus and amalgam of forces which would not be denied. The Rockefeller Foundation consolidated the previous projects Gates and Rockefeller had already started such as the Institute for Medical Research (their education foundation, termed the General Education Board [GEB] had already been incorporated by Congress in 1903) into "a single holding company which would finance any and all of the other benevolent organizations, and thus subject them to its general supervision;" it was originally envisioned by Gates as securing a "charter from Congress, thus giving it a national character and locating its principal office in the District of Columbia…The Congressional charter as planned by us was to permit limitless capital, to be national and international in scope," and to be equally limitless in its powers, as its board of trustees were to be "wholly self-perpetuating and authorized to do anything, anywhere in the world" (Howe, 1982, p. 29). Although as previously noted the Congressional charter was denied due to popular opposition, the reality is that with the New York state charter the Rockefeller Foundation proceeded in 1914 to hold an in-house conference on

China which brought together leaders of the main missionary programs operating in China, prominent China scholars, the general secretary (John Mott) of the YMCA's international committee, as well as academic advisors such as University of Chicago President Harry Pratt Judson and Harvard President Charles W. Elliot, who were both trustees of the two most prominent Rockefeller philanthropies (Brown, 1982, p. 128).

Taking into account China's political volatility at the time due to the uprising led by Sun Yat-sen's Nationalists in 1911 which culminated in the abdication of China's last emperor in 1912 (Li, 1963), geology professor Thomas C. Chamberlin of the Rockefeller-endowed University of Chicago swayed the committee with his determination that although China's instability provided an opportune time to penetrate China, the project should be politically neutral in order to be shielded from political vicissitudes and appeal to anyone regardless of their party affiliation, while James H. Franklin of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society clarified that more specifically it should be an education program of "the proper kind" in order to train Chinese leaders "who will do the things we wish to see done" (Brown, 1982, p. 129). The "proper kind" of education project which the committee settled on as being conducive to accomplishing the aims of American ambitions in China as well as the one most likely to be accepted by Chinese authorities was the creation of a western medical college in Beijing (Brown, 1982; Berman, p. 25). A medical college would provide them with an ideal Trojan Horse vehicle due to (1) its ability to convert Chinese minds in a discrete, "invisible" manner as opposed to missionaries or universities to which few objections if any would be raised on account of its promise to deliver health equally "to the palace of the rich and the hovel of the poor" (2) it had proven itself in rebellious Philippine provinces where western medical staff had been granted access previously denied to soldiers by demonstrating that "for purposes of placating primitive and suspicious peoples medicine has some advantages over machine guns," and had opened the way "for establishing industrial and regular schools" (3) western scientific medicine would improve the health of

the Chinese people and therefore secure a larger volume of cheaper raw materials for American industrialists as well as a larger market for American goods by increasing worker productivity (4) it would "inculcate industrial culture" by "train[ing] an important segment of China's managerial and professional stratum to…adopt [Western] perspectives, values, and world views…Scientific medicine would thus contribute to the industrial development of China under the guiding hand of the Western powers" (Brown, 1982, pp. 130-133).

4.1.11 Deep relations between the Rockefeller Foundation, elite academia, and the General Education Board, formation of the China Medical Board

Once the decision had been made to focus on medical education, a China Medical Commission was sent to China to gather detailed information on the state of Chinese medical facilities in order to guide the formation of a concrete plan of action regarding the specific content and location of their program (p. 133). Demonstrating the deep interweaving within Rockefeller Foundation projects between education and government, this initial China Medical Commission included the aforementioned University of Chicago president Harry P. Judson, Harvard Medical School's Francis W. Peabody, as well as the US consul-general at Hankow, Roger S. Greene, whose brother Jerome happened to be a trustee of both the Rockefeller Foundation as well as the Rockefeller-founded/Congress-incorporated General Education Board (p. 133; Baick, 2004, p. 77), which was an organization used primarily to support higher education and medical schools in the United States (Gates, F.T., 1912). The China Medical Commission's recommendations to insert their programs into Beijing's missionary-founded Union Medical College (from here referred to as the Peking Union Medical College so as to be consistent with other academic references, which keep the old-style English spelling of this institution) and secularize its operations (the six missionary societies which ran the college were paid off to relinquish control to Rockefeller's group)

were ratified on November 30th, 1914, and led to the formation of the China Medical Board (CMB). Conceived of as "subsidiary of the foundation to conduct all Rockefeller medical aid programs in China," the Hankow consul-general Roger S. Greene was designated the resident director, the executive officer of the General Education Board (Wallace Buttrick) was named the first director, while Rockefeller's eldest son, John D. Rockefeller Jr. was appointed as the first chairman (Brown, 1982, pp. 133-134; Baick, p. 78).

4.1.12 The China Medical Board "prepared to pay any price…to convert their boards at home, and the people behind their boards," establishment of 'English-only' policy, American foundation programs and US foreign policy

In order to ensure that their project would take root and proceed from an advantageous position, another "even more illustrious" China Medical Commission was put together (including the celebrated education reformer William H. Welch as well as Simon Flexnor, the director of the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research) and sent to China to garnish further support for the project as well as to "gather more information, make more detailed recommendations…(for) admissions requirements and…curriculum, (and) win complete cooperation from missionaries in China" (Brown, 1982, p. 134). This second commission paved the way for the final stage of constructing additional buildings and facilities along with setting up the details pertinent to the needs of administration and faculty, so that in the fall of 1921, 13 years after Gates and Rockefeller, Sr. sent their first exploratory team, the formal dedication of the Peking Union Medical College (PUMC) was finally held (Bowers, 1972; Iacobelli, 2022). The unrelenting determination to see this project through to its launch reflects the primacy with which US authorities viewed China as "the key to the world's future" (Baick, p. 69), which explains why the CMB was "prepared to pay any price…For we intended not only to found scientific medicine in the hearts of the missionary doctors but through them to convert their boards at home, and the people behind their

boards'' in order that "the missionary boards themselves would (eventually) demand and support scientific medicine in China and elsewhere" (Baick, p. 84).

Once Rockefeller's project became a reality in Beijing, the Chinese were confronted with a condition which they hadn't prepared for- the foundation proclaimed that all of the classes were to be conducted in English (Iacobelli, 2022), which was "perhaps the most controversial policy decision the foundation had to make" (Brown, 1982, p. 135). This insistence upon instruction in English contradicted the medical instruction in Chinese policy at the other more accessible, admission-friendly American missionary medical schools and placed the PUMC in the same category as the imperialist-tinged French, German, and Japanese-run medical schools, who "viewed the use of their languages as an inherent element in their imperialist designs" (Bowers, 1974, pp. 458, 464), to which great opposition was raised by both informed Chinese and missionary medical school faculty, seeing as they viewed addressing "the present needs of China in the shortest possible time" as the most urgent concern (Brown, 1982, p. 135).

Such inflexible determination to stick to an 'English only' policy despite the huge deficit which would result in terms of the number of physicians who would receive training at the PUMC (and therefore the number of Chinese patients who would receive their treatment) speaks volumes about the stress the foundation was applying to the importance of North American English as representative of the US and its intended effects in "creating a Western-oriented medical elite" via the "proper type of education" which would train Chinese leaders to "do the things we wish to see done" (Brown, 1982, pp. 129, 136). It also foreshadowed related policies which were to be implemented by the Rockefeller foundation after the war in Japan as well as around the world by the US Information Agency, which often worked closely with the foundation as part of the US' post-WWII policy of indoctrinating influential members of foreign communities who would actively spread American values of democracy

and capitalism (Matsuda, p. 80). Stated simply, “foundation programs were designed to further the foreign policy interests of the United States”, and have actively impacted their intended targets as they have been largely unopposed by an unsuspecting public, being organized outside of the channels of public state policy via privately-funded educational and cultural projects which have served to “complement the cruder and more overt forms of economic and military imperialism that are so easily identifiable” (Berman, p. 3).

4.1.13 Mandated ‘English-only’ policy abroad and domestically

The fact that Rockefeller Foundation policy mandated English language instruction in PUMC’s classes reflected not only American foreign policies tied to the push for US expansion abroad, but also accurately characterized US domestic language policies at the time. After the US declared it was entering World War I in 1917, US officials began to enact policies which first banned the speaking of German, then extended these measures to include all foreign languages, a situation summed up by Iowa state governor William Lloyd Harding’s statement in the New York Times in June 1918 that “English should and must be the only medium of instruction in public, private, denominational, other similar schools. Conversation in public places, on trains, and over the telephone should be in the English language” (Baron, 1990). Between 1917 and 1923, 21 states banned the use of any foreign language in all schools (public, private, or parochial) both as a medium of instruction and as a separate subject for study for elementary grade students (Knowlton Flanders, 1925). This development was foreshadowed by the Wisconsin and Illinois legislation in the 1880’s which stipulated only English instruction for both public and parochial schools, the banning of the Hawaiian language in 1896 along with the injunction that only English could be the medium of instruction in Hawaii’s schools (Hawaii DOE), as well as an ‘only in English’ classroom mandate by US authorities in Puerto Rico in 1902 and in the Philippines following its annexation by the US in 1899 (Crawford, 2001). Not surprisingly, the intensive circa World

War I (WWI) Americanization campaign was "funded entirely by…'philanthropists,' that is, by (capitalist) financiers and industrialists" who had been spooked by "the revolutionary potential of immigrant workers, as exemplified in the Lawrence, Massachusetts textile strike of 1912" and continued after WWI, as "Suspicion toward foreign tongues…deepened during the postwar Red Scare…It was during this time period that, for the first time, an ideological link was established between speaking 'good English' and being a 'good American'" (Crawford, pp. 20-21), although as we have seen, seeds planted during the 18thth century had already begun to sprout in the 19thth century.

4.1.14 The Rockefeller Foundation as "the principal source for funding public opinion and psychological warfare research," support for Yale research which advocated war, Nelson A. Rockefeller and the creation of the CIA/ US Information Agency

As discussed previously, Rockefeller's Standard Oil was one of the first corporations to employ public relations executives at the beginning of the 20th century to shore up its image due to massive public opposition. In fact, the Rockefeller Foundation became a driving force within the field of research related to assessing and influencing public opinion. After World War One (WWI), matters progressed to the point that the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) "was the principal source for funding public opinion and psychological warfare research between the late 1930's and the end of World War Two…most of the money for such research came from this powerful organization" due to the fact that the RF "recognized the importance of ascertaining and steering public opinion in the immediate prewar years" despite there being "limited government and corporate interest or support of propaganda-related studies" at this time (Tracy, 2012). The US government's reticence to involve itself in a formal overseas propaganda program stemmed in large part from the American public's desire to remain neutral at the outset of the second World War due to disillusionment with the outcome of WWI (US Department of State, n.d.). As the RF funded research both internally

and at Yale which advocated active involvement in war in order to secure markets and resources as part of a 'hard-edged' Realist perspective on global political and economic affairs (Berman, pp. 43-48; Parmar, pp. 68-74), it is not surprising that Nelson A. Rockefeller (one of John D., Sr.'s grandsons) "set up Washington's first significant official cultural and information operations abroad' (Dizard, p. 10). Along with former RF employee William Donovan (Waller, 2011, p. 18), Nelson A. Rockefeller created the programs which gave rise to the CIA as well as the Office of War Information, which would later be renamed the United States Information Agency (USIA), whose primary task as the US' official office of public diplomacy from 1953-1999 (Snyder, 1995) was to sway the hearts and minds of foreign citizens to a pro-US orientation (Dizard, pp. 9-13).

4.1.15 Influence of N. Rockefeller and the Rockefeller Foundation on academic think tanks and the US government

From this outcome, it is possible to observe a couple of things. First of all, despite not having held any related public position, Nelson A. Rockefeller (N. Rockefeller) was appointed as the head of US public affairs for all of Latin America by President Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR) in 1940 due largely to N. Rockefeller's lobbying efforts (Cramer & Prutsch, 2006; Dizard, pp. 9-13). The fact that N. Rockefeller served as a Rockefeller Center board member from 1931 and as its president/chairman from 1938-1958 while overseeing the initial Roosevelt-designated position as well as other subsequent federal positions related to US-Latin American affairs determined by US presidents from 1940-1958 illustrates how Rockefeller interests (both N. Rockefeller and the RF had already started various Latin American projects prior to N. Rockefeller's 1940 federal appointment) significantly interacted with and even directed US state endeavors (Dowie, 2002, pp. 105-140; Dizard, pp. 9-13; Parmar, pp. 183-189). Another Rockefeller Foundation project amply illustrates this. Started in 1939 and entirely funded privately by the RF on the recommendation of the State

Department due to its "politically sensitive character" (Parmar, p. 77) until its completion at the end of WWII (Schulzinger, 1984, p. 61), the Council on Foreign Relations think tank's War-Peace Studies Project (WPS) was a "massive research effort that involved almost one hundred leading academics" whose discussions and conclusions were forwarded directly to the State Department and President Roosevelt (Parmar, p. 77), and as alluded to above was in fact an "unprecedented secret collaboration" between the State Department and a privately-funded think tank (Barnes, 2017, p. 63). The Rockefeller Foundation also funded the Institute of Pacific Relations, which after being established in Honolulu in 1925 was charged with gathering information on the major Asian and Pacific countries in order to support "a greater American role in global affairs" (Barnes, p. 63). The War-Peace Studies Project centered on three major themes related to a vision of the US' role in a post-WWII world: (1) the availability of sources of raw materials vital to US economic expansion and American security concerns need to be maintained/procured and protected (2) living standards of European citizens as well as those of underdeveloped countries should be raised in order to promote profitable US corporate expansion and productive overseas financial investment (3) these goals can only be realized within a world which adheres to US capitalist policies (Berman, pp. 41-42).

Related to the first theme, a memorandum issued to the State Department and President Roosevelt in October 1940 stated that after the war's conclusion at minimum initially the US would require "free access to markets and raw materials in the British Empire, the Far East, and the entire Western hemisphere" (Shoup & Minter, 2004, p. 128). Another memorandum sent during the summer of 1941 (prior to the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor) made it clear that if Japan and certain areas which the Japanese had designs on at that time (the Dutch East Indies and China) were not co-opted into a postwar US-friendly economic union, essential imports such as tin, jute, rubber and vegetable oils would be put at

risk, as would the export of American goods to those vast markets (Shoup & Minter, p. 136). These sentiments were in line with the Rockefeller-funded American Committee for International Studies' research director and Princeton professor Edward Mead Earle's suggestion that the American public needed to develop a "war mind" and a foreign policy (stated by Earle in 1938) which urged a study of the US' military position in the Far East, as well as the RF-founded (1935) Yale Institute of International Study's Nicholas J. Spykman's pre-Pearl Harbor argument that "American interests demanded intervention in the war to restore the balance of power in Eurasia" (Thompson, 1992, p. 401). Roosevelt's administration established an embargo on oil supplies to Japan on August 1, 1941 following Roosevelt's executive order to freeze all Japanese assets on July 26, 1941 (Worth, Jr., 1995; Bix, 2016, p. 401), a decision which left Japanese authorities feeling that war with the US was inevitable (Worth, Jr., 1995; Evans & Peattie, 2015).

4.1.16 The Rockefeller Foundation and the CIA, American Eastern Establishment

A second striking phenomenon related to the discussion above is the fact that Rockefeller Foundation-affiliated William Donovan lobbied for and then was tasked with creating the precursor to the CIA, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). Not only did Donovan set up his offices in Manhattan's Rockefeller Center in room 3603 a floor above the British spy agency's MI6's New York base (Waller, p. 352), he then recruited Allen Dulles (the former director of the aforementioned Rockefeller-funded Council of Foreign Relations) to be the OSS director; after WWII, Dulles was incorporated into the CIA and rose to Deputy Director in 1951, then became head of the CIA in 1952 (Waller, pp. 360-363). It should also be noted that Donovan, Dulles (both Alan and his brother John, who worked closely with John D. Rockefeller III in post-war Japan; see 4.2 below), the Rockefellers, Theodore and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as well as the majority of the figures discussed so far, are from the east coast and belong to the American Eastern Establishment (Halberstam, 1994), in other

words “men drawn largely from the leading financial and business institutions, law firms, Ivy League universities, major philanthropic foundations, and communications media of the East coast, who take a particular interest in…the direction of twentieth-century American foreign affairs” (Roberts, 1983). The two men (see below) representing this group’s interests in post-war Japan understandably exerted significant influence on the formation of the Japanese state after the end of WWII, reverberations of which are felt to the present day.

4.2 Consolidating American power in Japan after World War II Restoration of Japanese Imperial power

From 1945-1947, the Occupation authorities groomed Japan to be a country receptive to peaceful democratic ideas through such measures as demilitarization, stated intent to instigate the breakup of the large ‘zaibatsu’ conglomerates and banks who had actively funded Japan’s war effort, the blacklisting of prominent right-wing nationalists, arresting alleged Class A war criminals, the dissolution of restraints on political expression, allowing for the formation of labor unions, giving woman the right to vote, and land reform (Dower, p. 82). At this time American planners still believed the US-funded Nationalists in China would prevail over Mao Tse-tung, and would therefore take on the central role of leading Asia in a manner sympathetic to US geopolitical interests; within this construct it was expected that Japan would obediently fall into line with an American-empowered China, who would take on the role of policing Japan (Barnes, pp. 12, 148).

However, with Mao’s victory came what has become known as ‘the reverse course’ (1948-1951), in which Occupation authorities put Japan on a drastically different course through such actions as rolling back civil liberties (i.e. forcibly removing journalists, broadcasters and people involved in the film industry who were perceived as too left-leaning), reinstating formerly purged right-wing conservatives, withdrawing the right to

strike, actively working with conservative politicians and corporate managers to weaken worker solidarity (i.e. fostering the conditions which led to the firing of 11,000 activist union members between 1949 and 1950), leaving many conglomerates and their associate banks intact, and rearming/remilitarizing Japan without constitutional revision (Cumings, 1993; Dower, p. 547, pp. 271-272, 432-440). In essence, the US was now frantic to cast Japan in the role originally envisioned for China (Cumings, 1993; Saeki, 2007). Owing to this, the initial impetus to eradicate the structures which had led to Japan's militarization was now abandoned; this then allowed for the emergence of a new, extremely powerful conservative bureaucracy. This "occupation structure, jerry built on the pre-surrender state's own ponderous wartime bureaucracy" (Dower, p. 546), is "dominated by so-called 'keiretsu'…powerful groupings of commercial and industrial enterprises that essentially replaced (without doing away with) the zaibatsu…By the 1950s, six such major concentrations of economic power had emerged…Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Fuji, Daiichi, and Sanwa" (Dower, p. 545), all of which except for Sanwa were reconfigurations of the 'zaibatsu.'

4.2.1 Kishi Nobusuke and one-party 'democracy'

To ensure that a pro-American climate would persist down to the present day, US authorities engineered Japan's political environment by releasing well-connected individuals who were accused of war crimes from prison on the condition that they agreed to use their influence to lead Japan in a pro-US direction in the post-war era. Along with people such as criminal syndicate godfather Kodama Yoshio and other members of the imperialist elite, class A war criminal Kishi Nobusuke (the grandfather of Japan's current Prime Minister Shinzo Abe) was released from Sugamo prison and became Prime Minister after World War II (Seagrave & Seagrave, 2003), aided in his second ascent to a lofty government position by the generous funds supplied to him by the CIA (Gibney, 2015). In his first tenure in the

Japanese government as deputy minister of industrial development in Manchuria during World War II, it was Kishi who had made the decision to staff Japanese factories with Chinese and Korean slave labor ("between ten and twelve million") via the rationale that Chinese people were mentally more similar to dogs than people (Driscoll, 2010, p. 19; p. 266).

Kishi also viewed Chinese and Korean women as "disposable bodies" that were useful for the Japanese military and had no compunction about them being made to serve as 'comfort women' (Driscoll, pp. 307-308). These examples of Kishi's policies are brought to light here as they illustrate his technocratic approach to administration, through which "Nobusuke's colonial labor policy promised to deliver nearly free Chinese labor and guaranteed revenue streams to capitalists and war profiteers" (Driscoll, p. 299) such as Ayukawa Yoshisuke, the CEO of Nissan (Driscoll, p. 260). Here one cannot but be reminded of the *karoshi* (death by overwork) phenomena which Japan's working culture has become famous for under the guidance of the Japanese government (Hunt, 2021), and the fact that although under Prime Minister Abe corporate profits increased greatly, wages for normal working people did not share in the huge monetary perks which were reserved for a few select upper management personnel (Lee, Y.N., 2020; Yokoyama, Kodama, & Higuchi, 2016). People in general also seem to be unaware that there is actually a surprisingly high degree of poverty in Japan which remains hidden and not spoken of (Smith, N., 2019; Emmott, 2020). The pro-US Liberal Democratic Party (L.D.P.) still in power today (they have continuously ruled Japan since the end of WWII except for two brief intervals totaling roughly 4 years) was in fact installed by the US via the CIA and collaborators such as Kishi, a decision that a leading Japan scholar at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology notes has led to consequences which make us "look at the L.D.P. and say it's corrupt and it's

unfortunate to have a one-party democracy. But we have played a role in creating that misshapen structure" (Weiner, 1994).

4.2.2 Post-war Japanese educational policy and the use of the mass media

Having restored to power members of the pre-war establishment who were beholden to them for their freedom, the US government along with their Japanese partners set their stamp upon Japan's educational system. Japan's educational policies, which inculcated views consistent with conservative American interests, were implemented in order to secure US financial aid (Nishino, 2011). The ultimate goal of the US planners was to "completely dismantle the old system and replace it with a new system based on American values" (Lagotte, 2003, p. 241). The objective, "as explained in the U.S. policy papers, was to 'effect changes in certain ideologies and ways of thinking of the individual Japanese' by using 'all possible media and channels'" (Tsuchiya, 2002, p. 194). Shoriki Matsutaro, another former class-A war criminal released and supported by the CIA, used his connections to create Japan's first privatized television station (Nippon Television Corporation), which proved to be a boon to US planners as US-positive content was disseminated throughout the nation via Nippon TV as well as through Shoriki's Yomiuri newspaper (日本テレビとCIA－発掘された正力ファイル, 2006). So effective was the pairing of the CIA with Shoriki in the area of psychological manipulation that along with Walt Disney's animation ("Our Friend, The Atom" was broadcast on Nippon TV) they were able to shift Japanese public opinion from revulsion at the horrors of the Hiroshima/Nagasaki nuclear holocaust to acceptance of the construction of nuclear power stations in their country, which was a big financial success for US corporate giants GE and Westinghouse ("Tepco's 'deal with the devil,'" 2011).

4.2.3 The Dulles and Rockefeller brothers

On January 25, 1951, President Truman appointed John Foster Dulles to serve as his special envoy in Japan as head of the "Dulles Peace Mission;" Dulles (older brother of fellow Princeton graduate and CIA director Allen) then brought John D. Rockefeller III (himself a Princeton alumni and elder brother of Nelson) in to work for the peace mission as a cultural affairs consultant (Matsuda, 2007, pp. 4, 96). John D. Rockefeller III (J.D. Rockefeller III) was well-acquainted with John Foster Dulles as he was an in-law of the Rockefeller family, had been a Rockefeller Foundation trustee since 1935, became the appointed chair of the board of trustees in 1950, and led the foundation until becoming President Eisenhower's secretary of state in 1953; in the course of seeing each other frequently over the years a close relationship had been forged between the two men (Harr & Johnson, 1988, p. 505). Confirmation of the high level of interaction between the three Rockefeller brothers (J.D. Rockefeller III, Nelson, and David) and the Dulles siblings can be found in the fact that David had been close with Allen since his college days, as well as the state of circumstances which led to Allen situating his OSS office in the Rockefeller center (Strodes, 1999, pp. 207, 210). The Rockefeller brothers themselves held frequent family meetings in Rockefeller Center's Room 5600 to keep each other informed about their various projects (Harr & Johnson, 1988, pp. 530-531; Rockefeller, 2002, p. 149). The importance of J.D. Rockefeller III as cultural affairs consultant in Japan will be examined after due consideration is given to the considerable effect that MacArthur had upon the Japanese people.

4.2.4 MacArthur and the beginning of cultural reproduction

Takeshi Matsuda, the vice president and professor of American history at the Osaka University of Foreign Studies, has observed that during the post-WWII period, one way in which America imposed its culture on the Japanese people was via the sheer volume of

people and information which streamed into Japan in a unilateral manner, especially during the American military occupation of Japan headed by General Douglas MacArthur from 1945-1952 (Clayton, 1985; Masuda, 2007, p. 5). The impact that MacArthur as the top representative of the conquering nation had on the Japanese people cannot be underestimated. MacArthur set the tone in his administration policy on September 15, 1945, in which he specified that (1) The Japanese people were to understand that Japan is never considered to be equal to the Allied Powers in any conceivable way (2) Japan is a defeated enemy (3) the supreme commander-in-chief (MacArthur) issues orders to the Japanese government, and obedience is the only option, as negotiation is only possible between equals (Kitahara, 1989, p. 21). MacArthur then leveraged this powerful position by declaring that food would not be requisitioned from Japan for the occupation forces, and further that the US would provide food for the war-stricken Japanese population, which led to Japanese people accepting MacArthur as a benevolent ruler (Kitahara, pp. 22-23). Through control of the press, MacArthur and the US occupying forces in Japan (SCAP, or Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers) were able to elevate MacArthur even above the Japanese Emperor in the minds of the Japanese people by ordering (against the protestations of Japanese officials) the publication of the now well-known photo of the much taller MacArthur standing in a relaxed manner next to the formally-dressed, obviously tense and relatively frail Emperor Hirohito. Via the SCAP-monitored mass media and education system, “the Americans were presented as the model human beings, and the Japanese were taught and encouraged to become like them” (Kitahara, p. 23), with MacArthur as “a symbolic father figure” (p. 22) with whom Japanese women wanted to have children and still others desired as the President of Japan, reflecting a process where Japanese people began to identify with MacArthur (Kitahara, p. 24) and, in Bourdieu’s terms, thereby beginning the process of cultural reproduction.

4.2.5 Implementation of soft power via the Rockefeller "United States-Japanese Cultural Relations" report and US psychological warfare

Yet it was arguably through the more subtle, J.D. Rockefeller III-endorsed 'two-way street' approach that US planners were able to exact a much deeper and lasting penetration of the Japanese psyche via calculated cultural and educational exchange programs that were enacted by the US government in tandem with "the massive global activities of private groups, which emerged as the largest force influencing America's ideological impact abroad…broadly defined, (they) encompassed the mass media, the advertising industry, and cultural and educational institutions…whose agendas included concern about overseas public opinion" (Dizard, p. 5; Matsuda, p. 5). Providing guidance for this strategy was the document that Rockefeller submitted to John Foster Dulles titled "United States-Japanese Cultural Relations" (hitherto referred to as the Rockefeller report) which was drafted in 1951 by J.D. Rockefeller III along with a panel of Japan experts. Among them were Charles Fahs, a scholar who used a grant from the RF's General Education Board to study Japanese in Kyoto, taught at Pomona college, worked for the OSS (precursor of the CIA) during World War II and later served as assistant director at the RF; Eileen R. Donovan, who represented the State Department's Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs and had attended the Harvard Graduate School of Public Administration (now the JFK School of Government) as a Foreign Service Institute Fellow; Sir George Sansom, British diplomat and esteemed Japan scholar-professor at Columbia University; Columbia University's Far Eastern Institute professor Hugh Borton; Douglas W. Overton, who worked as a professor at Rikkyo University before becoming a diplomat in the US consulate in Yokohama; and Edwin Reischauer, a Harvard University professor who would later be appointed as the US ambassador to Japan (Lowrie, 1998; Matsuda, p.111; Kapur, 2018; Rockefeller Archive Center). The Rockefeller report served as the foundation for US cultural foreign policy in post-war Japan and was created to manifest a plan of action which could decisively sway the opinion of the Japanese people, given that the

majority of them remained undecided about where their true sympathies lay. J.D. Rockefeller III and the Rockefeller report panel wrote while conscious of the supposition that "our battle with Communist ideology will revolve around this large middle-of-the-road group" (Matsuda, p. 111). The Rockefeller report stated that US planners ought to view the Japanese as two distinct entities: intellectual leaders, i.e. "scientists, government and educational authorities, journalists, capitalists, military leaders, and religious leaders," and "Broad groups such as the farm and rural population, labor, professional groups, women, and youth" (p. 114), with the former group being weighted more heavily (p. 116), although it appears efforts were made to persuade all strata of Japanese society. The US Information and Education Service programs, established in 1948 to oversee US cultural policy in the post-SCAP era (pp. 98-99), were to focus on the two categories of Japanese people separately, with intellectual leaders being targeted with "cumulative cultural programs such as cultural exchanges and person-to-person exchanges," while the broad groups were to be "reached through the 'interchange of information' by means of the immediate-impact media such as the press, radio, and motion pictures" (p. 114).

As stated by former US State Department Foreign Service officer Wilson P. Dizard, Jr., the US has waged Machiavellian ideological warfare through "the sophisticated use of information and cultural resources to support national interests" since 1940 as a fact of modern international politics, with its "massive domestic networks of private information and cultural enterprises- from Hollywood to Harvard- that no other society could match" which play upon "a mythic perception of a far-off country whose citizens are acquiring what the rest of the world thinks it wants" in its quest to achieve "the most elusive of human acts-changing someone else's mind" (Dizard, 2004, pp. 1-3, p. 5, p. 22). The political scientist Joseph Nye, Jr. has observed that the US has adopted an approach of persuading other countries to do

what they require through what he has termed “soft power” (see above) or skillful use of culture, ideology, and institutions (Nye, 2002, p. 9). Professor Matsuda has concluded that the US used soft power in Japan to “develop human resources in Japan, especially a leadership group…who understood America and its foreign policy objectives…The (pro-American) Japanese elite were expected to enlighten the Japanese population” in order to gain the support the United States was seeking to further its long-term objectives throughout Asia and the hot and cold wars it expected to wage there to meet these objectives (Matsuda, pp. 42, 77-79, 210).

The “leadership group” which Professor Matsuda refers to and discusses are those elites at top-ranked Japanese universities who the US supported with generous foundation grants and programs such as the Fulbright fellowship, whose creation in 1946 was “intended to provide the rest of the world with US cultural emissaries who would serve as living examples of democracy and capitalism” and brought foreign scholars to the US “so they would have the opportunity to be directly inculcated into the American way of life” (Matsuda, p. 80). Another approach which J. Rockefeller III recommended in the 1951 Rockefeller report on US-Japan cultural relations (created with aid and oversight from the US State Department, US and UK diplomats, and professors associated with Columbia and Rikkyo University) resulted in the implementation of five key initiatives which targeted Japanese intellectual leaders: (1) the creation of a cultural center in Tokyo (2) the creation of an international house for students in Kyoto and Tokyo, where students would have access to American books and materials (a Rockefeller-funded cultural center/international house is still actively present in the Tokyo Roppongi area and is known as International House Japan (https://www.i-house.or.jp/eng/history/index.html) (3) further commitment to exchange programs for students and national leaders (4) establishment of a material interchange program emphasizing the donation of books by the US government to Japanese schools and

libraries, and allowing for projects such as exhibits of Japanese art in the US (5) the development of a large-scale English-language-instruction program (p. 116). The rationale for an approach which focused on Japanese intellectuals that "would yield the maximum results" (p. 116) is that "Japanese intellectuals enjoyed authoritarian positions in the organization and communication of groups" and that therefore "mass groups in Japan tended to be guided and influenced by the leadership of intellectuals" in Japan's elitist, Confucian-influenced society; it was therefore deemed an effective way to positively spread American propaganda (p. 115).

4.3 Prioritizing American English in Japan as part of the US post-war program for Japan

The explicit reference in the Rockefeller report that stated the primacy of creating an extensive program of English-language instruction unambiguously confirms that this was an official focus of US foreign policy in Japan. Its prominence here was reinforced by the formal program of English language activities carried out by the United States Information Agency (USIA) in foreign countries (where it was known as the United States Information Service, or USIS) to sway those citizens to a pro-US stance through what former USIA/State Department officer Wilson P. Dizard, Jr. refers to as psychological warfare, which the USIS based on studies (often Rockefeller-funded) detailing how to influence public opinion (Dizard, pp. XI, 19, 32). In addition to broadcasting the Voice of America radio network, distributing books and other printed materials, maintaining a global library network, creating thousands of in-house produced documentary films, newsreels, and television dramas (including soap operas), and administering exchange programs which brought millions to the US, the USIA engaged in the "largest English-teaching program (abroad) ever mounted" (p. 4). The USIA utilized the Voice of America radio broadcast to promote English "at the mass level," offered

its listeners free English dictionaries, and made scripts along with taped recordings of the broadcasts available to schools. The USIA also created an English-teaching division in the 1950's to prepare English teaching materials and began training tens of thousands of overseas local English teachers abroad in the 1960's through specially-designed seminars; in 1963 it began publishing the *English Teaching Forum,* which is a quarterly publication that was mailed to over eighty thousand overseas local English instructors, and is still made available at a State Department web site (p. 182). As far as J. D. Rockefeller III was concerned, "an extensive program of *English-language instruction* (Professor Matsuda's italics) in Japan was an absolute necessity," a sentiment which was given further credence by a USIS-Japan evaluation report which "emphasized the potentialities of an English-language teaching program" that would "open for the infiltration of sound American ideas by ostensibly assisting in improving English-language teaching techniques" (Matsuda, pp. 117-118). Cultural centers staffed by qualified English-language teaching specialists could "have a long-term effect by making use of the opportunities for affecting textbook writing and introducing well-selected American materials," for the "great potential in that field lay in the receptivity in every segment of Japanese life to the learning of English" (p. 118). The link between the learning of English and indoctrination into American ideology is further explicated by the fact that the original intention was for the USIS English classes to eventually be converted to discussion groups which focused on American studies, as the teaching of English, "the mother tongue of modern democracy and freedom," was "part of the ideological projection of US strategic interests" (Dizard, p. 181; Matsuda, p. 118).

4.3.1 The utilization of Hollywood films and related media to imprint American culture and American English as spoken by white native speakers onto the Japanese psyche

In designing their program for Japan, John Foster Dulles (in conjunction with Saxton E. Bradford, the head of the State Department's US Information and Education Service

working out of the US embassy in Tokyo) concluded that in addition to providing more security and improving economic conditions for the Japanese in post-war Japan, the best way to persuade Japanese people would be "to introduce measures designed to change the culture-bound attitude of the Japanese and their subconscious motivations, something that could not be achieved by rational appeal" (Matsuda, p. 81). One such measure as discussed above was to 'develop human resources' amongst the elite of Japanese intellectual society. Another approach which the US aggressively utilized was the distribution of materials which would deeply impress facets of American culture upon the Japanese subconscious. In addition to USIA-produced documentary films, newsreels, and television dramas, US authorities worked intimately with Hollywood to develop films which would serve as cultural ambassadors abroad. A 1944 US State Department memorandum entitled, 'American Motion Pictures in the Post-War World' "urged foreign ambassadors to provide advice and assistance to the Hollywood studios" (Moody, 2017, p. 3) in order to ensure "that the pictures distributed abroad will reflect credit on the good name and reputation of this country and its institution" (Trumpbour, 2007, p. 89).

Regarding Japan, Professor Jennifer Coates has found that "The offices of SCAP (Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers, the organization administering the US command of Japan from 1945-1952) headed by General Douglas MacArthur, explicitly positioned the cinema as a means to change audience behaviors and ideologies in everyday life…Cinema content was developed…with the goal of fundamentally reforming the Japanese way of life" (2017, p. 591), and that Hollywood films had deeply affected Japanese viewers and altered their innermost feelings and perspectives (p. 595). The use of Hollywood movies was but one facet of post-war "American involvement on a broad scale in reorienting virtually every aspect of Japanese citizenry, including education, cinema, drama, radio, parent-teacher

associations, libraries, sports programs, transportation, publishing, and numerous other seemingly insignificant aspects of daily life" (Kushner & Masaharu, 2005, p. 29).

So overwhelming was the effect of American films on the Japanese people that Donald Nugent, SCAP chief of Civil Information and Education, was prompted to exclaim "I am happy to say that the motion picture branch of our section has played an important part in the rebuilding of Japan" (Tsuchiya, 2009, p. 209). This phenomenon was greatly aided by the fact that SCAP's intimate dealings with Hollywood ensured that Hollywood films, represented by the Hollywood-sponsored Motion Picture Export Association (MPEA), was heavily privileged over other foreign film distributors, and therefore took over the lion's share of Japan's post-war foreign cinema market. In return, "Hollywood studios routinely submitted scripts and prints to the Office of War Information, which offered 'instructions' and 'suggestions' to enhance the US government's information campaign" (Kitamura, 2012, p. 142). Researchers have found that Japanese students are motivated to learn English due to the influence of English-language movies (Kimura, Nakata, & Okamura, 2001; Kelly, 2005; Piller & Takahashi, 2006), which may be linked to the omnipresence of Hollywood films in Japan (Blair, 2019). Particularly striking is Piller and Takahashi's conclusion that "Hollywood movies have widely become ELL (English language learning) 'textbooks', teaching not only English, but also providing guidance in matters of love and sex" (2006, p. 66). Hollywood movies, as an agent which has promoted the *akogare* (desire) for English-language learning, has greatly aided in the process which has resulted in Japanese people identifying themselves with American English as an integral part of their core identity, which serves to affirm themselves as a thoroughly modern, 'authentic' Japanese person, even if they are not particularly proficient in speaking, or even do not particularly always like, English (Kubota, 1998, 2002; Piller & Takahashi, 2006; Seargeant, 2009; Piller, Takahashi, & Watanabe, 2010; Toh, 2015). With the measures detailed above, US authorities and their

collaborators in Hollywood and a myriad of corporate/cultural/educational institutions were able to thrust American English deep into the Japanese collective.

The Hollywood images which carried American English deep into the Japanese psyche were populated with actors who were predominantly white. It has been noted that from its inception Hollywood has established a Caucasian-centric narrative where white people are of central import, reflecting the "procrustean forcing of cultural heterogeneity into a single paradigmatic perspective in which Europe is seen as the unique source of meaning, the world's center of gravity, as ontological 'reality to the rest of the world's shadow" (Shohat & Stam quoted in Bernardi, 1996, p.4), as "US cinema has consistently constructed whiteness, the representational and narrative form of Eurocentrism, as the norm by which all "Others" fail by comparison (Bernardi, p. 5).

Despite calls for measures to rectify this situation, Hollywood continues to be dominated by films which depict stories about "a straight white man made by a filmmaker who is also straight, white, and male" (Lang, 2020), reflecting the observation that in actuality Hollywood remains as "white, straight, and male as ever" (Salam, 2018; see also Molina-Guzman, 2016). Although compared to the past there have been gains in the representation of people of color notably on American television, according to the 2020 UCLA Annual Diversity Report, similar to "Hollywood studios TV executive ranks are still dominated by white men" (Nakamura, 2020). This has prompted the observation that the underrepresentation of people of color at the executive level is problematic as "even if there are more people of color in acting roles...their characters' storylines may lack authenticity or will be written stereotypically or even 'raceless' if the disparity continues" due to the fact that "Just as with film, it's those at the top of the television industry who have the most power to foster talent and invest in programming" (Ramon quoted in Nakamura, 2020). This state of affairs also extends to the production of US documentary films, where "findings suggest an

overall portrait of high-level non-fiction storytelling that largely does not reflect a diversity of viewpoints on screen; on-screen portrayals, after all, are reflected by the power dynamics and decision-making ability of those who create the stories," an insight which leads Borum Chattoo to conclude "Given that documentary storytelling at the highest level overwhelmingly reflects the lens of White, male creative decision-makers, the perspectives of...marginalized racial and ethnic groups barely register" (Borum Chattoo, 2018, p. 394).

4.4 American conception of the Japanese mind as a 'problem'

The main objective of this re-orienting Japanese people to a US-friendly perspective "did not aim at (creating) any truly democratic society. As historian Charles S. Maier argues, the U.S. viewed the post-war world as 'a tabula rasa' where it could build a 'consensual American hegemony'" (Tsuchiya, p. 194), where the terms are set by the conquerors, who have come to re-educate the fundamentally-flawed non-western natives. Concrete evidence of this can be viewed in the US propaganda film entitled, "Our Job in Japan," in which the narrator makes it clear that within the 'Japanese brain' so-called 'bad thoughts' need to be replaced by "modern, civilized sense," as it was the aim of the US Occupation (1945-1952) to "remold the Japanese…recast them in our mold" (Pacific Century, 3:18-4:15). This attitude was reflected in the general American eugenics-influenced collective view of Asian people as a "yellow peril" (Barnes, 2017, p. 18), and more specifically in President Franklin D. Roosevelt's deep-seated private musings, which had great bearing upon the shape and tenor of US Occupation planning (Barnes, 2017). Roosevelt supported the 1924 exclusion act which barred Japanese people from emigrating to the US, and vigorously defended his view as justified in a 1925 newspaper column because "'Mingling of Asiatic blood with European or American blood…produces in nine cases out of ten, the most unfortunate results'" and therefore, "Asian immigrants…would be detrimental to the future American population" (p.

18). Such an assessment persisted to occupy FDR's outlook, and manifested itself when during World War II the President requested funding to investigate "'problems arising out of racial admixtures' resulting from (war-induced) moving populations…he (FDR) wrote an involved professor and asked him to consider whether the 'less developed skulls' of the Japanese might explain their 'nefariousness'" (p. 18).

4.5 Dominance of a centrally-controlled bureaucracy

The imposition of the conqueror's language on the Japanese people from a position of ethnocentric, racially-biased condescension was but the start of a relationship between the Japanese people and English which has been characterized as "complicated" as well as in "a permanent sense of crisis" (Ryan, 2009, p. 407), and has over time contorted itself into a shape in which "English is often linked to…a discursive progamme that promotes English within strict social limits as well as a reinvigorated programme of Japanese national cultural identity" (Yamagami & Tollefson, 2011, p. 16), often referred to as *Nihonjinron*. In discussions of the national curriculum for English education Japanese government officials have focused on the tension between viewing English as opportunity vs English as threat (p. 31), thereby encouraging the divergent narratives that English is to be learned in a prescribed, paper exam grammar-focused manner "with minimal attention paid to the development of communication skills" (Ushioda, 2013, p. 1) for work on the global stage while the true heart and soul of Japanese people is to be cultivated through the Japanese language. Although the Japanese government has initiated (10 years later than South Korea and China) projects which boast the implementation of English-medium Instruction (EMI) at the university level, in reality they are limited to 50 specially designated universities to which a fraction of the Japanese student population will be able to attend (i.e., primarily those with privileged backgrounds); upon closer inspection, researchers note that students found the

classes deficient in providing adequate opportunities to interact in English and were also constrained by native English speaker (NES) norms (Murata & Iino, 2017). Suzuki similarly concludes that the current course of national educational guidelines set by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) overemphasizes the goal of English education as learning to communicate specifically with native English speakers (NES) of American and British Englishes; is characterized by an overreliance on NESs for teaching; and subordinates Japanese Teachers of English (JTEs) to NESs, to whom they are "encouraged to receive assistance for lesson plans and delivery of lessons…because…they speak English with 'standard' and 'correct' pronunciation" (2020, p. 83). Such an approach is counterproductive because it can "undermine the authority of JTEs as independent users of English " and "Students would see them (NESs) and consequently themselves as second-class English speakers who are subordinate to 'NESs.' As long as 'NESs' remain as the goal, Japanese speakers of English are not seen in their own right" (p. 84). Such tendencies may be manifested due in part to the fact that American authorities funded the ruling political party in Japan which ensures "Japan's willingness to play a follower's role" that "gives the United States wide latitude to pursue its own bilateral and global interests (in Asia)…Japan clearly acts as the junior partner in the US-Japan relationship…and almost always accommodates the United States on issues of central importance" (Nye, 1993, p. 2), and that the preponderance of a massive US-installed bureaucratic structure (as discussed earlier) has since the mid-1990's become increasingly monolithic in its behavior due to the circumstance that there has been "enacted a series of far-reaching administrative and civil-service reforms designed to strengthen 'political leadership' in the form of top-down, centralized control over the bureaucracy and the policymaking process" (Nonaka, 2020). What has occurred is that the Cabinet Office (headed by the chief cabinet secretary and the prime minister) has been empowered to create entirely new advisory councils composed of private-sector and

government experts to formulate recommendations for legislation and basic government policies. This has led to the phenomenon known as *sontaku*, which is “the apparent willingness of senior administrators to cast aside ethical standards in their rush to curry favor with the prime minister and his cronies” (Nonaka), and appreciably diminishes the autonomy of individual ministries and agencies to suggest meaningful changes to the existing structures which are in place.

5 Shortcomings of English Education in Japan

The previous chapter made extensive use of historical references in order to lay bare the relations which exist between American English language policy and politics, as well as to reveal the character and nature of American English language policies. By stepping outside the confines of the traditional applied linguistics scholarly approach and consulting the historical record, one is able to clearly see that the emphasis on American English both inside the US as well as in American foreign policy originated in a eugenics-based view of other races. Eugenics research both in the US and Nazi-era Germany was funded by John D. Rockefeller's Rockefeller Foundation. Sources referred to in chapter 4 indicate that the Rockefeller Foundation actively engaged in projects to socially engineer American society with the support and cooperation of the US government, and also funded elite American academic institutions to produce reports which supported RF and US government objectives. Using its experience in the US and China, the RF in conjunction with the US government then utilized American English as a component of its massive campaign to socially engineer Japanese people to a pro-US outlook in the post-war era, which was then carried forward after the end of the American Occupation of Japan (1945-1952) by Japanese government officials and conservative elite figures who were reinstated to power by US officials. In this chapter I will discuss how the emphasis on the use of American English as a tool for US and Japanese elites has resulted in serious shortcomings for Japan's English education system.

5.1 The English language industry in Japan prioritizes profit and elite hegemony

Explicating to depth how American English took root in Japan has facilitated an understanding of the character of English language education in Japan as well as its deep relationship with the global English language teaching industry, which is

inextricably tied to western geopolitical aims (Pennycook, 2017; Von Esch, Motha, & Kubota, 2020) that were justified in Japan due to theories of racial superiority, and are embedded within the institutionalized racial bias (Stukan & Torres, 2019) of the English language teaching industry and the continued domination of native-speakerism (Holliday, 2018) within Japan (detailed below). Spreading American English across Japan was part of an effort to indoctrinate Japanese citizens in "sound American ideals," especially a type of capitalism which is focused on encouraging rampant consumerism. Within the capitalist economic system, in which the few owners of the means of production employ workers who sell their labor for an hourly wage, a person is reduced to "a cog in a super-rational money-driven machine in order to make profit" (Boetger & Rathbone, 2016), while the "government of advanced and advancing industrial societies can maintain and secure itself only when it succeeds in mobilizing, organizing, and exploiting the technical, scientific, and mechanical productivity available to industrial civilization" (Marcuse, 1991, p. 3). The inevitable result of such a system is that education will tend to become bureaucratized into a technical type which serves the state via its emphasis on sorting future workers in a time-efficient manner, i.e. standardized testing. Modern education then can be said to be an institution which reproduces inequality (Bowles & Gintis, 2011) and tips the scales in favor of the privileged class who have access to the resources necessary to thrive (such as sufficient capital to afford private tutoring), with the result that, through "competition, success, and defeat in the classroom, students are reconciled to their social positions" (p. 111). As noted above, English proficiency in Japan "has become a very expensive commodity" (Goto Butler, 2015, p. 305) in a country where the foreign language market was worth roughly $7.8 billion in 2019 (Yano Research Institute, 2019).

The fact that the TOEIC and American English have become prevalent throughout Japan is owing in no small part to the strong US roots which were set down in Japanese soil as a result of the outcome of World War II and the subsequent activities of US authorities and their Japanese collaborators in the post-war era, a scenario which was also replicated in South Korea after the Korean War (Joun, 2015). This is not entirely unlike how language policies have been enacted within other countries by and for the elite class (Lo Bianco, 2016; Ricento, 2012), wherein "national elites often adopt self-serving language policies and grossly disadvantage poor, rural, and ethnic communities" (Lo Bianco, p. 2). In this respect Hatori (2005) confirms that in Japan language policies which privilege the study of English do so at the expense of foregoing or limiting instruction options of heritage languages for Ainu, Okinawan, Chinese, and Korean residents, which is reflective of broader institutional practices that disenfranchise these ethnic groups through laws related to such areas as taxation, employment, the right to vote and university entrance examination regulations. Suzuki and Oiwa (1996) have demonstrated that Japan does not adhere to the stereotype of a racially homogenous country. In fact, the number of people residing in Japan who are not ethnically Japanese is actually far higher than is reflected in official Japanese government records, as the data which characterizes people as Korean or Chinese does not include the considerable number who became naturalized as Japanese citizens, many of whom were brought to Japan as forced labor prior to and during World War II (Hatori, p. 47). Although the issues related to the English language education options in Japan for these groups is an important area which deserves further investigation, it is beyond the scope of this project.

5.2 Prominence of native-speakerism in Japan

Getting a better understanding of the nature and character of English language education in Japan arguably gives one a more informed perspective from which to then base teaching approaches and practices in the classroom. Utilizing the lens of critical pedagogy enables one to see that English language education around the globe is often not neutral and has been used to promulgate the power of Anglo-oriented countries beginning in the age of British colonization and through to current US policies (Pennycook, 2017), which then allows us to "reconstitute it (English) in more inclusive, ethical, and democratic terms" (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 2). In order to facilitate this, Fairclough (1989) notes that power relations within the classroom need to be acknowledged and language addressed as a social practice. The Rockefeller (as well as Carnegie and other major actors)-driven American quest for economic and political supremacy in the post-WWII era determined that setting down an English language hegemony in Japan via establishing American political hegemony was an absolute necessity, by any and all means, both hard (infiltrating and destroying anti-US student movement groups; Weiner, 1994), corrupt (Weiner, 1994), and soft (see above). One of the logical outcomes of this situation is that within the world of English Language Teaching (ELT) in Japan, there persists a very strong presence of an outlook which reflects, incorporates, and thereby represents American interests in the Japanese English language classroom, often referred to as 'native-speakerism.' 'Native-speakerism' may be definedas "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," regarding which there is often "a lack of awareness of their deeper political significance," which in turn readily lends itself to a situation where "native speakerist prejudice is often obscured by

the apparent liberalism of ‘a nice field like TESOL’” (Holliday, 2006, p. 385). In order to ensure that the Japanese became indoctrinated in “sound American ideals,” as discussed previously American interests spared no effort in presenting America and its people as the epitome of modern civilization, with the result that “Japan essentially adopted the USA’s racial hierarchy, with an implication that white ‘Others’ are generally afforded high prestige, whereas non-white ‘Others’ (e.g. Africans, Indians and Chinese) are often maligned” (Sherlock, 2016, p. 1). This hierarchy and its implications for ‘correct English’ being equated with a person of white ethnicity has been transferred to the English language textbooks which are marketed and sold throughout Japan (Sherlock). Honna has bluntly stated that “This ‘nativist’ goal should be held largely accountable for the present low achievement of English abilities by Japanese students. It more or less creates the social pressure that dictates: Do not speak English until you can speak it like an American” (2008, p. 2). Konakahara and Tsuchiya (2020), Iino (2020) and Suzuki (2020) similarly find ‘native-speakerism’ and its cementing of native speaker norms in Japan to be a fundamental obstacle towards Japanese learners developing communicative English proficiency as it blinds them from viewing the multicultural aspects of English in real-world usage, while Nogami has also noted that even when Asian learners went to study abroad, a “colonial mentality...linked English proficiency, Westernized mannerisms and...a particular ethnic group to greater power” expressed through denigrating racialised remarks targeting “Asians...who were visibly different from majority white American students" undermined their English language learning efforts in US educational settings, reflecting the reality that “the global spread of English and its association with American and British global power are...intact” (2020, p. 19). Related to how similar elements may manifest themselves in a Japanese classroom Koshino (2019) details how

Japanese university students felt outrage and exasperation at the lack of cultural sensitivity and competence of their native instructors, which in one documented case led to 12 out of the 14 enrolled students dropping the course (p. 60).

In contrast to the findings of these researchers, Damian Rivers (2018a) has asserted that "The notion of native-speakerism presents individuals with an ideological package of supposed inequitable practices believed to have originated in a specific place and exported to the detriment of an unspecified people in an unspecified place" (p. v). He further contends that the "supposed pressures for Japanese students to speak like Americans" should be reconsidered, and that it is more reasonable to "investigate the extent to which such pressures originate from within the home context rather than the English-speaking West" (p. viii). As Rivers has emphasized the concept of 'native-speakerism' as the main source for discrimination and mistreatment of native speaker English instructors, he insists on the removal of the term 'native-speakerism' (as well as related nomenclature such as 'native' and 'non-native') from academic discourse (Rivers, 2018a). I do recognize there are problems that can arise if one projects the demeaning associations which Rivers ascribes to this expression and its related terms (Rivers, 2018a; Rivers, 2018b), and also agree with Oda's description "expert users of English" (Oda, 2017, p. 111) as a substitute for 'native speakers' when posting job recruitment ads. However, the term itself has proved useful in providing a forum to discuss various salient topics (Houghton & Rivers, 2013; Houghton & Hashimoto, 2018; Houghton, Rivers, & Hashimoto, 2018) and provides a frame through which to express one's encounter with this construct (Ng, 2018). By problematizing the use of these terms before agreed upon substitutions are found, discussions related to topics such as unwarranted white privilege or lack of cultural sensitivity on the part of Centre instructors in English language teaching become difficult to initiate. It is for this reason

that from this point on I will utilize this term without affixing any single quotation marks.

Rivers' statements quoted at the beginning of the previous paragraph which purport that native-speakerism is propagated solely by forces which "originate within the home context" stand quite apart from the observation and experiences of many researchers in Japan

(both foreign and Japanese) who have been active for many years (Kubota, 2002; Hammond, 2007; Anderson, 2009; Hino, 2012; Koshino, 2019; Von Esch, Motha, & Kubota, 2020), and also do not take account of the evidence regarding the very active interest which the US government has taken in using English to help attain their objectives in Japan. Rivers repeatedly emphasizes throughout his publications (Houghton & Rivers, 2013; Rivers & Ross, 2013; Rivers, 2016; Rivers, 2017; Rivers, 2018a; Rivers, 2018b) how the native speaker has been a victim of heinous discrimination due to the native-speakerist construct which has been perpetuated by the Japanese government and Japanese people owing to their "collective insecurity and anxiety" (Rivers, 2018b, p. 60). A telling example of white western instructors' complaints that they have been misused and discriminated against via the concept of native-speakerism may be gleaned from the first major work on native-speakerism that Rivers edited with Houghton in 2013.

Relating the experience of a participant in the JET program (see above), Falout details how western participants have stated that they were made to wear costumes or 'required' to act in silly ways, given roles to entertain or enunciate on command like a tape recorder, rather than being accorded the respect and dignity of an educator (2013, pp. 108- 109), in an example of what Rivers views as being used as a stereotyped, "expendable commodity, sold by the institution and consumed by the student in a

transaction bereft of educational morality" (p. 90). In the same publication, Hashimoto clarifies that there has been a disconnect between how foreigners and Japanese view the ALT position in the JET program due to terminology in play. From the foreigner perspective, 'ALT' (Assistant Language Teacher) denotes an actual teacher who should be accorded the respect of an educator. However, the Japanese term used for the foreigner's job in JET (when asked to work at a Japanese secondary school with Japanese English teachers) is *gaikokugo shi do joshu* (外国語指導助手), which "literally means 'foreign language teaching assistant'. In other words, in English they are teachers, but in Japanese they are assistants" (2013, pp. 161- 162), which as defined by MEXT in the Course of Study's 'Curriculum Design and Treatment of the Contents' entails being used as a resource for and by the Japanese English instructor at their discretion (pp. 162-163). Having worked both as a conversation school instructor and ALT (direct hire of the Tokyo Metropolitan government), I have personally experienced being asked to perform in an entertainer role, although in my case this was exclusively to do with my conversation school's requirements at events based on imagined American versions of Halloween and Christmas parties. Although I myself chafed at times to these requirements, I came to understand that undertaking an entertainer role served to break the ice between foreigners and their Japanese students, as part of learner anxiety in Japan is being constrained to behaving as the obedient student who is always expected to follow the teacher's instructions. In my capacity as an ALT at Japanese high schools for 7 years, although I was never asked to wear a costume or act in a 'silly' manner, initially at times the Japanese English teacher assumed that I would simply fulfill the role of a subordinate.

However, when I demonstrated initiative and came up with concrete lesson plans utilizing materials and approaches which ultimately proved more engaging for the

students than the standard MEXT fare, I was without exception granted a leading or co-leading role, in contrast to Toh's report on this topic in Houghton & Rivers' 2013 Native-Speakerism publication (Toh, 2013b, p. 189), which may or may not have been informed by Toh's direct personal experience. Almost without exception, the Japanese English teachers were not displeased to break away from or modify the curriculum and materials provided by MEXT if I spoke and interacted with them and the students in a manner which was considered culturally appropriate. In other words, as a native English speaker of Korean ancestry (the *Nihonjinron* narrative is far more overtly biased against Koreans) my teaching experiences along with the historical evidence presented above do not confirm River's reasoning for wanting to disallow terms such as 'native-speakerism,' so I will continue to use them until better alternatives can be agreed upon. Returning to my time spent working as an ALT, I did come to feel restrictions and limitations related to salary, working hours, and the complexity of topics that could be introduced into the curriculum (also encountered in the private sector working for language schools and corporate language service providers), so I decided to move on and enter graduate school. In this respect, working in the English language industry in Japan may not be too different from working in any other field, which collectively have their own challenges and obstacles, and opportunities for advancement.

5.2.1 Blind spots of the native-speakerist approach

Despite the entrenched preference for native speaker norms in Japan, studies have shown that it is unrealistic to expect students to achieve native-like fluency (Honna, 2008), and that an English-only classroom environment can be demoralizing for students (Carson, 2018). It has been said that western native speaker teachers may not be attuned to the learning patterns of Japanese learners due at least in part to not being deeply conscious of related elements in Japanese school culture and the students'

sociohistorical background (Hammond, 2007). Although the majority of EFL research and classroom practice appears to focus on linguistic flows (for example grammar, or target language), scholars such as Risager (2006) have affirmed the need for an intertextual perspective, in which one is cognizant that there is always a meeting between a linguistic and a discursive flow within each classroom transaction between the instructor and students (and I would like to add here that the same occurs between the students themselves). As Japanese students may not always overtly express what aspects of an instructors' approach may hinder their interest or motivation, it is more clearly the instructors' responsibility to investigate what aspects of the subjective construct of reality which they bring with them into the classroom may be problematic or lacking in understanding the student perspective, especially in cases where the majority of a given class' students are well-grounded in productive study habits and attitudes. Following Risager's line of reasoning, it may be that misalignments in the discursive flow could lead to the creation of a gap between non-Japanese instructors and Japanese students, which ultimately may compromise learner motivation.

In Professor Risager's 2006 book, she stated the need for an intertextual perspective when teaching, in which one is cognizant that there is always a meeting between a linguistic and a discursive flow within each classroom transaction between the instructor and students. In other words, as learners are complex individuals with their own sociohistorical background, teaching language as we know all too well is not simply a case of inputting linguistic data into the students as though they were computers. Whether we are giving assignments, checking homework, or attempting to have students create and engage in English conversation, underlying all those linguistic interactions is a constant negotiation

which arguably largely determines how sincerely and whole-heartedly the students will take on those activities. That underlying negotiation takes place in the discursive flow, where things such as ideologies, personal biases, different interpretations of history, codified ways of thinking and behaving based on one's upbringing and cultural environment, and memories of past English language instruction classroom experiences, all live and exert influence on both the instructor and the students.

If we take a view of this using the lens of critical discourse analysis, we could say that contrary to the orthodox practice of discourse analysis, which is rooted primarily within the relationship between form and function in language, critical discourse analysis is concerned with how such form-function relationships correlate with social practices (Gee 2004), and also asserts that the shape and nature of power relationships within the classroom between the instructor and students, as well as between the students themselves, are of primary concern (Fairclough, 2013). In effect, critical discourse analysis takes into account situated meaning (Gee, 2007), which implies that any word or structure has a specific meaning potential depending on different contexts, and collectively are related to a deep and hidden structural agent.

According to Risager, these hidden structural agents exist because language is deeply related to culture, and so language should be thought of as "linguaculture," which she based on Agar's term "languaculture." Both of those terms were coined to bring awareness to the importance of recognizing the key role that the discursive flow plays in daily interactions. Agar gives the example of when the Berlin Wall came down, his West German acquaintance remarked that although the East Germans used the same grammar and vocabulary, "…in terms of their attitudes, the beliefs and values behind their language, what they're trying to say, I often don't understand," (1996, p. 212).

In an English language classroom setting where the instructor and students do not share the same mother tongue to begin with, there may exist the potential for a similar disconnect to occur. Anderson (2009) observes that

> …when they (Japanese students) are confronted with a non-Japanese (especially western) instructor, many appear unaware of how their behavior deviates from the instructor's expectations. Teachers, conversely, may be equally unaware that what seems to them as unproductive, or even unacceptable, student behavior may in fact be
>
> the norm in the student's culture. In this way, teachers and students experience a 'culture bump'…a situation where communication is lacking but where neither party understands why (p. 91-92).

A factor which contributes to the creation of these 'culture bumps' (Agar refers to them as 'rich points') may be the fact that while the linguistic codes (English vs. Japanese) are patently distinct, "less so are the differences in learning styles and classroom interaction patterns…the latter being closely connected to cultural values and socialization processes" (Anderson, p. 91). As Anderson points out in another article entitled, "The Enigma of the College Classroom" (1993) we all know that the 'Japanese are silent' stereotype is inaccurate, and that Japanese people can be extremely chatty. However, the manner in which Japanese people talk can be vastly distinct, as "the contexts in which talk is culturally sanctioned, and the types of talk that occur in these settings, do not correspond to those of the West. Just as language differs in their rule for grammar, cultures have rules for when, where, and how one talks" (p. 102). An example Anderson gives of this is the deeply-ingrained Japanese need for consensus in a group situation, which would normally discourage an individual from engaging in speech-related activities which could be construed as speaking out of turn, or expressing an opinion which may be deemed to be too

far from a perceived norm. Now delving into that further, what I have noticed in my own research is that in beginner, or high beginner classes, students who have an advanced level of communicative English relative to their classmates may have a tendency to truncate or limit the amount they speak in class in front of their peers, especially when instruction is given only in English, but that if instruction is given in Japanese, they would open up and speak more as the initiative of the other students improved. The lower level students, as alluded to, would also become more responsive if they clearly understood what was asked of them. In other words, giving the instructions in Japanese leveled the field in terms of comprehension as well as power relations, and appeared to make it easier for everyone to become involved on more equal terms. Additionally, allowing the use of L1 in the classroom amongst the students allowed them to freely ask for clarification from each other, and engage more freely in dialog for activities such as the creation of conversations in English, so that they were able to view each other as valuable producers of information and construct the content of the class in conjunction with the instructor. In order to get a clearer picture of the students' sentiments regarding this, I conducted some research among university students, which will be presented in Chapter 8.

In order to further shed light on how the native-speakerism prevalent in Japan's English education system may be problematic for Japanese learners, it may be instructive to consider data from other researchers which delves into how differences in cultural outlook may lead to disconnects and communication difficulties. In their study entitled, "Narrative, Literacy, and Face in Interethnic Communication," Ron and Suzanne Scollon explore the face-to-face and written interactions between ethnic groups in the Alaskan and Canadian outback which collectively create the frames of reference from which are derived the impressions and government policies which lie at the heart of the social, economic, and political concerns in the interior of Alaska and

Canada. More specifically, the authors look into causes for the interethnic conflicts which have been occurring between the native peoples of Alaska/northern Canada (the Scollons focus particularly on the Athabaskan tribe) and those of European origin who have settled in these areas. As the influx and incursions of European settlers has increased dramatically over the years, the Athabaskans have become ethnic minorities within the territories which they have traditionally occupied in North America. Owing to this, as well as the overwhelming disparity in political and economic/industrial power, non-Athabaskans of European background have come to hold the reins of power, and occupy the role of gatekeeper regarding the potential for the Athabaskans' social or economic upward mobility (p. 4). This in its turn has put extreme pressure on Athabaskan families to conform to western expectations in the way Athabaskans speak and present themselves, as they must be cognizant and competent both in their native discourse patterns (in order to interact amongst themselves) as well as European-based ones. Added to this is the issue of discrimination, as "social workers, economic planners, and others involved in governmental agencies, business, and Alaska Native corporations all indicate the centrality of communication to problems of discrimination" (Scollon & Scollon, 1981, p. 3), a statement which although published in 1981, seems to not have lost relevance in light of the racially-charged demonstrations witnessed across the US in 2020 and 2021.

As discussed, the US occupied Japan after the war and went to great lengths to install "sound American ideas" into Japanese people, a significant part of which has been to implement a large-scale program of English language study which emphasizes American English. The pressure which Athabaskan families feel to adapt to a western style of discourse makes its presence keenly felt for the Japanese learner from elementary school in the form of English language education, and becomes

progressively more of an imposition as Japanese students are forced to devote significant amounts of time and effort to prepare for the English language sections of standardized exams, which will determine to some degree their placement in junior and senior high school, university, and potentially their place of employment. In informal discussions, Japanese people have often expressed to me the resentment they felt while in school about having to devote so much of their energy to the staid memorization of English vocabulary and grammar for the sake of standardized exams. Standardized English exams like the TOEIC as well as those included in school entrance exams are discriminatory in a pro-capitalist manner as they clearly favor those who have the sufficient financial means to afford supplementary study materials and prep school courses.

As Scollon points out, "the main problem in interethnic communication is not grammar," but rather "it is the discourse system which produces the greatest difficulty," as "it is the way that ideas are put together…the way some ideas are selected for special emphasis, or the way emotional information about the ideas is presented that causes miscommunication" (p. 12). For an Athabaskan, learning to acclimate to a western style of discourse is described by Scollon as a rather tricky endeavor, as there are certain key elements which are at odds with the Athabaskan approach to discourse. First of all, before even entering into discourse, in Athabaskan culture one should not talk with another person until one is familiar with that person's point of view (i.e. through detached observation), which doesn't match very well with the western view that one should talk together in order to get to know each other. This difference in outlook lends itself to westerners viewing the Athabaskan as overly taciturn, while Athabaskans are apt to view westerners as too talkative and intrusive (pp. 15-16). The potential for misunderstandings and truncated, unsuccessful social transactions is therefore great as

the majority of interaction between Athabaskans and foreigners is in a semi-formal business, medical, legal, or educational context.

As for discourse itself, here again we encounter a fundamental difference. In the west, it is customary to present oneself in as positive a manner as possible, especially in situations such as job interviews, in the classroom, and meeting people for the first time. Primary importance is attached to projecting an image of strength and assuring others that one's future prospects are bright. The recent surge in social media has only served to amplify these tendencies even more, ratcheting up the emphasis on such concerns to arguably unprecedented levels of image-projection competition on such websites as Facebook, YouTube, and Instagram. Although in western culture it is often said that one should endeavor to "put one's best foot forward," in the Athabaskan context this concept is somewhat unwieldy, as it is taboo in Athabaskan culture to display oneself in the best light possible. To put it more plainly, the "English system is very different from the Athabaskan system in which it is considered inappropriate and bad luck to anticipate good luck, (or) to display oneself in a good light" (p. 20). Once more the Athabaskan reluctance to engage in what westerners regard as natural or expected behavior often reinforces the impression that Athabaskans are "unsure (of themselves)…withdrawn, and aimless," while the Athabaskans come to view the "English speaker as boastful or careless with luck and the future" (pp. 20- 21).

The western view of Athabaskans in these regards are not too far off from how western instructors have characterized Japanese students in their English classes as being overly withdrawn and reluctant to put forth their opinions, i.e. "I frequently hear uninitiated teachers of Japanese university students comment that 'Getting them to talk is like pulling teeth'…'They don't have opinions,' or that 'They won't say anything until they have discussed their answer thoroughly with a classmate,' (Anderson, 2009,

p. 92). Yet as pointed out earlier in this dissertation, Anderson noted that it is often the western instructors' unfamiliarity with Japanese styles of learning and classroom interaction patterns that results in compromised returns on investments in classroom attendance. The western emphasis on boldly expressing one's individual opinion and engaging in debate to establish intellectual superiority is in direct contrast to the aforementioned Japanese stress on consensus. As the Scollons note in the conclusion of their study, one must take into account and allow for the sociohistorical background of other ethnic groups, and "must simply give up the illusion that change can be brought about through the unilateral action of any one side to the interaction" (p. 200). The post-war injunctions that the US' job in Japan was to convert the Japanese people to "sound American ideas" are still alive in teaching approaches within the native-speakerism which predominates in Japan need to be identified, rethought, and fundamentally renegotiated, as "we cannot expect the solution of interethnic communication problems to lie in anyone's simple learning of 'the other' system" (pp. 200-201).

In order to truly engage learners who come from a different sociohistorical background, it may be helpful to investigate what core values lie at the heart of a given student body's outlook and consequently drive student behavior. In Japan, as in other countries, of primary importance in how students are socialized in school (and at home as well) is politeness behavior. Politeness behavior may be defined as a core requirement for communicative competence in any given culture (Brown & Levinson, 1987) through which "a) languages express the social distance between speakers and their different role relationships; (b)… face-work, that is, the attempt to establish, maintain and save face during conversation is carried out in a speech community" (Richards & Schmidt, 2002, p. 405).Within politeness theory, Brown &

Levinson attach primary importance to the afore- mentioned concept of face, which is a person's concern with how others view them (Goffman, 1959). Essentially, the concept of face suggests that people strive to maintain the persona which they project in the minds of other people through social acts which promote a positive image, while simultaneously attempting to actively avoid or minimize situations which would diminish or undermine those efforts. Brown and Levinson's conceive of face as "something that is emotionally invested, and can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 66).

Brown and Levinson are widely credited with introducing the idea that face has both positive and negative aspects. For Brown and Levison, all people across cultures regardless of ethnicity or sociohistorical background share a universal concern for and desire to be liked, appreciated, approved etc. (positive face) while simultaneously being focused on steering clear of being imposed upon (negative face), i.e. "the want of every competent adult member that his action be unimpeded by others" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 62). According to Brown and Levinson, moment to moment social interactions are fraught with the possibility of occurrences which could pose a threat to one's sense of face. Termed face-threatening acts (FTAs), they can be either verbal, paraverbal (i.e. tone of voice, inflection), or nonverbal (i.e. facial expression). Failure to deal with FTAs can lead to not only a diminishing of one's social stature, it could potentially lead to conflict should one cause loss of face for someone else (Brown & Levinson, 1987). People therefore become attuned to consciously balancing face relations of multiple parties in social situations, and engage in actions which support the face of other people, so that in turn theirs will be supported (Goffman, 1959). However, in Brown and Levinson's view, the amount of attention and effort that one expends to do so is variable, and is manifested in degrees determined by the social distance between

people (i.e. friends vs. strangers), the reality of how much power one has over someone else (i.e. manager vs. part-time worker), and how great an imposition on one's culture is a given FTA. Moreover, "these three factors are all relevant and at the same time independent. Consequently, their [Brown and Levinson's] framework predicts that these factors interact to determine how people engage in facework" (Kiyama, Tamaoka, & Takiura, 2012, p. 2).

For Brown and Levinson (pp. 103-211), the complexity involved in maintaining both positive and negative face for oneself and others has led to the creation of a number of approaches one may use socially. These various forms of social negotiation may be divided into two basic categories: (1) positive politeness strategies, and (2) negative politeness strategies. A positive politeness strategy will emphasize an overtly proactive, extroverted mode of behavior, while a negative politeness strategy will favor a more inward- looking, self-effacing attitude. Considering these strategies Brown and Levinson come to the conclusion that America is more of a 'positive politeness' culture, while other researchers note that Japan has a 'negative politeness' culture (Mizutani & Mizutani, 1987; Fukushima, 2000), one in which there is a marked "strong emphasis on indirectness and politeness in interpersonal communication" (Takano, 2005, p. 634). Japanese mothers purposefully inculcate within their children a strong sense of indirect and politeness behavior in a vigorous fashion, reflecting the observation that "the communicative style of the Japanese is intuitive and indirect, especially compared with that of Americans," for "verbal expression among the Japanese is …'indirect, rich in connotation, and evasive in denotation'" (Clancy, 1986, p.213). Within this cultural context, "overt expression of conflicting opinions is taboo. Even (Japanese) conference participants, for example, in contrast to their American counterparts, tend to express their views tentatively…they try to feel out…their colleagues…seeking common

ground for establishing unanimity" (p. 215). This may be in part owing to the Japanese preference for a style of communication which de-emphasizes talking in favor of reaching consensus through guessing another's position (Akanuma, 2004).

Vital to understanding the subtle nuances of how Japanese interact with each other is the concept known as *omoiyari,* which has been translated as attentiveness, empathy, and concern/consideration for others, in which one stands in the place of the other party in order to "to feel what others are feeling…without being told verbally" (Lebra, 1976, p. 38; see also Fukushima & Haugh, 2014, pp. 2-3). Within the world of Japanese relational communication, o*moiyari* is said to be an absolute necessity for communicative competence in society for a Japanese citizen (Clancy, 1986), so it comes as no surprise that "elementary and junior high school teachers in Japan answered that they put the highest value on *omoiyari* in moral education" (Hara, 2006, p. 28). In addition, in a survey conducted by the Yomiuri newspaper in 2005, "86.7% of the parents expected their children to be a child with *omoiyari*. As these data show, to have *omoiyari* is essential in Japanese relational communication across contexts" (Hara, p. 28). A core component of polite behavior in Japanese society, *omoiyari* is set apart from western concepts of 'consideration' or 'thoughtfulness' by virtue of its intuitive component (Travis, 1998), via which "the ideal interaction" does not involve direct verbalization of the speakers clearly expressing their wishes and needs, "but rather one in which each party understands and anticipates the needs of the other, even before anything is said" (Clancy, p. 217). It being the case that *omoiyari* stresses empathy to the point of feigning agreement, White finds that it can be problematic for Americans, who while valuing tact, are moreover keen on "getting one's own point of view or true feelings across (i.e., being open and assertive), even if it may challenge the other's viewpoint, (as it) is also expected and also ranks high among the virtues deserving of

respect for Americans" (1989, p. 67).

Further complicating matters regarding cross-cultural understanding is that even if one should dedicate oneself to deeply studying Brown and Levinson's work, there are those who strongly question whether East Asian people's behavior adheres to Brown and Levinson's concept of negative face. Namely, due to the assertion that "'autonomy in one's actions' (represented by negative face) is biased towards the Anglo-American concept of politeness…it has been argued that the core dimensions underlying politeness in languages such as Chinese, Japanese, Korean and so on" are qualitatively different from those outlined by Brown and Levinson (Haugh, 2005, p. 43). One scholar who Haugh cites is Matsumoto, who proclaims that Japanese polite behavior is distinct on account of her assertion that in contrast to Brown and Levinson's view that all people harbor a need for 'negative face' in order to secure one's "claim to territories, personal preserves, right to nondistraction – i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition" (1987, p. 62), Japanese people are more concerned with displaying knowledge and acceptance of "the structure and hierarchy of the group," being that "What is of paramount concern to a Japanese is not his/her territory, but the position in relation to the others in the group and his/her acceptance by those others" (Matsumoto, 1988, p. 405). Haugh also calls our attention to Ide's (1989) study of *wakimae*, which is verbal or non-verbal behavior that indicates cognizance of and adherence to one's place and role in any given situation (p. 230). *Wakimae* as denoted in the expression *yorosiku onegaisimasu* ('I make a request of you and hope it turns out well') is not uttered to demonstrate approval for the listener's wants, nor does it exhibit concern for the other's desire to be free from imposition, but instead is used to delineate the place of another person in relation to oneself, in order to maintain "the debt-credit equilibrium between interactants (Ohashi, 2003, p. 269), which renders Brown and

Levinson's notions of positive and negative face as inadequate explicators of why politeness arises in contexts where *yorosiku onegaisimasu* is vocalized (Haugh, p. 44).

These are some of the reasons why it is plausible to infer that native-speaker/Center- informed standard English language pedagogy could be enriched by taking more into account details related to the local socio-cultural background of Japanese learners. Speaking more broadly, through his examination of how different cultural groups may have fundamentally different perceptions of space Levinson (1996) demonstrates how erroneous one may be in assuming that cognition-processing patterns are fundamentally universal (pp. 177-202).

Levinson asks us to consider the case of the Guuguu Yimithirr people of North Queensland, Australia, who in lieu of spatial orientations of relativistic space which we take for granted (such as 'in front of,' 'to the left of,' or 'opposite of'), view things instead through a perspective of absolute orientation such as 'to the North of,' 'west of,' etc., which means the Guuguu Yimithirr people who Levinson speaks of are always cognizant of where the cardinal directions are, and therefore "utilize a system of spatial conception and description which is fundamentally different from English-speakers…there is simply no analogue of the Indo- European prepositional concepts" (p. 180). Further, Levinson finds that this state of affairs "makes available a gestural system…which has further deep interactional and indeed linguistic consequences [e.g. widespread zero anaphora reinforced by gesture]" (p. 181).

Koshino's study (2019) illustrates how native-speakerist concepts embedded within Japanese English education which favor the hiring of native English speakers may result in unqualified instructors being employed more for their white ethnicity than their knowledge and sensitivity to learners' sociohistorical background. Rivers has also confirmed that "As a white European male, my innate physical attributes have

undoubtedly been unfairly advantageous in securing employment within Japanese tertiary education (Houghton & Rivers, 2013, p. 88). These hiring practices may then lead to situations such as those documented by Koshino, i.e. “The instructor had been in Japan for more than 10 years, but did not speak Japanese much...As Ken (university student) explained, ‘He would speak simple Japanese. But it did not help me understand...the concepts that really needed to be explained,’” a situation which led to Ken becoming “upset and angry when the instructor repeated ‘Japanese students are shy’ in class as if to hide his own lack of competency in Japanese, while putting the blame entirely on the students” (p. 60). Koshino gives another example of how a university student he identifies as Kazuya “also felt frustrated and questioned the lack of cultural competency by the [NEST] instructor in his English-only class,” owing to the fact that he felt “overwhelmed because it was taught all in English and... he (the instructor) did not seem to consider the fact that some of us had no clue what he was saying. He didn’t stop, but just carried on with his talking” (p. 60). Koshino notes that according to Kazuya, although students in this class pretended to understand, none of them actually had a clear understanding of the instructions, a situation which led to 12 out of the original 14 students dropping the class.

6 Methodology and Research Design

The study which I conducted and is chronicled in chapters 6 to 9 was carried out in order to gather data on how university English language instructors and Japanese university students view English language education in Japan. As this dissertation dealt with questions and issues that ultimately pertain to how one constructs and interprets one's living and work situations, a fundamental qualitative approach was considered to be most appropriate. With its focus on interpretation, nuance, and context, qualitative research is well suited to (1) investigating and discovering underlying meanings and patterns of relationships; (2) facilitating an understanding of how we make sense of life experiences and the world we inhabit (Merriam, 2009). It being the case that qualitative research focuses in on how individuals view their environment, it accommodates the recognition of multiple socially-constructed realities. The creation of each of these realities is a very complex process tying together individual life experiences, intelligences, and human emotions, which are themselves subject to a variable number of streams of information, coercions, and environmental stresses which flow inward and outward, actively interrelating with consciousness to ultimately shape and reshape one's individual view of the world (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Hurworth, 2008). Qualitative research has the capability to "develop analytic perspectives that speak directly to the practical circumstances and processes of everyday life" (Miller, 1997, p. 24) via its utilization of 'thick' data predicated on recordings of social interactions including interviews as well as individually-generated narratives. Therefore, a qualitative approach allows for the recognition of values and ethical issues (Midgley, 2004). This in turn enables one to: (1) critically analyze data so as to reveal structures and consider the policies in place that reproduce them (Santucci, 2010), and (2) introduce

relevant episodes of one's life experiences, which relates to why I also incorporated critical lens and autobiographical reflections into this study.

6.1 Data collection and data transcription

6.1.1 Validity and trustworthiness

Information for this dissertation was sourced through semi-structured interviews as well as surveys administered to students. One is able to strengthen the viability of interpretations obtained from participants' responses if corroborative evidence can be confirmed in the literature (Merriam, 2009).

6.1.2 Interviews

Qualitative research encapsulates the dynamic, complex nature of a topic and can be described as a great aid when employed in the process of making sense out of social interaction (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). In order to construct an intimate description of the examined phenomena, I decided to conduct semi-structured interviews with (1) expatriate EFL instructors who have taught in Japan, (2) a Japanese native EFL instructor who spent part of her childhood and adolescence in the US, and (3) Japanese university students. Personal interviews are a prime source of the 'thick' data that is the emblem of qualitative research. As EFL instructors who go abroad to teach are highly impacted by the new environs and circumstances they encounter (Brown, H.D., 1994), giving them a platform to convey narrative aspects of their teaching journey may help bring to light "the wide range of institutional and organizational settings, some more and some less coercive, that shape the selves we live by" (Chase, 2005, p. 659). Including a native Japanese teacher who had lived in the US provided the opportunity to explore insights and perspectives from

an individual who simultaneously has an ‘insider’ angle to Japan as well as a working knowledge of living and studying in a western environment. In terms of interviewing Japanese university students, a qualitative approach enables us to “understand the world from the subjects’ point of view” (Kvale, 1996, p.1), which is of immeasurable value in trying to decipher underlying causes of Japanese university classrooms being “filled with students who lack interest, motivation, and proficiency” (Leung, 2020, p. 10).

Regarding the instructors who were interviewed, I set out to recruit six individuals for this investigation. Utilizing purposive sampling (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016), I sought to select individuals that could be described as “proficient and well-informed with a phenomenon of interest” (p. 2). Expatriate EFL instructors as well as Japanese native instructors who had lived abroad with at least four years of experience living and working at the tertiary level in Japan who were willing to discuss their teaching approaches and working experience in Japan were invited to participate. Invitations to participate were embedded in a private message and sent via email presented to university teaching associates. Additionally, invitations to participate were embedded in a private message and sent via email to university instructors who I had not worked with, but had had academic discussions with. In total, six instructors responded to my invitations to participate. Of the six, four expatriate university instructors as well as one Japanese university instructor with experience living abroad agreed to do an interview, while one prospective participant ceased to communicate with me before learning about the details of this project. Of the five instructors who became participants in the study, one is a former associate, one is a university instructor who I met through a research project, and three are current associates. The group consisted of two native English speakers and three non-native English speakers. Both of the two native English speakers hail from England and are of Caucasian descent, while

in terms of the non-native English-speaking participants, one is from China, one is from Romania, and one is Japanese. All of the instructor interviews were conducted in English.

As for the Japanese university students who were interviewed for this project, I again utilized a purposive sampling approach as opposed to a more random sampling due to the fact that from my perspective it is generally difficult to persuade Japanese university students with whom one is not familiar to consent to be interviewed. Students who had taken my class and were willing to discuss their English language learning experience were invited to participate. Invitations to participate were embedded in a private message and sent via email to prospective participants. Of the five who initially responded, four agreed in the end to be interviewed. Additionally, through an English conversation program at my workplace I was able to conduct a spontaneous interview with a student who I was not previously acquainted with. Although the majority of the student interviews were conducted in English, the use of Japanese was admitted for the sake of clarity when deemed necessary.

All of the participants (both instructor and student) were interviewed over the internet from a location of their choosing. Although the original intention was to conduct one interview, two of the instructor participants as well as one of the student participants required more than one interview in order to completely express their thoughts. This inadvertently allowed the participants and interviewer to reflect upon what they had said in the first encounter and may have contributed to the production of rich, detailed insights (Markham, 1998; Kivits, 2005). The interviews were conducted using a semi-structured format with open ended questions framed by nine pre-determined questions. Assuring each participant that an alias would be used in the published report was a major factor in helping them feel secure. As the participants

were then extremely eager to comment in a spontaneous manner on a number of topics, as well as the fact that more than one session took place for three of the participants, the interviews ranged in time from one and a half to four hours and were recorded on a secure and confidential social media platform.

The determination to conduct the interviews through social media not only secured the accuracy of the recorded data, it also allowed the researcher and participants to clarify and confirm statements during the interview in real-time as they scrolled back to appraise what they had written (Markham, 1998). In addition, as a direct outcome of the automatically- generated display of one's basic personal information that occurs when individuals agree to communicate online, using social media enabled me to authenticate the identities of the participants. The time of the interviews was agreed upon mutually. All told, it took seven weeks to complete the majority of the interviews, although one participant required an additional session outside of this time frame due to scheduling contingencies. As each interview was concurrently recorded on the participant's individual social media account, each participant obtained a copy of their interview.

There has been a considerable amount of anxiety expressed about the usage of information extracted from online exchanges for research purposes (Hine, 2005; Markham & Baym, 2009; Markham, 2013). Particularly the terms *virtual* and *real* have been utilized to distinguish between "nature vs. technology, referent vs. sign, science vs. fraud, genuine vs. reproduction, authentic vs. fake, human vs. machine, and so forth" (Markham, 1998, p. 119). Markham's determination that labels such as *real, hyperreal, not real* and *virtual* are invalid and that any event that is experienced qualifies as real "because our experiences are not easily separated into these binary oppositions" (1998, p. 120) has been endorsed by requests for online research to be

moved more centrally into the field of qualitative research (Denzin, 2004). Regarding conducting interviews online, apprehension for the absence of visual cues such as facial expression and body language to enable relationship building and allowing the participant to feel comfortable (Salmon, 2012) have been countered by data which indicates that online anonymity actually encourages more openness and disclosure (Williams & Robson, 2004; Joinson, 2005) and can boost the sense of kinship through the "perceived homogeneity of the group" (Joinson, p. 23).

Working without a video feed of my participants' appearance, it was my experience that interviewing participants in this manner produced data which exceeded expectations in terms of both volume and depth, as well as complexity. Issues that are often left to simmer in students' hearts, instructors' rooms and curriculum meetings detonated onto my computer screen in such profusion that I sometimes found myself pausing to wonder at the intensity of sentiment expressed in the typed exchanges. No longer having to nod knowingly or suppress any facial expressions that might convey a sense of contradiction, I was free to focus solely on the content of the interactions as well as the intent inherent in the participants' utterances, factors which were also noted by researchers (Joinson, 2005). Having the option to scroll back in the course of interviews allowed the participants to review and rephrase their responses/enabled me to formulate better follow-up questions, while the assurance of confidentiality appeared to play a major role in eliciting meaningful responses. Similar conversations which I have had in public spaces (it is up to the participants to select the location of face-to-face interviews) were often cut short by feelings of unease related to the fear that someone influential could be nearby eavesdropping; as for conversations in private spaces (i.e., at an instructor's residence), topics expounded upon by participants in my online exchanges often proved to be in some way too big or intense to deal with in a

face-to-face situation. This could be connected to Markham's statement (1998) that people are emboldened to express more online due to the fact that they can take on different identities that are set apart from their embodied physical appearance, which thereby allowed the participants to become whistleblowers at times and vocalize generally suppressed observations and assessments concerning the ELT industry. Although it is now widely recognized that no internet interaction is entirely secure, research has found that as the risk/sensitivity level of a given topic under discussion increased, email was consistently chosen over face-to-face exchanges (Joinson, 2005).

Utilizing the internet also allowed me to logistically do the interviews, as the breakout of the corona pandemic made it ill-advised to meet in person. A final point to consider is that the absence of visual cues may have been influential in the sense that neither I nor the participants could see how tired we were during the interviews. Had any of the participants seen how fatigued I was at some stages, they may very well have truncated their explanations, or may have opted to summarize more generally topics which they ended up expounding upon in great detail.

The questions for the expatriate instructor participants were formulated to elicit their reasons for coming to Japan, their rationale for adopting the teaching approaches they utilize regarding L1, the participants' experience of living and working in Japan, their perceptions of EFL institutional influence, and their views on the presence or absence of hegemonic factors at play in the Japanese educational system. The type of questions which were addressed to the native Japanese English instructor were similar to those which were used for the expatriate instructors, with the exception of the inquiry about the reason for coming to Japan being switched out to why she had gone to the US. The questions for the student participants focused on their experience of learning English at the primary, secondary, and tertiary levels of education in Japan, how they

viewed the use of L1 in the classroom, and how they viewed studying English with foreign instructors. Upon completion of each interview, the recorded data was copied from my social media account to secure electronic folders on my laptop, and from there was also copied onto a USB memory stick. Care was taken during the interview to clarify text which could be viewed as ambiguous, and member checks were carried out by email to confirm the interpretation of key statements.

6.2 Data analysis

Adopting the perspective that a qualitative inquiry acknowledges that reality is socially constructed via an interpretive process localized within social contexts and interaction (Holstein & Gubruim, 2000), I made use of both deductive coding (relates the data to larger concepts and questions which framed the study), as well as inductive coding, which lets the data to speak for itself. Reading through the transcripts multiple times, my main concern was to remain focused on the data and "to look for data rather than at data" (Robrecht, 1995, p. 171), so as to more fully detect the structures and intent undergirding the immediately apparent and observable (Layder, 1993). As Corbin and Strauss (2008) note, analysis "should be relaxed, flexible, and driven by insight gained by interaction with the data rather than being structured and based on procedures" (p. 12).

Once the salient aspects of each participant's experience started to emerge, I could see that with further re-readings particular responses and passages began to emerge as insights or "questions of meaning and social significance" (Clandenin & Connelly, 2000, p. 131) and also revealed themselves as relevant to the research questions (Boeije, 2002). I then commenced to formulate categories. Reading over each transcript repeatedly was conducive to further illuminating the experiences and dilemmas which were shared by participants (and at times myself), as well as

identifying those which were distinctly different. From the initial perusals to the several re-readings, on through to the analyses and emergence/groupings of clustered comments, basic underlying themes emerged. It was in this way that I made my way from open to axial and then finally to selective coding (Charmaz, 2006).

For the sake of clarity, I then assembled the selected material under topical headings and interpreted the data utilizing a critical lens informed by the literature. Once all the data of a given theme was grouped together, it then became possible to detect the relevant

characteristics within emerging concepts. I also ascertained significant differences. The salient themes were revealed by clusters/combinations of coded patterns, i.e., as discussed by Layder:

> When all the coded segments that belong to a given code are put together, it becomes possible to discover all the relevant characteristics of this concept in a substantial field and to describe the concept. The researcher then goes about identifying the criteria on which some interviews differ from others. Together these criteria constitute the dimensions on which a typology can be constructed. These different dimensions are mostly governed by patterns or combinations of codes. These combinations form profiles, clusters or types (1993, p.137).

7 Instructor Interviews

7.1 The instructor participants

In order to create the narratives of the five instructors, I chose information which describes each instructor's teaching journey and fundamental perspective on English education in Japan. I also opted to quote passages from the interviews that expressed some urgent concern or shed light on some aspect of an instructor's teaching journey and view of English education in Japan. Each participant was given a pseudonym. Brief descriptions for each instructor participant will now follow.

Fei Hong. Fei Hong moved from China to Japan with her family after graduating from university and working in China as a high school English teacher. As a non-native speaker, she experienced a personal transformation through learning English with help from her Chinese junior high English instructor. The seeds of this were sown through developing an interest in literature and reading various books in English, as well as being encouraged to write and read English texts aloud. Fei Hong did not study with any native English-speaking instructors, and her Chinese teachers used the Chinese language to teach English grammar and pronunciation. In high school her English benefitted from engaging in written correspondences with pen pals in foreign countries. A year after arriving in Japan, she began to teach Mandarin to Japanese adults, which she did for three years, before she began to teach the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) primarily to foreign students (non-Japanese) at a Japanese language school.

Although she studied literature for her MA and PhD, she decided to also obtain accreditation in applied linguistics as a way to earn money, which led her to enroll in an MA program in the UK. Being able to experience life in England, along with travel to other European countries, brought to fruition the transcultural and translingual awakening which had begun in middle school via the significant cultural impressions which enveloped her

while in Europe. After obtaining her MA in 2014, she returned to Japan and had been a university instructor at Japanese universities for 6 years at the time of the interview. In contrast to the enthusiasm which she felt as a student growing up in China, Ms. Hong has found Japanese university students lacking in motivation to speak English, and feels the "test-oriented educational system has limited students' development." Regarding this point, she stated that as so much emphasis is focused on passing the university written entrance exam, the students do not develop English as a communicative tool, and once accepted into university do not exhibit the desire to improve their English. In order to counteract the reticence she sees especially among her students, she feels that "L1 is necessary especially for lower level students," as she does "not think 'English only' is the best approach, and I think students need to learn grammar by using L1." Fei Hong did note that in her experience working as an English teacher in Japan she did observe that western instructors were privileged and that "it seems easier for them to get a full-time position easily."

Aya. Aya was born in Japan but spent part of her childhood and adolescence (from the age of 11-15) in California, where she was impressed with the kindness of an elderly American lady named Lena who helped Aya improve her English. Only charging a few dollars per hour, Lena served Aya and other students sweets and tea during their lessons in Lena's home. With the notion of education as a way to help others deeply imprinted upon her, after returning to Japan Aya participated as a volunteer in projects geared to nurturing students, took teacher training courses in high school and university, and became a private tutor for secondary school students (one middle school student and one senior high student) during her freshman year at her university in Japan. Although she obtained a teaching certificate while in university, she initially pursued a career in the music business after graduation, working as a product manager in marketing for major international corporations, as well as a freelance interpreter.

When the rise of the internet began to deeply impact the bottom line of the music industry (especially from 2007), Aya again became interested in education both as a means of income as well as a vehicle for further self-development, and therefore obtained an MA in applied linguistics in 2015 (she had been teaching English at the tertiary level in Japan for 5 years at the time of the interview) from a noted institution in London. It was there that she reconnected with the concept of education as a social force through courses which stressed the importance of taking the students' sociocultural background into account, which she finds lacking in Japan's English education system. Regarding her impression specifically of Japanese universities, she stated that she "was surprised to see many non-Japanese English teachers (both full and part-time) are teaching rather 'one-way' disregarding students background, individual differences etc." as "Some of them (they were both native speakers) said 'we don't have time to deal with all students. Can't even remember their names. Just have them sit by student # so that we can manage [the] classroom easily.' I was horrified. They were treating students like cattle."

Aya also singled out the head of a Japanese college English department for ignoring the recognition of English as a world language with its respect for the learner's language rights (e.g. Kachru, 1992, 2005; Pennycook, 1995, 2006) in her recollection that, "I even had a boss (full time, American male) who explicitly said 'Your Nepalese *ryugakusei* [foreign students studying in Japan] need to correct their pronunciation because they have strong accents.' I got angry with my boss." Aya continued in noting the apparent incongruity in this administrator's decision to segregate students based on ethnicity in an International Communication department class: "I told my boss that this is a great chance to teach about multi-culture by mixing ryugakusei with Japanese students but my idea was turned down. Our department was 'International Communication' and we had about 80 international students and 40 Japanese students."

John. John came to Japan from England with the intention of studying martial arts, and therefore initially got into English teaching simply as a means to support himself while training to improve his martial skill. He started teaching in Japan as a high school assistant language teacher (ALT) for 3 years, then taught his own high school English classes for 2 years, before obtaining his MA and Ph D, which has led him to teach at universities in Japan for 8 years, the last 4 of which have been as an administrator/instructor/researcher. Reflecting on his years spent working as an ALT in high school, he recognizes that he was not very empowered, and was not in a position to make any significant decisions about the teaching program. It wasn't until he completed his MA and began teaching at the tertiary level that he became motivated to contemplate pedagogy. Through his 13 years of experience teaching English in Japan, John has come to the conclusion that the English language system in Japan has developed a peculiar character. Speaking to the point, John summarized it as, "All focused on reaching standards/testing set by the government. No thought about pedagogy, especially about how to get students USING the language with non-Japanese (which is the point). Just checking boxes and translation practice."

Despite this state of affairs and John's view that most English teachers are content to "keep their heads down" in order to not appear as "trouble makers," he also made it clear that there were those instructors active in research, publishing, and presenting at conferences (especially in the area of Task-Based Language Teaching) who were fighting to improve the situation. Even so, his assessment of the overall impact they could have overall was "Very little. It seems that they can take their own ideas back to their classrooms. But at meetings, little is spoken about such things at the uni[versity] level. Mostly about procedural things (getting tests done, etc.)." In order to stress that this state of affairs is not merely the result of not having enough time to address such issues, John stated that Japanese universities are not trying to engineer progressive change so much as they monitor each other in order to "not

stand out." His conclusion then is that great improvement cannot occur in the area of pedagogy within the English education environment of Japan unless "they [administrators and politicians] are influenced from the outside" in conjunction with the exhortation that, "Actual teachers need to play more of a part (bottom up) for changes," which he admits is difficult as Japanese educators who push for change are liable to be "socially exiled…which is almost like being sacked…That is a huge motivator to do nothing in Japan. Stand out and be pushed out. Even taking paternity leave means the end of your career! Even though it is a right."

Regarding pedagogy, John expressed the view that L1 should be allowed in the classroom, as it helps to cultivate an approach which is "about people, rather than strict rules." He pointed out that in real-world interactions people "often mix (languages) when…trying to get meaning across." In light of this, if a student needs to use some L1 in the classroom to communicate, "that is real world use in itself," as it will promote fluency and encourage "confidence of communicating, rather than a shut-down of communication when they (students) don't know how to say something." Echoing the sentiment he expressed about the majority of instructors being content to keep a low profile related to raising issues such as the emphasis on standardized testing, John stated that as far as pedagogy was concerned, he had the impression that although he had come across dedicated instructors who do "take a lot of time to research/try/adjust things to help their students get better," his overall impression was with the majority of foreign English instructors that was not the case.

Nathan. Nathan also originally hails from the UK, and has been involved in teaching English since 1979. His outlook is shaped by having grown up in an era when the Labor party was in power (his parents were pro-Labor, and lived by the maxim that one's life ought to be one of service to others), before a shift occurred and a conservative government headed by Margaret Thatcher took over. His formative years were also heavily influenced by the fact

that he grew up in a pro-multilingual household, one in which his English father spoke French at the dinner table, took holidays in France, and were supportive of Nathan living in Germany as a university student while he worked in a youth hostel and studied the German language. This theme of multilingualism continued when he then transferred from his UK university to Paris University, where he brushed up on his French while teaching English. That experience convinced him that teaching language would be a viable way to make a living, so he returned to the UK to acquire multilingual teaching qualifications (English, German, and French, respectively), before moving to Belgrade in 1983 to be with and marry a Yugoslavian woman he had met in Paris. He got a British Council-related university job in Belgrade, where he taught for 6 years (while at the same time earning an MA in applied linguistics in 1986), before political and personal instability (with his wife, whom he had separated from) led him to move to Japan in 1989.

In Japan Nathan started as a coordinator for an American start-up university program, working with 30 other instructors from the UK, the US, and Australia to help prepare Japanese students with low English proficiency to study at universities in the US. After devoting 2 years to this project, Nathan landed a job teaching English through drama at a women's university in Osaka (he had used drama with his Yugoslavian students), where he taught for another 2 years, before taking on a university position in Tsukuba for 9 years, where he met his Burmese wife. Upon concluding his work there, he moved to Tokyo and began at his current university, where he coordinates a taught-in-English program, helps in interviewing and hiring foreign English teachers, and conducts research related to, among other things, multilingualism. In the midst of these various changes, Nathan managed in 2005 to complete his doctoral degree specializing in second language vocabulary acquisition, which he had embarked on in 1997.

Nathan views the challenges facing English education in Japan as foremost a systemic problem created by the Japanese government's insistence on an approach which "prioritizes formal knowledge of a foreign language and memorization," as this "clearly creates problems for learners to use the language for their own purposes." To clarify this point. Nathan stressed that the learning environment created by these policies causes Japanese students "from JHS [junior high school] onwards… to see English that is something to be studied for entrance exams." According to Nathan, underpinning and reinforcing these structures is the fact that universities and high schools have become accustomed to profiting financially from entrance exams. Partly owing to this, schools are firmly locked into perpetuating this emphasis on standardized testing, "and unless universities change their entrance exams away from translation towards use of English in some ways, then it will be very difficult for secondary schools to change what high school students need to do." In his final analysis of this state of affairs, Nathan stated that, "There are many many commercial interests at stake here, and it won't change quickly."

Nathan's view regarding L1 in the classroom has evolved over the years. He admitted that at times prior to studying for his PhD that he "strongly emphasized using English to my students…and been left quite frustrated at how little some students might use English within a class." On the topic of insisting on English-only in the classroom, while in Belgrade he noticed how "within the British Council world of ELT there was a very strong sense of the BC people being experts who would enlighten professionals in Yugoslavia about the right way to do things. I remember that I felt this was very patronizing." It was when Nathan began work on his doctorate that he began to realize that "L1 knowledge is not separate from L2 knowledge, they are interlinked," and that the process of becoming aware of the language rights of students has led him to his present outlook, one in which there is an "acceptance that it is beneficial for students to consciously use and make decisions about using

languages…not just English only," an approach which encourages students "to think about how they can combine their use of both languages [English and Japanese] for their own goals."

In addition to the allowance for L1 in the classroom, Nathan emphasized that he strives to create a learning environment where students feel free to use all aspects of their language repertoire, including regional accents, language varieties (i.e. youth talk), registers (i.e. formal and informal), and other languages, such as Korean and Chinese. He stressed the importance of multilingualism in a global environment where "white supremacy seems to be rather strong at the moment, and racism has become acceptable again in many different countries," noting that the "19th century 'racial Darwinism' that Europeans developed and propagated as a means of control and divide and rule in their colonial conquests" has also heavily influenced Japan in its emphasis on monoculturalism, and a strong tendency to group people as "either 'in' and on the inside of a particular group or not, and the biggest groups that this refers to is 'Japanese people' and 'non-Japanese.'" Nathan feels this outlook has affected Japan's language policies in a number of ways, and provides the example of his current workplace's practice of separating classes along the lines of taught-in-Japanese versus taught-in-English offerings, which serves to "other" foreign instructors as non-Japanese as well as promoting stereotypical attitudes and behavior.

Elena. Elena was born and brought up in Romania, in a region which was also populated with German and Hungarian communities. Noting that people freely switched between various languages in their daily interactions and that her mother was a language instructor of English and French who taught her these languages from a young age, Elena stated unequivocally that she grew up in a very multilingual environment. Further abetting this situation was the fact that English and Italian television programs enlivened her household and conversations with childhood friends, and that her local city hall offered her

the opportunity to study Japanese, which Elena took advantage of from the age of 10. Her interest in Japan and the Japanese language took root and began to flourish (she undertook a more in-depth course of study from the age of 15), a state of affairs which led Elena to transfer to a university in western Japan, where she became part of a "hyper diverse" community of students from around the world and completed her BA (linguistics) and MA (sociolinguistics and language education) degrees.

Elena mentioned the fact that although she developed a strong identity as a multilingual speaker, she suffered from an inferiority complex regarding her English fluency. Even though she had become a fully proficient speaker of English, when she became an English teacher Elena took every minute deviation from an American or British person's manner of speaking English as a shortcoming, which she identifies as arising from the influence of native-speakerism. It is only within the last 5-10 years that Elena has "become 'free'…and this freedom has come about through being exposed to research on the evolution of the "multilingual turn" in language education and the questioning of the 'native speaker' norm." A significant source of pressure to adhere to "native speaker norms" emanated from the English language education environment in Japan. Her first major encounter with this occurred when she applied for a job as an English instructor at a small, privately-owned *eikaiwa gakko* (English language school); one of the first questions she was asked during the interview was why the school should hire someone from Romania. A similar incident took place when she applied for a tertiary-level position; despite having passed the interview, the university's administration was reluctant to hire her. As Elena recalls, when the administration saw that her passport was Romanian, "they questioned my ability to speak English as I was not from a centre [western] country." On the flip side of this type of situation, she remembers "being very angry that completely unqualified native speakers were getting jobs that I had no chance [to apply] for, even though I was qualified."

Regarding the use of L1 in the classroom, Elena stated that she regards it as an invaluable tool in the classroom, and that her position is that teachers and students should use L1 along with any other means to "ensure the success of the class." Elena's ability to use L1 was in fact an indispensable part of convincing the owner of the *eikaiwa gakko* to hire her (see above), which resulted in Elena securing her first teaching job in Japan. Over the two years that she taught there, Elena had "various classes…where I had no choice but to use Japanese…the students were happy and made progress and that was all the owner cared about." She also noted that her ability to use Japanese was a great aid in forging a good relationship with the owner. As someone who had devoted years to learning English and Japanese (along other languages), Elena posited that as someone who had struggled herself to learn English as a second language she was able to help her students more than other native speaker *eikaiwa* teachers. While working at her first teaching job (she stayed on for two years), she noticed that many of her students were those who had quit taking classes at large, corporate *eikaiwa* schools, who also made up a sizeable portion of the student body at her second teaching job, which was at a non-profit organization. Describing the reasons why those students left the corporate conversation schools, she confided that, "Some of the friends I made later on who had worked in chain *eikaiwas* told me the horror stories," namely that in their "desire for profit" these corporate schools tended to "put a lot of energy in attracting new students with enticing offers to join…they lock the students in for a certain period of time [via legally-binding contracts]…then they don't care if they quit because they have new ones coming along." Elena also acknowledged she had heard of western instructors taking advantage of the lack of sound pedagogy/emphasis on merely selling the image of English education in their work approach as well as relationships with students.

Subsequent to working with students at conversation-type schools, Elena taught at vocational schools for two years while working on her master's degree. After obtaining her

MA, she “did three years in high school and some part-time uni.” From there she secured her first full-time university position, which was contracted for three years. Upon finishing her time there, Elena found full-time work at her current university, where she has been for seven years. Figuring in the two years she spent teaching at her second teaching job, Elena has to this point devoted nineteen years of her life to teaching English in Japan. Given her background, she is committed to interweaving her “multilingual identities and…[her] identity as an English teacher…to help my [her] students in their journeys as multilingual learners.” She is also intent on further investigating incidents of discrimination such as those that she experienced as a non-native English speaker, as “These type of incidents, I believe, show that Japan is not yet prepared to engage with the hyper-diverse community of foreigners living here.”

7.2 Findings from instructor interviews

Four major themes emerged from the instructor participants’ responses: The negative impact of standardized testing, the importance of L1 in the classroom, the impact of western instructors’ privileged position, and the role of school administration in setting and adhering to non-progressive policies. These themes featured prominently as primary factors which shaped and impacted the instructor participants’ personal journey and teaching approach as an instructor of English in Japan.

7.2.1 The negative impact of standardized testing

Standardized testing was explicitly identified by three of the five instructors as being a root cause which has led to deficiencies in English language education in Japan. Wei Hong felt there has historically been a direct link between the emphasis on standardized English exams and the lack of enthusiasm for the learning of English amongst Japanese students. She felt that the “test-oriented education system has limited students’ development," a situation

which has led to neglecting "the diversity of their development," with the result that "students lost their direction and motivation after they entered university." Nathan has the perspective that standardized testing continues to exert tremendous influence in a systemic manner due to standardized exams prioritizing "formal knowledge…and memorization," which thereby orients Japanese students from junior high school into a mind-set which views English as principally a test subject, rather than as a tool capable of multiple real world applications. Nathan sees this categorization of English as a test subject as related to the Japanese government's policy of cultivating a nation-state ideology related to a Japanese person's sense of identity "whereby 'national language' is one of the markers of belonging to 'Japan,' and equally overt proficiency in another language can be seen as…not belonging to 'Japan.'" Such a policy he contends originated in the 19th century Meiji government's efforts to create a strong nation-state derived from the 19th century "'racial Darwinism that Europeans developed…as a means of control and divide and rule in their colonial conquests…which the Japanese state followed in its identification as a 'developed' nation…as it started on military supremacy in Asia." This policy he feels is also related to the fact that schools at both the secondary and tertiary levels "make a lot of money from entrance exams…so…there is a commercial pressure there," with the cumulative result being that "Schools are locked into particular ways of arranging English education, and unless universities change their [English] entrance exams away from translation…then it will be very difficult for secondary schools to change," as "There are many commercial interests at stake…and it won't change quickly."

John also expressed the view that the main stumbling block for English education in Japan was that it is too wholly preoccupied with "reaching standards/testing set by the government. No thought about pedagogy, especially about how to get students USING the language…Just checking the boxes and translation practice." According to John this in turn has led to Japanese English teachers becoming accustomed to simply "Following a list A-Z

and no random things happening," which creates a classroom environment where spontaneous real use of the language cannot occur, as "Language learning is a random and unspecified path. You cannot just focus on finishing books which are already written. All students have different needs." John makes it very clear that for him, "Tests are…the main issue- English is treated…like Math…so it is standardized and no real world use is ever undertaken (so they cannot use it!)."

7.2.2 Importance of L1

Four out of the five instructors interviewed expressed the view that the use of the students' L1 should be allowed in the classroom. For Fei Hong, "L1 is necessary especially for lower level students and grammar…I do not think English only is the best approach, and I think students need to learn grammar by using L1." However, she did qualify this by stating that for communicative purposes, students would need to "get used to it [English] since some of them may have been passively learning English for a long time." On the contrary, John put forth the opinion that L1 can be conducive to promoting communicative fluency, pointing out that as it is common for people in multicultural situations to mix languages, "If students need to borrow words to finish dialogue, that is real world use itself. It will promote fluency and confidence of communicating, rather than shut down communication when they don't know how to say something." He continued further on this topic by noting that in his experience using various communicative strategies and mixing linguistic codes seems to be an instinctual learning behavior, as "Kids do it with words, gestures, cries, etc…then they learn to speak fluently over time with words…If I started learning Chinese…I'd like to be able to use English for a while to get through classes!"

Elena stated that she thought that a student's L1 "is a valuable tool in the language classroom," affirming that she believed "both students and teachers should be able to…use

L1 to explain activities, students use L1 to confirm understanding…but also that students and teachers can use L1 as a means to build rapport." Nathan admitted "I have at times strongly emphasized using English to my students…and been left quite frustrated at how little some students might use English within a class." This experience has been part of his struggle to discern "between learning [about] language and using language, and…[after] working for a long time now…I get to see better the different world views and ideologies that influence me and other teachers." He related that it was not until he had embarked upon doing his doctoral dissertation that he realized "L1 knowledge is not separate from L2 knowledge, they are interlinked, whereas perhaps at some point I had a model of separate language systems." Nathan commented that he was not sure why he initially held to a native-speakerist type of approach in Japan, as that attitude is quite at odds with the multilingual environment that he was brought up and matured in as a young adult in Europe. Going further into detail, he disclosed that it was through his doctoral research on phraseological learning in the Amin language along with observing his two children grow that he realized the indispensability of a learner's L1 for language acquisition as part of their "repertoire of language resources (not x number of separate languages)- that's what I mean…my now having a sense of my students as 'whole' people" for whom he now endeavors to follow a pedagogy which "is about enabling [learners] to think about how to make use of their L1, [and] other language resources, in an L2 class, so that brings up thinking about translanguaging and combining the use of English and Japanese/other languages."

7.2.3 The privilege of western instructors

Four out of the five interviewed instructors made comments which indicated that western instructors were privileged by way of receiving benefits in a biased manner, or else used their position as instructors in ways which did not fulfill their job description as a dedicated professional in the eyes of the interviewee. Wei Fong bluntly stated that in her

estimation "native speakers have priority to get a teaching job. Sometimes native speakers have more opportunities…it seems and that it seems easier for them to get a full-time position easily." Elena similarly expressed her feeling that there were unmistakable, significantly unfair hiring practices in place in Japan which favored native western instructors, recalling "being very angry that completely unqualified native speakers were getting jobs that I had no chance [to apply] for, even though I was qualified," and that despite passing the interview for a tertiary position, the school administration "questioned my ability to speak English as I was not from a centre [western] country." She also related that some friends who worked in the large corporate *eikaiwa* (English conversation school) business "told me the horror stories…a lot of horror stories" about how the chain *eikaiwas* would consciously mislead and exploit students for profit, and how native instructors (according to Elena the corporate *eikaiwas* would only hire native speakers or Japanese instructors) were not only complicit in their employers' actions but also took advantage of the system and the students.

As a full-time professor with 13 years of experience teaching English in Japan who is involved in hiring at his current university, John has interacted with and observed a number of western instructors. He admitted that while there were those "at conferences…trying to make a difference to improve classes with an open mind…other teachers just want to keep their head down." Regarding pedagogy, John related that the majority of western instructors he has observed consciously disallow the use of L1 in the classroom "because the OUTCOME of courses is always focused on improving language use…most teachers in Japan see the easiest way to get there as a straight line…using only that language [English] all the way until it is perfect," resulting in a situation where "they don't know the benefits" of allowing L1. In his words, this perception is based on the fact that, "I've…seen a lot of people teach in different settings for a lot of years. They all seem to follow this kind of

pattern. Schools, businesses, universities, private lessons, etc." Queried as to whether he thought these instructors would seek to improve their pedagogy, John replied, "I think with experience (if they are motivated to do so) they will. But most people are just finishing a job each day. I think this kind of deeper thinking might take [require] research experience as well."

Aya was noticeably more critical of native instructors, saying she was shocked when she witnessed native speaker instructors "were treating students like cattle" in their disregard for basic standards of pedagogy and the fact that in her eyes "They disregard students social background…I was surprised to see many non-Japanese English teachers (both full and part-time) are teaching rather 'one-way' disregarding students' background, individual differences, etc." When asked to give a specific example, she replied, "Some of them (they were both native speakers) said, 'We don't have time to deal with all students. Can't even remember their names. Just have them sit by student number so that we can manage the classroom easily.'" However, Aya did concede that there were conscientious native speaker instructors who did strive to improve their teaching by studying such issues related to native speaker privilege. Despite this, in her final analysis she stated that, "Basically almost all universities and colleges…lack [sufficient attention to] sociocultural issues."

7.2.4 Nonprogressive administration

A final major theme which emerged from the instructor interviews was the unanimous consensus that school administrations adhere to behaviors and policies which do not lead to progressive work or learning environments. As noted above, Fei-hong expressed concern over the emphasis on standardized exams, as well as favoritism towards native speakers in the hiring process. As a fellow non-native instructor with teaching credentials, Elena also experienced anguish over being denied opportunities which she was qualified for due to not

being from a western country, explicitly stating that chain *eikaiwas* often hired native speakers who had no teaching experience or qualifications, and that even universities exhibited a strong bias against professionals from non-Center countries. She also related that from her experience, part-time high school and university instructors were treated badly relative to full-time teachers, as they were "given a lot fewer responsibilities, less respect, [and] less choice about what to do in their classes." Similar to her comments on native speaker privilege, Aya was scathing in her evaluation of an American administrator at a 2-year college she worked at, who as head of the English language education department "explicitly said 'Your Nepalese ryugakusei students need to correct their pronunciation because they have strong accents.'" She also detailed how at this same college, despite having a department titled "International Communication," requests to have the foreign students interact with Japanese students were turned down in favor of keeping Japanese and foreign students segregated into separate classes, which ensured that minimal international communication occurred. Aya made it clear that in her experience these types of issues were not relegated to 2-year colleges, but that "basically almost all universities and colleges" had deficiencies related to "disregarding students' backgrounds," which she attributed to privileged native speakers as well as administrative staff.

Nathan also affirmed that at the university he currently works at there is a similar intentional bifurcation between that which is Japanese and non-Japanese, as "the curriculum divide between taught in J and taught in E is very strongly encoded… the English Department runs 190 courses which are titled in English as 'taught-in-English' and another 300(?) courses which are title[d] 'taught-in-Japanese,'" so that when he first started working there, "There was simply no communication across the divide or sense of common enterprise." With conscious effort and his position as full-time faculty member, he has endeavored to "get beyond this institutional coding" that puts teachers and students in a

situation where they "are working from particular stereotypes about who they are, what they do, and what their class involves." This has led to "a very strong demarcation of policies and practices for two particular essentialised groups of teachers - Japanese and 'native speakers.'" Besides institutionalizing native-speakerism, Nathan sees this type of administrative policy as also cementing a pedagogy in which "children are not taught to see others as different and equal" with "no sense of multicultural in this world, as it might be understood in other societies." With regards to hindering communicative ability in English language education, he saw the universities' policy of making the English section of entrance exams focused on translation as a major deficit which encourages students to view English as a subject only to be studied for exams, rather than as a social tool with real world applications.

John stated unambiguously that for meaningful changes in pedagogy to take place within educational administrative bodies, it is first and foremost a government issue, as "the people at the top (ironically furthest from classrooms and understanding grassroots teaching) must be the ones to make those changes," as "business culture (I see the government as a business) is very rigid. Very top down." Within the construct of government relaying policies to schools, he commented that "If I can talk about leadership…it is lacking here…Leadership is not just telling people what to do, but using all of your resources to get things working well. Using people from the bottom to top to make choices." As a result of this rigid hierarchical structure, there is a "Fear of difference. Not following rules, being different from other teachers or schools," with the result that at administrative meetings in universities, rather than focus on questions of pedagogy, "at meetings, little is spoken about such things at the uni level. Mostly about procedural things [getting tests done, etc]." Due to the crushing hierarchical social pressure, he asked "Why would a teacher risk their career and reputation by asking to change things on their own?" In this educational environment, rather than actively taking steps to improve themselves, "Universities…measure themselves against

other unis and change things to be MORE like each other…Just trying not to stand out." Ultimately, in John's view no substantial changes will take place in university administrative policies regarding a pedagogy which can improve Japanese students' communicative fluency "unless they are influenced from the outside," as the fear to change the status quo from within is not regulated by being "sacked, but socially exiled…That is a huge motivator to do nothing in Japan. Stand out and be pushed out. Social death is worse than anything here."

8 Student Interviews

8.1 The student participants

In creating the narratives of the five students, I selected information which characterizes each student's learning journey and basic perspective on English education in Japan. I also chose to quote passages from the interviews which expressed some urgent concern or illuminated an aspect of a student's learning journey and view of English education in Japan. All participants at the time of the interviews were 19 years old (with the exception of one 20 year old), and all participants were given pseudonyms. Brief descriptions of each student participant will now follow.

Hiro. Hiro stands out from the other student participants for two basic reasons. One is the fact that amongst the five students that I interviewed, he was the only one who had studied English abroad. The other is that the interview with Hiro happened spontaneously, without prior planning. At one of the universities that I work for, there is a free conversation 'tutor' program accessible for students to sign up for up to two consecutive 15-minute periods of English conversation. As this interview research was conducted during the first two months of 2021 while the Covid-19 virus was still problematic, all tutor sessions were conducted online. As this free conversation program is available to all undergraduates, it often happens that instructors speak with students with whom they are not acquainted. This being the case with Hiro, I asked him some basic questions to assess his level of English proficiency, and noticed that his listening and communication skills appeared rather accomplished, even though he spoke with a Japanese accent. This piqued my interest, as it appeared to me that although he had achieved a rather high level, he may or may not have lived abroad, and might be able to provide some interesting data. Even though I had not arranged to conduct an interview with him beforehand, he unreservedly agreed to allow me to use the contents of our conversation for my research.

Hiro grew up in Kanagawa prefecture, Japan, and attended a public junior and senior high school near Yokohama. A key turning point occurred for him when he did a 3 week homestay in New Zealand on the urging of his mother, who had gone abroad to study when she was 20. Due to his positive experience with his homestay family, Hiro became interested in improving his English language skills. This was in direct contrast to his junior high classmates, who he said looked at him in a "strange way" when he initially attempted to enthusiastically interact with the foreign English teachers. Due to this learning environment, Hiro said he significantly lessened the amount he would talk in his junior high English class, but would instead focus on listening to what his foreign instructors said, and then would go home and listen to English songs while studying vocabulary for the EIKEN, which is an English proficiency exam that Japanese people may take to demonstrate their prowess in reading and listening, as well as speaking about topics related to current events.

At his junior high school, Hiro said there were in total "about five" native speaker instructors who would work together with a Japanese English teacher to deliver English conversation lessons at his school twice a week, one hour per class. Although this is generally considered a generous number of teachers and English conversation lessons for a public school, Hiro noted that most students were not very motivated. The basic reason he felt was twofold: (1) the western instructors spoke too fast, and (2) even though the Japanese English teacher translated, not being able to catch what was said in real time made a huge difference; "If they [his fellow classmates] could understand word for word," it would be interesting for them. As someone who had developed his vocabulary from the age of 12, for Hiro being able to confirm what the foreign instructors were saying via the Japanese teacher's translation made the class engaging.

Speaking of his foreign English instructor at his Japanese university, Hiro revealed that she was a non-native speaker from South Korea, who was "so kind and speaks slowly for

us." Partly owing to this, he felt his university classmates were much more engaged than his junior or senior high classmates had been. Of more importance was the fact that as a non-native speaker, she herself had struggled to learn English as a second language, and therefore could not only sympathize with the struggles of her students, but more importantly the "Korean teacher tailor the word for students who cannot listen the word because she is from the country near Japan," which was significant for him, as "she understand the difficult of English word pronounce for non-western country [people]." He emphasized this point by stating that he felt "the big difference between a Korean teacher and other teacher…the teacher from western countries speak very well, but most people can't listen the word," stressing that Japanese students "feel really difficult, because speed and pronounce is difficult" as "Teacher from western country speak English unconsciously…sometimes speak too difficult unconsciously." On account of this, Hiro said in order to improve student motivation he felt it would be better for non-native English-speaking teachers (NNEST) to teach junior and senior high English conversation classes, as "The key point to improve Japanese students' motivation is to stand the same point as Japanese student." He thought his Korean English instructor had once upon a time also "had trouble studying English like Japanese [people], so it is the key point." Once students had achieved a good level of proficiency (he quantified this as at least a score of 550 on the TOEIC English language proficiency exam), Hiro felt then that a native speaker instructor would be more appropriate.

Tomoko. Tomoko grew up in Saitama prefecture, and had been studying English for ten years in the Japanese state education system. In addition to this, she studied outside of school for five years (from the age of 13-18) in what is known as a *juku*, which is a private institution that students may attend (assuming sufficient financial resources) in order to supplement their compulsory education. Regarding *juku*, Tomoko stated that the only reason she studied reading and writing in English was to prepare for entrance examinations. Prior to

university, Tomoko studied English with three foreign teachers- in senior high with an American, in junior high with a Canadian, and at the primary level with an instructor from the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. Of the three instructors, she cited her experience with her elementary teacher as the most interesting, as they "only played games," and felt that the study of English began to become tedious from junior high with the onset of grammar study. She recalled that at the secondary level, English class with a foreign instructor was held once a week for an hour. She stated that she felt her level of communicable English was low.

On the topic of the use of L1 in class, Tomoko brought up the most recent class she had taken with a Canadian instructor at her university. According to her, this instructor only spoke in English, and did not actively check student comprehension, so that students were reduced to frantically sending chat messages to each other in Japanese during the class to confirm whether they were following in an accurate manner. Students found it necessary to communicate on social media amongst themselves after class as well, as this instructor apparently only orally assigned the homework, and did not post it on the class website, which specifically has a heading for class assignments. Recalling her experience with this class, Tomoko asserted that, "Of course, it is important only speak English, but it is not useful when we can't understand meaning." Considering what could be done to improve Japanese students' motivation to study English, she felt that the strong emphasis on standardized testing was mainly to blame, and that Japan should "Reduce the percentage of paper test English system." Within the current system and its emphasis on standardized testing, Tomoko believed that it was a given that students needed to attend a *juku* (where it is said that very specific test-taking techniques are disclosed to students). In her words, students whose families could not afford to pay the costs of *juku* were at a distinct disadvantage- "Yes. I think those who do not have money can't do well unless it's a lot of effort."

Taro. Taro, who grew up in Nagano prefecture, had been studying English from the age of 9, both in school as well as privately. Fortunately for him, his parents paid a private instructor from America to tutor him once a week for two hours over the course of three years. Queried about whether his private lessons were enjoyable, Taro replied in the affirmative, and pointed out that his American instructor used L1 extensively during the lessons. Regarding school, he said he had studied English with four foreign instructors from the primary to tertiary levels. He characterized the elementary school classes as enjoyable, as "there were many games and everyone was speaking with a smile," and that a distinct change occurred in junior high, as suddenly there were "Many words to remember and many grammars. Gap from elementary school," which in his view caused many students to become demotivated. Going deeper into his analysis of the junior high English classroom situation which he experienced, Taro said, "I think half of the class are good at English and half are not good…If there is only one English teacher, students who cannot speak English pretend to listen and do not listen," as "It didn't help when the talk speed was fast. Because they only spoke English." In order to cope with the situation, "There is a system in which students who speak English can teach in Japanese after the teacher finishes speaking." As for the 'good half' of the his junior high class, Taro expressed the view that elementary school English classes alone were not sufficient to prepare and enable a student to be an active participant in junior high English classes, and answered in the affirmative when asked if he felt private lessons and/or *juku* cram schools were necessary for students to do well in junior high and continue to have motivation to study English- "…I personally feel that many of the people who attend English cram schools are good at English. I feel that elementary school plus...individual lessons are finally enough…I think that is the current situation."

Mayuko. Mayuko grew up in Shizuoka prefecture, was 20 years old (a year older than the other students) at the time of the interview, and had been studying English for 10 years.

From the age of 15-18 she took supplementary reading and writing 1 hour lessons at a *juku* three times a week. Although she feels her *juku* study improved her level of English, Mayuko flatly stated that she did not find the *juku's* classes to be interesting. Nonetheless, in her view supplementary English study outside of school was necessary "because I can deepen my understanding," and not participating in supplementary education decreases the likelihood of academic success. "Because we go to a cram school, we will study even if we don't want to." On the topic of foreign English teachers, she said that from elementary school to university she had had a total of five instructors, all of whom were from the United States or England. Of these instructors, she related that for the most part she found their classes difficult, "because I can't speak English well…Because they speak fast…I couldn't look it up right away [in a dictionary], and the story went on without knowing it [without understanding the content]." Despite that, she did relate that "…one class was different. Because he sometimes spoke Japanese." This being the case, it is perhaps not entirely surprising that Mayuko advocated for foreign English instructors to use Japanese in the class, which was communicated through her assertion that, "I think they should do it when we don't understand." On the topic of whether non-Japanese speaking foreign instructors adequately confirmed the content of the class with students, she related that, "They checked a little. But we didn't ask a question because we didn't know what we didn't know." She viewed the TOEIC exam as useful, offering the rationale that "By doing the test, we can see what we are not good at in English," and said she hoped the Japanese government would consider increasing the number of English conversation classes in the curriculum, due to her feeling that "it is difficult to actually speak…if we learn only grammar."

Reina. Reina grew up in Saitama prefecture, and had studied English for 10 years. She found her primary school English classes to be "fun, but English was normal for me." It was in junior high that her feelings for English shifted, indicated by her statement that, "I

entered junior high school and started the English test. I'm not good at English, so I dislike English a little." In order to prepare for the university entrance exam, in high school she studied for two years at a j*uku* once a week for 90 minutes, focusing exclusively on reading and writing. Although Reina acknowledged that due to her *juku'*s instruction she became "able to solve reading [comprehension] problems such as tests" and "improved my English reading and writing a little." In response to being asked to what degree her *juku* English teacher inspired her, she replied, "Nothing." On the other hand, after being invited by her best friend, Reina signed up for English conversation supplementary lessons at her high school, which took place during the summer break, and were held once a week for 90 minutes. Led by two non-native English speakers (from Russia and Germany), Reina found these classes stimulating: "It was very fruitful. The classes were student-centered…Each student teaches English and has discussions. Using a dictionary." When asked to explain further, Reina said the foreign instructors introduced a topic, from which the students themselves would generate questions that would then be used as a springboard for English conversation practice amongst themselves as well as with the foreign instructors. The fact that the foreign instructors were non-native English speakers who had themselves struggled to learn English was significant for Reina, as she asserted that "I think that if the teacher sees things from the same perspective as the students, the students will be more motivated to learn English." With the emphasis on using a dictionary, these classes were conducted entirely in English. Perhaps owing to this, her view on the use of Japanese in the classroom by a foreign English teacher was that it was not necessary, but that students should be allowed to use their L1: "I think we would like use Japanese in English class. The reason is that if we don't communicate ours questions…we will never get English skill better." Concerning her thoughts on the current state of English education in Japan, Reina let it be known that, "I feel that Japanese students

have a low awareness of English. And I don't think the time and money is proportional. It costs too much money and time."

8.2 Findings from student interviews

Five major themes emerged from the student participants' responses: The lack of motivation to study English from junior high school, a preference for non-native English-speaking teachers (NNEST), the necessity of private paid instruction in order to compete, the negative impact of a native-speakerist approach in the classroom regarding language usage, and the desire for a basic change to Japan's English education system. These themes featured prominently as primary factors which shaped and impacted the student participants' personal journeys and experiences as learners of English in Japan.

8.2.1 Lack of motivation from junior high school

Four out of the five interviewed student participants expressed views which identified junior high school as the time when Japanese students develop a negative attitude towards the enforced study of the English language. Tomoko identified the introduction of grammar study as the primary reason why she became demotivated to study English in junior high, a sentiment which was echoed by Taro, who stated that there were too "Many words to remember and many grammars." For Taro, another contributing factor was that the sudden introduction of intensive grammar study represented a significant change from primary school instruction, which consisted mainly of playing games, and therefore signaled a significant "Gap from elementary school." According to Taro, this change of classroom environment created a schism in his class between those students who were able to follow along and those who struggled, with the result that half of the class would merely "pretend to listen." For Reina, her change in perspective occurred due to the shift in the learning

objective toward grammar study, as she related that "I entered junior high school and started the English test. I'm not good at English, so I dislike English a little."

In contrast to the other participants, Hiro stated that, as a consequence of his homestay experience in New Zealand at the age of 12, he viewed the study of English in a favorable light in junior high, but felt himself to be an anomaly amongst his peers, whom he characterized bluntly as not motivated. Hiro remembers being stigmatized by his classmates when he attempted to interact with his teachers in English, which led him to shift from an active to passive mode of classroom learning, augmented by studying English on his own when he returned home from school. He identified the primary demotivating factor for the other students to be the western instructors speaking too fast, which made it challenging for them to understand in real-time what the co-teaching Japanese teacher translated on a slightly-delayed basis, which may have resulted in a tuning out of the English in favor of simply waiting for the translation.

8.2.2 Preference for NNEST

Three of the five student participants mentioned NNESTs as preferable to native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) from western countries. Throughout her primary and secondary school studies, Tomoko had three English instructors from foreign countries. As the study of grammar from junior high was a negative experience for her, she cited her elementary school experience with an instructor from the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago as preferable to her memories of working with instructors from Canada (middle school) and America (senior high). Tomoko also recounted a sub-optimal experience with a Canadian instructor at her university, who, while adhering to an English-only policy, did not confirm student comprehension, nor did he post any instructions for the homework assignments to the class website.

In contrast to Tomoko's preference for NNESTS by default, Reina had a significant, transformative learning experience with NNESTs. Initially saddled with a negative view of English language study in junior high due to the emphasis on grammar-based testing, Reina was able to see the study of English in an entirely new light in senior high when she responded to an invitation from her friend to join a supplementary English class held during the summer recess. As the English-only study sessions were outside of any consideration for formal evaluation, they were designed purely for language acquisition. Reina described the teaching procedure initiated by the instructors (a Russian and German national) as introducing a topic, regarding which students were then encouraged to formulate questions with the aid of a dictionary. The student-generated questions were then used as the basis for conversation-building exercises, in concert with the instructors as well as with fellow students. Reina described this student-centered, non-graded process as "very fruitful," one in which students could also assume the role of teachers when explaining words or concepts to fellow students.

Reina did indicate that for her there were definite benefits to be had through studying with NNESTs, namely that she felt NNESTs could empathize more effectively with the struggles that Japanese students face in their endeavor to improve their English proficiency. According to Reina, having themselves learned English as a foreign language, seeing things "from the same perspective as the students," NNESTs were positioned for "Thinking with students about expressions they don't understand, and giving advice" from that perspective. Reina's explanation of her preference for NNESTs was short and succinct. Hiro, on the other hand, was more verbose in delineating to greater depth very clear reasons why a NNEST and the provenance of the instructor was a clear asset in terms of pedagogy. Recounting his university class with a Korean national, Hiro specifically emphasized how it was due to his instructor being "from a country near Japan" who understood the difficulties of learning

English as a second language that enabled her to "tailor the word for students…the big difference between a Korean teacher and other teacher…the teacher from western countries speak very well, but most (Japanese) people can't listen the word." Hiro emphasized how his NNEST instructor was "so kind and speaks slowly for us" and as a non-native was able to "stand the same point as Japanese student(s)," criteria which for him led him to conclude that NNESTs were the preferable choice for teaching junior and senior high English conversation classes in Japan.

8.2.3 Necessity for private paid instruction

Three out of the five students interviewed indicated that they felt Japanese students effectively had to engage with some form of private paid instruction in order to compete within Japan's English education system. Mayuko, who attended a *juku* three times a week from the age of 15-18, stated that although students who did not have money could study grammar on their own at home, in all likelihood it would be quite difficult, as the *juku* environment forced students to study "even if we don't want to." Tomoko also affirmed the need to study outside of school at a private institution, noting that those students who did not have the financial means to do so "can't do well unless it's a lot of effort." Tomoko herself studied at a *juku* for five years from the age of 13-18. Speaking about how students become demotivated in junior high school, Taro referred to his impression that in his junior high class, half of the students were "good at English and half are not good." This he attributed to the presence or absence of private English instruction, intoning that "I personally feel that many of the people who attend English cram schools are good at English. I feel that elementary school plus…individual lessons are finally enough" for junior high students to compete well and remain motivated in their study of English. Unlike Tomoko and Mayuko Taro not attend a *juku*, but was fortunate to have had the opportunity to study with a private American tutor for three years from the age of 9-12.

Although Reina had experience studying English at a *juku* (in her case for two years) and admitted that doing so enabled her to be able to "solve reading problems such as tests" and "improved my English reading and writing a little," she did not make any comment to the effect that indicated she felt private study was essential. This may be due to the fact that she felt her involvement with teacher-centric *juku* study and her *juku* instructor did not inspire her in any way, and that in stark contrast her high school interaction with NNESTs from Europe in a "student-centered" environment was "very fruitful." Reina also explicitly stated that in terms of the costs of time and money which are required for Japanese students to study English, "I don't think the time and money is proportional. It costs too much money and time." Of the five students I interviewed, Hiro was the only student who did not study at a *juku* or with a private tutor but instead professed to be very enthusiastic about self-study with media ranging from reading traditional textbooks to watching movies and listening to music. The source of his motivation was tied to the need for a certain amount of financial resources, however, as he cited a three-week homestay in New Zealand as the trigger which ignited his passion for English study. The primary impetus for his having gone to New Zealand actually came from his mother, who had benefited from a similar experience when she was young. It therefore appears to be the case that Hiro's home environment had been more welcoming and conducive to nurturing and encouraging English study than other Japanese households.

8.2.4 Negative impact of a native-speakerist approach regarding classroom language usage

Four out of the five students interviewed affirmed the negative impact of a native-speakerist approach regarding the use of language in the classroom. A "native-speakerist approach regarding classroom language use" is here defined as the use of English by the instructor which does not take into account the students' basic language and identity needs. Tomoko stated that her university class with a Canadian instructor was problematic due to the fact that he only spoke in English, "so I couldn't hear what he said." As a result, Tomoko and

her classmates spent a significant part of each class texting each other on social media trying to decipher what the instructor wanted the students to do in class. The instructor in question also only verbally assigned homework and did not post an explanation of the homework assignments to the classroom website, which necessitated further efforts by the students amongst themselves to guess what work needed to be prepared and turned in before the ensuing week's class. Mayuko concurred that studying with western instructors from the US and UK had been "Difficult… because they talked fast." The result of this was that Mayuko could not sufficiently grasp the content of her classes, as "I couldn't look it up [the instructor's words] right away, and the story [the class content] went on without knowing it." Consequently, she expressed the hope that western instructors would use the student's L1 through her statement that "I think they should do it [use Japanese] when we don't understand." Elaborating further, Mayuko wanted western native instructors to confirm the students' understanding of the lesson, as in "They checked a little. But we didn't ask a question because we didn't know what we didn't know."

As part of his discussion of the challenges Japanese junior high students face when studying English with native speaker instructors, Taro noted that "the difficulty level increased [compared to primary school] and it became a little difficult…It didn't help when the talk speed was fast. Because they only spoke English." Taro identified the gap between primary school and junior high English class as the main factor in student demotivation to study English, with the result being that "half of the classes are good at English and half are not good at it. If there is only one English teacher, students who cannot speak English pretend to listen and do not listen." Those students who did not listen did not proactively strive to improve their level of listening comprehension and instead relied on more English-proficient classmates to translate the instructor's words. Perhaps owing to this, Taro stated that it was "very helpful" that a western English teacher whose university course he had enrolled in used

Japanese in the class, and also said “I think it’s good once in a while” regarding the use of the student’s L1 in English class. Echoing the sentiments of Taro as well as Mayuko and Tomoko, Hiro made it clear that the difference between his NNEST instructor and NEST instructors was that “the teacher from western countries speak with very well English but most people can’t listen the word…they (Japanese students) feel really difficult…because speed…Teacher from western country speak English unconsciously. Sometimes speak too difficult unconsciously.”

8.2.5 Desire for a basic change to Japan’s English education system

Three of the five students interviewed expressed the desire for a basic change to Japan’s English Education system. Reina was adamant in her desire for a more student-centered learning environment as a direct result of her experience with NNESTs, with whom she had experienced lessons in which, “Instead of the students being ‘listened’ [listening] to the lesson by the teacher, the students ‘created’ the lesson themselves. I was able to have a positive impression because of the teacher's way of teaching.” With regards to the Japanese government’s emphasis on standardized testing, she stated “I don’t think you need a score…I think it is better to have some English ability to talk.” Mayuko concurred with her pronouncement that “I hope there will be more conversation classes…This is because it is difficult to actually speak…if we learn only grammar.” Tomoko similarly voiced her dissatisfaction with Japan’s English education system in her assessment that “demotivation is only study test English” and through the proclamation of her desire to “Reduce the percentage of paper test English system.”

In contrast to the female interviewees, the two males whom I interviewed did not actively express any overt negative feeling towards standardized testing. Taro let it be known that in his estimation the college entrance exam actually acted as a positive factor regarding

his English proficiency as it forced him to learn more vocabulary and increase his listening skill level. Hiro stated more than once that students ought to study English actively on their own, and like Taro went through a period before the entrance exam in which he devoted himself to intense study, specifying that he spent three hours every day for five months from October to February memorizing and going through the exercises in an entrance exam-related English vocabulary book. In terms of changing Japan's English education system, Hiro did however express the desire to shift the emphasis from native speaker English teachers to non-native English instructors for junior and senior high English conversation classes.

9 Student Surveys

In order to further expand my view of Japanese learners' perspective on learning English in Japan, I administered questionnaire surveys to university and college students. A primary goal was to investigate factors in the classroom which could contribute to or inhibit student participation and motivation. According to Dornyei (2001), teachers and their behavior in the classroom figure prominently in the students' level of motivation to study English as a foreign language. Focusing on teachers' misbehaviors as demotivating factors, Zhang (2007) in his examination of 695 university students from the US, Germany, China, and Japan found a clear correlation across cultures of teachers' misbehaviors leading to student demotivation. Of teachers' misbehaviors, the most commonly cited one was incompetence. Within the English language classroom in Japan, intercultural communicative competence, in other words the ability of instructors to smoothly interact with the students and allow them to feel secure in who they are as Japanese people with a Japanese outlook on life, is the lens through which I formulated the questions of my survey (see Table 1 and Table 2 on pp. 170-173).

9.1 Methodology

The surveys were administered at two locations: a technical college in a western suburb of Tokyo which prepares students to enter the hotel and airline industries, as well as a private university also located in a western suburb of Tokyo. This private university had a domestic ranking of 131 out of the 717 universities (evaluated by a website named "Unirank" [http://www.4icu.org/reviews/2895.htm] at the time that this research was carried out; no ranking was available for the technical college). In total, 56 students from 4 classes participated at the technical college, while 206 students from 12 classes participated at the private university. All of the students were either first or second-year undergraduate students

(or if not had failed to pass mandatory English classes in their first or second years), were at the ‘beginner’ or ‘high beginner’ level of English proficiency based on the private university’s interpretation of TOEIC exam results, and were from diverse disciplines. All students at the private university were required to take the TOEIC exam in the English language classes which were compulsory for all first and second-year undergraduate students. These classes were taught primarily by foreign instructors. The result of the TOEIC exam counted for 20% of the students’ final grade. As all first and second-year students were required to take mandatory English language classes for each semester during their first two years of undergraduate study, the students took the TOEIC in these classes a total of four times (on the other hand, students at the technical college did not study for the TOEIC in their English language classes with foreign instructors). The study was conducted from 2016 to 2020. Students were asked to respond to statements having to do with English language instruction administered by a foreign instructor.

As alluded to above one of the foci of the statements was related to topics concerning how smoothly and comprehensively students felt they were able to interact with a foreign English language instructor as well as with each other) given the teaching approach and cultural competence of the instructor. A central feature therefore of the questionnaire were statements related to L1, as the majority of the students did not yet have the proficiency to understand or interact in English at a level which could be regarded as reflecting communicative competence. Additionally, statements concerning the TOEIC exam (not applicable to the technical college students, as they did not study for the TOEIC exam in class), as well as whether topics in English class should be only western-based or should include Japan-related content, were also incorporated. In total, the questionnaire was comprised of thirteen statements. These statements will be displayed, along with how the students responded to them, in 9.2.

In order to gauge the students' responses, a 5-point Likert scale was applied: 1. Strongly agree, 2. Agree, 3. Neutral, 4. Disagree, 5. Strongly disagree. The questionnaire was conducted in an informal manner, with the instructor translating each statement into Japanese and inviting questions from students, as well as giving the students the option to not participate if they did not feel inclined to do so. Students also were not obligated to respond to all of the statements on the questionnaire. A qualitative content analysis approach was employed to evaluate the questionnaire data in line with the rationale as outlined in chapter 6.

9.2 Student survey data

How the students responded, along with the statements they were asked to evaluate (in the order as they appeared on the questionnaire), will now be disclosed. The number of students who circled either 1 (strong agreement) or 2 (agreement) were then processed and noted under "Agree" in order to clarify the total number of students who indicated they were in agreement, while those who circled either 4 (disagreement) or 5 (strong disagreement) were processed and noted under "Disagree" to clarify the total number of students who disagreed with a given statement's connotations. The total number of students who circled 3 in response to a given question were noted under the term "Neutral."

1 Strongly agree

2 Agree

3 Neutral

4 Disagree

5 Strongly disagree

Table 1

Private Japanese University 2016-2020

	Agree: Total (Strongly Agree)	Neutral	Disagree: Total (Strongly Disagree)
1.The class should be conducted exclusively in English at all times, even if there are students who do not understand what the instructor is saying.	38(10)	65	92(38)
2.Students should never be allowed to use Japanese in the class.	32(13)	52	112(53)
3.Japanese can be a useful tool to help students understand directions and difficult words.	154(96)	33	10(5)
4.Allowing students to use Japanese facilitates group work and helps students share information and improve comprehension of the lesson's contents.	134(57)	47	16(4)
5.Japanese can be a useful tool to create a fun atmosphere to study in.	133(62)	50	14(2)

6.Studying for the TOEIC exam is a good use of class time for students whose level of English is at the beginner level.	81(39)	56	38(13)
7.An English conversation textbook with basic grammar and vocabulary would be more useful than a TOEIC textbook to help students communicate with people from other countries.	87(33)	70	18(6)
8.The TOEIC exam is a useful test for students who want to learn to communicate with people from other countries.	61(17)	72	64(20)
9.When studying English, the topics should only concern the culture and events of foreign countries.	34(4)	78	85(32)
10.When studying English, topics concerned with Japan may help students learn how to talk about their culture with people from other countries.	126(57)	57	11(2)
11.If a Japanese student who does not have a high level of English cannot understand what a foreign English teacher is saying, that Japanese student may become tired and lose interest in studying English.	110(41)	66	18(1)
12.If Japanese students who don't have a high level of English have a hard time understanding what a foreign instructor says in English, the foreign instructor should consider learning Japanese in order to explain difficult words and phrases.	106(39)	74	12(3)
13.Foreign English instructors should make an effort to learn about Japanese culture in order to better understand the feelings of Japanese students.	88(28)	79	20(3)

Table 2

Private Japanese Technical College

1.The class should be conducted exclusively in English at all times, even if there are students who do not understand what the instructor is saying.	5(0)	28	17 (8)
2.Students should never be allowed to use Japanese in the class.	12(5)	22	24 (7)
3.Japanese can be a useful tool to help students understand directions and difficult words.	31(18)	18	6(2)
4.Allowing students to use Japanese facilitates group work and helps students share information and improve comprehension of the lesson's contents.	36(17)	17	4(1)
5.Japanese can be a useful tool to create a fun atmosphere to study in.	28(12)	23	5(1)
6.Studying for the TOEIC exam is a good use of class time for students whose level of English is at the beginner level.	Not applicable (NA)		

7.An English conversation textbook with basic grammar and vocabulary would be more useful than a TOEIC textbook to help students communicate with people from other countries.	N/A		
8.The TOEIC exam is a useful test for students who want to learn to communicate with people from other countries.	N/A		
9.When studying English, the topics should only concern the culture and events of foreign countries.	8(5)	78	26 (13)
10.When studying English, topics concerned with Japan may help students learn how to talk about their culture with people from other countries.	35(20)	19	2(0)
11.If a Japanese student who does not have a high level of English cannot understand what a foreign English teacher is saying, that Japanese student may become tired and lose interest in studying English.	28(17)	25	3(2)
12.If Japanese students who don't have a high level of English have a hard time understanding what a foreign instructor says in English, the foreign instructor should consider learning Japanese in order to explain difficult words and phrases.	31(17)	18	6(1)
13.Foreign English instructors should make an effort to learn about Japanese culture in order to better understand the feelings of Japanese students.	30(12)	19	7(3)

9.3 Student survey findings

Overall, there was a striking correspondence between the responses recorded from the private university students and those noted for the technical college students. The student survey findings can be broken down and analyzed in four categories: (1) L1- related (2) TOEIC-related (3) Content-related (4) Instructor-related. When percentages are mentioned, it should be understood that they have been rounded up or down in accordance with standard statistical procedures (i.e. 74.5% would be rounded up to 75%, whereas 74.49% would be rounded down to 74%)

9.3.1 L1-related

Survey statements 1-5 are directly related to the treatment of L1 in the classroom, and whether it is de-emphasized or allowed. At both the private university (PU) as well as the technical college (TC), students surveyed overwhelmingly expressed a preference for the allowance of L1 in the classroom, and similarly disagreed with the statement that their English class should be conducted exclusively in English at all times. It could be argued with regards to survey statement 1 that if students do understand what the instructor is saying, then they would be amenable to having the class conducted only in English. However, the stark reality of beginner (even high beginner) level English classes in Japan is that the majority of students have been streamed into a beginner or high beginner class because they are not able yet to understand English at a level which would compel them to agree with survey statement 1. Nearly half of the PU students surveyed disagreed that the class should be conducted at all times in English (98 PU students disagreed compared to 38 who agreed, which is well more than a 2:1 ratio), over half of those PU students disagreed with the statement (#2) that L1 should never be allowed in class (at nearly a 3:1 ratio), and 75% agreed (more than a 15:1 ratio) that Japanese can be a useful tool to aid in understanding directions and difficult words

(#3). 65% of the PU students surveyed agreed that allowing L1 in the classroom facilitates group work/helps students share information/aids in content comprehension, and that L1 can help create an enjoyable classroom atmosphere (#'s 4 & 5; nearly an 8:1 ratio for both). The results from the TC students surveyed reflected the sentiments of the PU students, with more than three times the students disagreeing with #1 versus those who agreed (17 disagreed compared to 5 who agreed), disagreeing at a 2:1 ratio for #2, agreeing at more than 5:1 with #3, agreeing with #4 by a 9:1 margin, and also agreeing with #5 at a nearly 6:1 ratio. For survey statements 1-5, the majority of both the PU and TC students surveyed who chose to express a preference which reflected either a general sense of agreement or disagreement selected identical responses (general disagreement with #1 and 2, general agreement with #'s 3-5), the only notable difference being in the degree (i.e. disagree vs. strongly disagree) of preference.

9.3.2 TOEIC-related

Survey statements 6, 7 and 8 are related to how students perceive the TOEIC exam. However, it should be noted that the TC students did not circle a preference for these statements due to the fact that they did not study for the TOEIC in class. The PU students who were surveyed expressed agreement with statement 6 that studying for the TOEIC is a good use of class time for beginner level students at a 2:1 ratio (81 agreed, while 38 disagreed). However, interestingly these same students also agreed with statement 9 that an English conversation textbook with basic grammar and vocabulary would be more useful than a TOEIC textbook to help students communicate with people from other countries at a 3:1 ratio (87 agreed, 18 disagreed). Moreover, student sentiment was split almost evenly for #8's statement that the TOEIC exam is a useful test for students who want to learn to communicate with people from other countries, with slightly more students disagreeing (64) compared to those who agreed (61).

9.3.3 Content-related

Survey statements 9 and 10 are related to the content of the class, and more specifically to the cultures represented in the topics covered in an English language class. The surveyed PU students expressed disagreement with #9's statement that the topics presented in class should only concern the culture and events of foreign countries at a ratio well above 2:1 (85 disagreed, 34 agreed), while a significantly larger number of students agreed with #10's statement that topics concerned with Japan may help students learn how to talk about their culture with people from other countries (126 agreed, 11 disagreed, at a ratio greater than 11:1). The TC students concurred with the PU students, with a large majority disagreeing with #9 (8 agreed, 26 disagreed, at a ratio slightly higher than 3:1), with an even larger majority agreeing with #10 at a ratio slightly surpassing 17:1 (35 agreed, 2 disagreed), the largest differential recorded in this student questionnaire survey.

9.3.4 Instructor-related

Survey statements 11, 12, and 13 are concerned with the role and impact that a foreign English teacher has on Japanese learners. More specifically, survey statement 11 posits that if a Japanese student cannot understand what a foreign instructor is saying, that student may become tired and lose interest in studying English. PU students surveyed agreed with this statement at a ratio of over 6:1 (110 agreed, 18 disagreed). A similar number of PU students also agreed with #12's statement that if Japanese students who don't have a high level of English have a hard time understanding what a foreign instructor says in English, the foreign instructor should consider learning some Japanese in order to explain difficult words and phrases (106 agreed, 12 disagreed, a ratio well over 8:1). A decided majority of PU students also agreed with the final statement of the survey, which is that foreign English instructors should make an effort to learn about Japanese culture in order to better understand

the feelings of Japanese students, at a ratio of over 4:1 (88 agreed, 20 disagreed). Here again the TC students reflected the sentiments of PU students, with a large majority agreeing with #s 11-13. Broken down, for #11 there was a ratio of slightly over 9:1 (28 agreeing, 3 disagreeing), a ratio of slightly over 5:1 for #12 (31 agreeing, 6 disagreeing) and a ratio of over 4:1 for #13 (30 agreeing, 7 disagreeing).

9.4 Conclusion

The results accumulated from the student questionnaire surveys were striking in that the sentiments expressed by the private university students reflected those of the technical college students for all 13 questions. Taken together, this data corroborates relevant issues brought up by the university students and instructors who were interviewed by the researcher (see chapters 7 and 8).

9.4.1 L1 and cultural awareness

First and foremost, the overwhelming preference for the allowance of L1 in the classroom in conjunction with the student's desire that foreign instructors familiarize themselves with the Japanese language in order to explain difficult words and directions clearly echoes the fact that four out of the five students and instructors interviewed affirmed the negative impact of a native-speakerist approach regarding classroom language usage. Additionally, student agreement with the statement that foreign instructors ought to familiarize themselves with Japanese culture in order to better understand the feelings of Japanese learners affirms the relevant strong declarations made by Reina and Hiro in the sense that (according to them) there was a noted lack of awareness on the part of NESTs as to what made the study of English difficult for Japanese learners. In connection to this, among the foreign instructors who contributed to this study, Elena noted that unqualified foreign instructors were hired based on their nationality/white ethnicity, while Aya contended that

she had witnessed foreign instructors who had no regard for their learners' social background and treated them "like cattle." The surveyed students' responses to the statements regarding class content which affirmed a strong preference for the inclusion of topics related to Japan, and similarly strong disagreement with the statement that English class content should only be concerned with western topics, may also be said to denote a resistance to the native-speakerist tendencies that would appear to be insensitive to the learner's culture.

9.4.2 TOEIC and standardized testing

The sense of the importance and prominence of the TOEIC exam and the need to study for it reflected in the student questionnaires was also affirmed by the student and instructor interviews; all interview participants clearly stated that standardized testing was the central focus of Japanese English education, as it can play a large role in determining which schools a student can become eligible to enroll in (Chawala, 2021). Here it should be noted again that the TOEIC must be taken by the surveyed PU students four times during the first two years of their undergraduate enrollment, and is weighted as 20% of their final grade. Concerning the notion that the TOEIC/standardized exams perhaps do not aid in promoting conversational fluency was a topic which garnered a mixed response from both the surveys as well as the student interviews, with the sense that standardized exams did not promote fluency being supported by a slight majority in both cases. However, the fact that a significant majority (3:1) of students surveyed agreed with the statement that a conversation-oriented textbook would be more useful than a TOEIC-based one in developing conversational fluency should also be taken into account, as should the fact that Japanese students are generally made to be preoccupied with achieving high marks on standardized English exams throughout secondary level education at the expense of developing fluency (Hagerman, 2009; Barker, 2018), and may conflate the fluency they have developed (overall Japan ranks quite low in comparison with other countries; see chapter 1) with their

preparation for standardized exams. The majority of the instructors interviewed held a negative view of the effects of standardized testing on the fluency of Japanese learners, and regard standardized testing as one of the fundamental flaws of the Japanese English education system. However, it should be noted that whereas the TOEIC exam was specifically targeted in the student questionnaires, in the student and instructor interviews general English language standardized testing within Japanese secondary education and the English section of the college entrance exam were the related topics of discussion. Having said that, the results of the student surveys would seem to suggest that for the PU students the notion that the TOEIC exam/TOEIC instructional materials facilitates the development of conversational fluency is a conclusion which at the very least is debatable.

10 Recommendations

> …much of the world's verbal communication takes place by means of languages that are not the users' "mother tongue", but their second, third, or nth language, acquired one way or another and used when appropriate … In fact, the whole mystique of native speaker and mother tongue should probably be quietly dropped from the linguists' set of professional myths about language. (Ferguson, 1992, xiii)

The foregoing pages have brought to light the need to further reconsider the root causes of hegemony of American English in Japan, its consequences in terms of language policies and proficiency outcomes, and blind spots in pedagogy. As enumerated by numerous scholars such as Phillipson, Canagarajah, Kubota, Holliday, Pennycook et al., the incursion of English into various countries and the negative effects this has had on local languages and culture has been noted as a global phenomenon. It may be worthwhile to consider from here what type of progressive English language pedagogic trend has been occurring in recent years to counteract this general malaise. Jenkins (2015) notes that since the late 1990's, scholars have been questioning the legitimacy of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) pedagogy with its traditional emphasis on teaching English for communication with native English speakers/strict adherence to Anglophone modes of English, and have advocated for a break with this approach in favor of one that shifts the focus instead to the teaching of English for the purpose of intercultural communication. Within this paradigm, students studying English in non-western countries would be encouraged to create a version of English which is authentic for them and tailored to their experience of the world as constructed from their peculiar sociohistorical background, so that English language study is not "about absorbing something new that is…imposed from outside of the student's experience" but rather is a project which seeks to "align students' learning experience with the content of learning in a

developmental journey" (Leung & Lewkowicz, 2017, p. 67), one which recognizes the importance of the diverse multilingual and multicultural backgrounds of the various peoples who use English (Jenkins, Baker, & Dewey, 2017). This alternate line of thinking is actually more in tune with the reality that Anglophone speakers of English only account for roughly a quarter of all English speakers (cited in Ishikawa, 2018), a number which is declining as non-native English speakers (NNES) continue to increase globally (Jenkins, 2015; Bershidsky, 2019, March 8). In short, it is far more likely for a Japanese person traveling or working abroad to interact in English with a non-native speaker, as English increasingly becomes a lingua franca which is incorporated into one's linguistic repertoire (Jenkins, 2015; Nagy, 2016; Ishikawa, 2018; Laitinen, 2020). The teaching approach which has been advocated by Jenkins and other like-minded scholars is known as English as a Lingua Franca (ELF).

10.1 English as a lingua franca

As stated above the basic premise of ELF, and the aspect of ELF which is most relevant to this study, is that "the many users of English for intercultural communication, rather than for communication with native English speakers, should not be expected to defer to the latters' norms, " in other words, "users in…the non Anglophone-English world…were also entitled to acceptance of their own ways of using English," an outlook which "Many Native English ELT practitioners, with their instinctive sense of 'ownership' of the English language… tended at least initially to regard… as outrageous" (Jenkins, 2015, p. 50). That native speakers would take umbrage at the suggestion that ownership of English should be transferred to non-native speakers can be said to be reflective of the sense of entitlement that has prevailed until now in many domains of English language instruction as a consequence of how language is used to project and perpetuate one's power (Bourdieu, 1991).

10.2 ELF in Japan

Perhaps owing to the oft-stated somewhat dire state of English education in Japan (Seargeant, 2009, p. 47; Margolis, 2020, May 26), researchers (D'Angelo, 2017) have been eager to embrace and promote ELF as a panacea for Japan. However, although D'Angelo emphasizes that in secondary education (1) more characters from non-native backgrounds are now represented in English language textbooks (2) there is an increased interest in using teaching approaches which focus on developing communicative fluency (3) there is an increasing number of NNS who are employed by the JET program to serve as assistant English teachers (ALTs), Suzuki (2017) has found that over 93% that JET hired in 2015 were from 'inner- circle' countries (i.e. the US, Canada, UK, Australia, New Zealand); data provided from JET on its Wikipedia entry (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/JET_Programme#cite_note-20) indicate that in 2019, of the 5761 people who participated in the JET program in 2019, 4722 (82%) of them were from the US, Canada, and the UK (it should also be noted that in the figures which JET provides, 'participant' does not necessarily mean assistant language teacher, and may denote a person who works in administration and has little if any interaction with Japanese students). Further, although Suzuki confirms there are more NNS characters in the textbooks and that government policies aim to increase communicative fluency, the reality is that "what students do in the classroom appears to still be static and traditional" (Suzuki, Liu, & Yu, 2017, p. 496), and that Japanese English teachers' strong attachment to native speaker (NS; i.e. US/UK) English "clearly contributed to towards students' highly positive views of NS English" (p. 496), which is reinforced by research on sixteen English language textbooks for Japanese junior and senior high students which has found that "English communication presented in them mostly took place between a NS character and a Japanese character" (p. 496).

Concerning tertiary education, D'Angelo notes that due to the Japanese government initiating the Global 30 project, thirteen upper level institutions such as Keio University, Waseda University, Osaka University, Hiroshima University, and Nagoya University have been introducing English Medium Instruction (EMI) programs to their curriculum, where international students from various countries study together with Japanese students in classes conducted in English by faculty from diverse backgrounds, with the result that related ELF issues are now thrust to the fore amongst their professors and students (2017, p. 171). This government-funded initiative has been expanded to the Top Global University Project, so that EMI programs are now also in place at 24 additional universities that are seen as also having the potential to stimulate and develop the internationalization of Japan (Murata & Iino, 2017, p. 402). Admittance to EMI programs for Japanese students is typically based on their having demonstrated that they have been successful compared to their peers in learning the native English speaker (NES) version of English which forms the basis of Japanese standardized exams, and conform to its norms (Murata & Iino, 2017, p. 405). This, together with the fact that they have gained acceptance to a 'Top Global University,' signifies they belong to an elite group and do not represent the majority of the Japanese student population.

Murata and Iino (2017) conducted research at a Japanese university which had incorporated EMI into their curriculum for five years, both through interviews and questionnaire surveys. Although the government touts these EMI programs as a means to help internationalize, Murata and Iino found a fundamental discrepancy exists between EMI policies/practices and actual ELF use due to the influence of native speakerism and NES norms. On account of the fact that Japanese university students are heavily influenced by the prescriptive NES-based English which they studied for the university entrance exam, when these students enter an EMI environment, they feel disenfranchised and lack confidence to use their own version of English, and feel "ashamed of and embarrassed with, for example,

their Japanese-accented pronunciation…as well as commenting on some (NNES) lecturers' accented English not necessarily favorably, judging the latter's English on the basis of NES-based 'correctness'" (p. 407). Murata and Iino did find that some Japanese students did appreciate the opportunity to be exposed to the variety of Englishes they encountered through interacting with students and instructors from diverse linguacultural backgrounds, but the number of Japanese students who expressed this ELF-oriented attitude was negligible (p. 407). The students Murata and Iino examined also suffered poor evaluations on their class participation, as in the EMI program a "broadly Anglo-American NES' class participation style and communicative conventions are employed and encouraged, and students are evaluated on these bases, and with lack of confidence in 'English', most of the (Japanese) students find themselves not participating enough in the EMI community" (p. 406). Related to this, Murata and Iino provide a quote from one of their student interviews in which the student relates that initially he/she was completely passive in EMI seminar and lectures as this student had "never been encouraged to give opinions in class at high school" (p. 406). Murata and Iino concluded their study by recommending that Japanese students enrolled in an EMI program should not be constrained by NES norms, and that the English which is emphasized should not be that of the NES but that of ELF, in other words an English which is "owned equally by each member of this community as their own" (p. 409).

10.3 Considerations of ELF in Europe vs Japan

The concept of ELF evolved from reflections based on Professor Jennifer Jenkins' observations of interactions between students from different countries in classes that Jenkins taught in London in 1980's; the key driver for these reflections came from Jenkins' familiarity with Braj Kachru and Larry Smith's World Englishes framework, which argued for the acceptance of postcolonial Englishes (Jenkins, 2015). Jenkins' initial work was

followed up on by Professor Seidlhofer in Vienna as well as Professor Mauranen at the University of Tampere (Finland) in their efforts to describe ELF lexicogrammar and establish the Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings, or ELFA (Jenkins, 2015; Mauranen, 2003). ELF therefore from its inception was primarily conceived in a European academic environment, and radiated from there to stimulate discussions and developments in other locales. In its drive for the validation of non-native varieties of English, ELF proponents have had to critically question the native speaker's status as the inherently superior model English instructor (Mauranen, 2003). However, in Japan, "the paradigm shift from EFL to ELF…does not stem from critical awareness…but from general trends in education…The lack of awareness …(has) reinforced (the) centeredness of 'native English speakers' under the rationale of teaching ELF for global mindsets" (Suzuki, 2020, p. 72). So in other words, the study of English in Japan still does not appear to promote ownership of the language for those who invest huge amounts of time and money into its study and results in students viewing themselves as "second-class English speakers who are subordinate to 'NESs'" (Suzuki, 2020, p. 84), because "although (Japanese) society is increasingly becoming multicultural and multilingual, the view of English, which stems from standard English ideology, still seems to be fairly monolingual in Japan" as "In Japanese society, it is often American English…that is strongly believed to be 'real' English" (Konakahara & Tsuchiya, 2020, p. 8). The fact that this widely-acknowledged perception still exists in 2020 and beyond (Morikawa, 2019) may indicate that this phenomenon is very deep-rooted and is kept in place by forces which remain very active.

11 Conclusion

> That there are now several centers of power that compete in promoting several native models of English and market distinct [English language teaching] methodologies cannot be denied. The motivation is clearly the exploitation of the economic power of English, as is obvious from the following quote: 'As the director of a dynamic world-wide chain of English language schools puts it, "Once we sent gunboats and diplomats abroad; now we are sending English teachers."' (Phillipson, 1992, p. 8)

> Social linguists and critical discourse analysts have long argued that the spread of English was, and continues to be, linked to the agendas of both the multinational business community, and the economics and political interests of both the UK and US governments. (Wicaksono, 2012, p. 242)

The research conducted in this investigation suggests that the monolingual, native-speakerism tendencies still so pronounced in the Japanese English language education system is not the result of an accident, but rather is a consequence of a deliberate political and commercial agenda established after the conclusion of World War II which has been put into play by certain institutions who stand to profit by the perseverance of native-speakerism in Japanese English education. Pennycook (2017) argues the fact that the term *applied linguistics* was coined in 1948 along with the huge outlay of funds that the US Defense Department was allocating to its development at that time is indicative of the emphasis that the US government placed on utilizing English as a key component of American Expansionism during the Cold War era (p. 134-135), a phenomenon presaged in 1943 by Churchill in his position that adherence to and promulgation of a codified, standardized version of English (p. 130) would assure the US of world domination in a post-war scenario where "colonialism and open physical exploitation were to be replaced by more subtle forms of exploitation in

which…English…was to play a very large role" (p. 131). As delineated above, actors such as John Rockefeller III and his associates saw to it that American English became firmly rooted in the consciousness of Japanese people. Japan in this regard appears similar to South Korea, where the elite have carried on a program of supporting pro-American policies through English (Kim, E.G., 2011; Lee, I., 2011) as a symptom of a colonized nation instilled with a doctrine of survival-of-the-fittest social Darwinism (Lee, Wha Han, & McKerrow, 2010; Shin & Lee, 2019; Choi, 2020), as a result of the US government's post-war policy of restoring to power Korean members of the pre-war establishment (Cumings, 1981, 1997; Kim, E.G., p. 197). Also eerie in echoing what has occurred in Japan, in South Korea the "ultimate goal of the US planners was an education system fully staffed by Koreans but structured along American lines" (Armstrong, 2003, p. 75), which resulted in policies such as the adoption of American English as the only standard teaching model in secondary education (Ahn, 2013). This project was only part of a much larger intensive multimedia campaign to Americanize South Koreans and "was carried out by a wide range of actors, including the US government and its cultural agencies; Christian organizations...volunteer organizations such as the Boy Scouts...and private foundations, including Rockefeller, Ford, Carnegie, and the Asia Foundation" (Armstrong, 2003, pp. 95-6). Regarding Japan, this objective to Americanize the Japanese people was overtly stated in a film (briefly referred to above) which was shown to US military personnel who were sent to Japan in the post-war era for occupation duty, which proclaimed, "There are 70 million of these (Japanese people) in Japan…These brains, like our (American) brains, can do good things…or bad things…All depending on the kind of ideas…that are put inside…We're (the US) here to make it clear to the Japanese that the time has now come to make sense- modern, civilized sense. That is our (the US') job in Japan" (Dower, 1999, pp. 214-217). In fact, by all indications US officials deliberately carried out a massive operation of social engineering on the Japanese citizenry. MacArthur described post-

war Japan as “the world’s great laboratory of an experiment in the liberation of a people” (quoted in Kitahara, 1989, p. 23) and viewed the Japanese people as “weak, dependent, incompetent children” who needed to be taught “how to become acceptable, decent adults” (p. 23).

The deliberate enshrinement and spread of American English throughout Japan in the post-war era, therefore, was but one component (insisted on by John Rockefeller III and carried out by the USIA; see Chapter 4.3) of the overall US plan to utilize Japan for its ambitions in East Asia (Cumings, 1993; Dower, 1999; Matsuda, 2007; Barnes, 2017), which as we have seen was an objective stretching back to the 19th century, and is unquestionably pro-capitalist in character. The US’ success in Japan has been greatly abetted by Japanese war criminals who were released from incarceration who had no qualms in implementing US policies, as they were able to re-ascend to positions of prominence and make full use of their deep connections to institutions of Japanese power (Weiner, 1994; Dower, 1999; Johnson, Schlei, & Schaller, 2000; Arima, 2008; Driscoll, 2010). In her doctoral research into the influence of culture and politics on English education during World War II and the US Occupation of Japan, Ohara (2016) concludes that current Japanese government policies (influenced greatly by what occurred during the Occupation) such as recommending the TOEIC and TOEFL exams are elitist and have produced a situation in which “better English language education is reserved for a small number of elites, who are selected for government-sponsored projects, as well as for people who can afford English language education outside of school” (p. 257).

Although elite stakeholders have profited greatly from the pro-capitalistic booming business of English in Japan, research in this study suggests that Japanese students themselves feel shortchanged by the Japanese English education system, and are not comfortable with native-speakerist elements in the classroom. On the other hand, from their

perspective, some native English speakers who come to Japan to earn a living teaching English have expressed discontent at what they view as being discriminated against (Houghton & Rivers, 2013; Rivers, 2018a; Rivers, 2018b) in the workplace. Other educators, including those interviewed for this study, have noted more urgent concerns such as the negative impact of standardized testing. From the Bourdieusian perspective, the prevalence of a for-profit standardized testing model which stresses native speaker norms as the de facto dominant narrative within the Japanese English education system is but another example of structures that have been put in place by administrators which help to ensure that the education system does its part to "'reproduce' the culture of the dominant classes, thus helping to ensure their continued dominance and to perpetuate their covert exercise of power" (Jenks, 2002, p. 1). From this perspective, every time he or she begins a lesson, it is therefore left to the English language educator in Japan to either perpetuate the discourses which relegate the majority of students to a marginal status, or strive to help even out the balance of power which exists both inside and out of the classroom.

References

17th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution: Direct Election of U.S. Senators. (n.d.). https://www.archives.gov/legislative/features/17th-amendment

Ahn, H. (2013). English policy in South Korea: A role in attaining global competitiveness or a vehicle of social mobility. *Journal of English as an International Language*, *8*(1), 1-20.

Akanuma, K. (2004). Nihonjin wa naze gambaru noka (Why do the Japanese make efforts to anything?). Daisan-shokan.

Allman, P. (2001). *Critical education against global capitalism: Karl Marx and revolutionary critical education*. Bergin & Garvey.

Anderson, F. E. (1993). The Enigma of the College Classroom: Nails That Don't Stick Up. In P. Wadden (Ed.), *A Handbook for Teaching English at Japanese Colleges and Universities*, pp. 101-110. Oxford University Press.

Anderson, F. E. (2009). Cross-cultural perspectives on education and language socialization. Chat Technical Reports No. 7. *Research Report on 2007 Kansai University Activity Theory Research Center, 91-108.*

Aoki, M. (2016, September 5). English heads for elementary schools in 2020 but hurdles remain ahead. *Japan Times.* Retrieved from https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2016/09/05/reference/english-heads-elementary-school-2020-hurdles-abound/

Aoki, M. (2017, April 6). Japan's latest English proficiency scores disappoint. *Japan Times.* Retrieved from https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2017/04/06/national/japans-latest-english-proficiency-scores-disappoint/#:~:text=The%20latest%20ministry%20survey%20also,30.2%20percent%20the%20previous%20year

Apple, M. W. (2013). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Apple, M., Da Silva, D., & Fellner, T. (Eds.). (2013). *Language learning motivation in Japan.* Multilingual Matters.

Appleby, R. (2017). 12. Occidental romanticism and English language education. In *Isms in Language Education* (pp. 249-266). De Gruyter Mouton.

Arima, T. (2008). *Genpatsu· Shōriki· CIA: kimitsu bunsho de yomu Shōwa rimenshi*. Shinchōsha.

Armstrong, C. K. (2003). The cultural cold war in Korea, 1945-1950. *Journal of Asian Studies, 62*(1), 71–100.

Arnove, R. F. (1982). *Philanthropy and cultural imperialism: The foundations at home and abroad*. Indiana University Press.

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the EFL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 9–32.

Auerbach, E. (1995). The politics of the ESL classroom: Issues of power in pedagogical choices. *Power and inequality in language education*, 9-33.

Ayabe, Y. 2009. Sengo Nihon no Makuro Shakaiteki Eigo Kyouiku Bunka: Gakusyuu Sidou Youryou to Shakai Kouzou wo Chushin ni (戦後日本のマクロ社会的英語教 育文化: 学習指導要領と社会構造を中心に). In: Y. Ayabe, ed. Gengo Jinruigaku kara Mita Eigo Kyouiku (言語人類学から見た英語教育). Hitsuji Syobou. pp.87-193.

Baca, G. (2011). *The English wave: Foreign language and class conflict.* Retrieved from http://congress.aks.ac.kr/korean/files/2_1357261587.pdf

Bachman, L. F., Davidson, F., Ryan, K., & Choi, I. C. (1995). *An investigation into the comparability of two tests of English as a foreign language* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.

Baick, J. (2004). Cracks in the Foundation: Frederick T. Gates, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the China Medical Board. *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*, *3*(1), 59-89. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/25144355

Baker, W. (2015). *Culture and identity through English as a lingua franca: Rethinking concepts and goals in intercultural communication*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Barker, D. (2018). *Fundamental Problems with English Education in Japan*. 岐阜大学教育学部研究報告. 教育実践研究・教師教育研究, *20*, pp.139-148.

Barnes, D. L. (2017). *Architects of Occupation*. Cornell University Press.

Baron, D. (1990). *The English-only question: an official language for Americans.* Yale University Press.

Barret, T. & Miyashita, H. (2016). The pervasiveness of the neoliberal agenda and linguistic instrumentalism in Japan's English education policy "English Education Reform Plan Corresponding to Globalization". *Journal of English as an International Language*, 11, (1), 50-70.

Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal, 57*(3), 278–287.

Beasley, W. G. (Ed.). (2002). *The Perry Mission to Japan, 1853-1854* (Vol. 1). Psychology Press.

Berger, M. (2011). English-only policy for all? Case of a university English class in Japan. ポリグロシア, *20*, 27-43.

Berman, E. H. (1983). *The influence of the Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations on American foreign policy: The ideology of philanthropy*. SUNY Press.

Bernardi, D. (Ed.). (1996). *The birth of whiteness: Race and the emergence of US cinema*. Rutgers University Press.

Bernstein, C. (1977). *The CIA and the media*. Rolling stone.

Bershidsky, L. (2019, March 8). Brits and Americans no longer own English. *The Japan Times.* https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2019/03/08/commentary/world-commentary/brits-americans-no-longer-english/

Bix, H.P. (2016). *Hirohito and the making of modern Japan*. New York: Harper Collins.

Black, E. (2012). *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America's campaign to create a master race*. Dialog Press.

Blair, G. J. (2019, January 29). Japanese box office tops $2B, Hits Third-Highest Total in 2018. Hollywood Reporter. https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/2018-japan-box-office-revenue-tops-2-billion-1180481

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge University Press.

Boeije, H. (2002). A purposeful approach to the constant comparative method in the analysis of qualitative interviews. *Quality and Quantity, 36*, 391–409.

Boëttger, J.F., & Rathbone, M. (2016). The Marikana massacre, labour and capitalism: towards a Ricoeurian alternative. *Koers, 81*(3), 1-7.

Borg, P. (2018). What is the JET programme really for? A Discussion of Official Discourse and Policy. *The Journal of Gifu Keizai University, 52*(2), 89-109.

Borum Chattoo, C. (2018). Oscars so white: Gender, racial, and ethnic diversity and social issues in U.S. documentary films (2008–2017). *Mass Communication and Society, 21*(3), 368–394. https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2017.1409356

Bourdieu, P. (1977). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social science information, 16*(6), 645-668.

Bourdieu, P. (1987). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2018). Structures, habitus, practices. In *Rethinking the Subject* (pp. 31-45). Routledge.

Bowers, J. (1972). *Western Medicine in a Chinese palace Peking Union Medical College, 1917-1951*. The Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation.

Bowers, J. (1974). Imperialism and medical education in China. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine, 48*(4), 449-464.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (2011). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life.* Basic Books.

Brenner, D. (2012). From core curricula to core identities: On critical pedagogy and foreign language/culture education. In G. Levine, & A. Phipps (Eds.), *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy: Issues in language program direction* (pp. 125–140). Heinle.

Bresnihan, B. (2012). "Using TOEIC Scores to Evaluate Student Performance in English Language Courses." The Jimbun Ronshu, Vol. 43. pp. 1-47. Kobe: Institute for Policy Analysis and Social Innovation, University of Hyogo.

Bronner, S. E., & Kellner, D. (Eds). (1989). *Critical Theory and society. A reader.* Routledge.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown, R. E., (1982). Rockefeller medicine in China: Professionalism and imperialism. In *Philanthropy and cultural imperialism; The foundations at home and abroad* (pp. 123–146). Indiana University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness. Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buenker, J. D., Burnham, J. C., & Crunden, R. M. (1986). *Progressivism*. Rochester: Schenkman.

Burgess, C. (2012). Foreigners reluctant to come, Japanese reluctant to leave: The uchimuki discourse as a cover for Japan's failure to secure and cultivate global human resources. Kokusai kankei gaku kenkyu kiyo ronbun. International Relation Studies Departmental Bulletin Paper, 39, 79-97.

Burden, P. (2000). The Use of 'Only English' In a Learner-Centred University Classroom in Japan. *RELC Journal*, *31*(1), 139-149.

Burden, P. (2004). An examination of attitude change towards the use of Japanese in a university English 'Conversation' class. *RELC Journal*, *35*(1), 21-36.

Burgess, C. (2012). Foreigners Reluctant to Come, Japanese Reluctant to Leave: The Uchimuki Discourse as a Cover for Japan's Failure to Secure and Cultivate "Global Human Resources". *Kokusai Kankeigaku Kenkyuu Kiyou Ronbun [International Relation Studies Departmental Bulletin Paper]*, *39*, 79-97.

Business Korea (2014, March 11). Denouncement of regulations: President Park calls needless regulations archenemy, cancer. Retrieved from http://www.businesskorea.co.kr/article/3618/denouncement-regulations-president-park-calls-needless-regulations-archenemy-cancer.

Butler, Y. G., & Iino, M. (2005). Current Japanese reforms in English language education: The 2003 "action plan". *Language Policy*, *4*(1), 25-45.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Card, J. (2005). Life and death exams in South Korea. *Asia Times.* Retrieved from http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Korea/GK30Dg01.html

Carragee, K. M., & Frey, L. R. (2012). Introduction: Communication activism for social justice scholarship. In L. R. Frey & K. M. Carragee (Eds.), *Communication activism. Vol. 3: Struggling for social justice amidst diversity* (pp. 1–68). Hampton Press.

Carson, E. (2018). *Japanese student preferences for medium of instruction (MOI) in EFL classes and teacher beliefs in MOI.* - [Doctoral dissertation, Hiroshima City University].

Chandler, A. D. (2002). *The visible hand: The managerial revolution in American business*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Chang, J. (2016). The ideology of American English as standard English in Taiwan. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(4), 80-96.

Chang, K. M. K., Grafton, A., & Most, G. W. (Eds.). (2021). *Impagination–Layout and Materiality of Writing and Publication: Interdisciplinary Approaches from East and West*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Chaplin, G. (1998). *Press time in paradise: The life and times of The Honolulu advertiser, 1856-1995*. University of Hawai'i Press.

Chapman, M. (2003). TOEIC: Tried but undertested. *Shiken: JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter, 7*(3), 2-7.

Chapman, M, & Newfields, T. (2008). "The 'New' TOEIC." Shiken: *JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter*, Vol. 12, No. 2, Apr. pp. 32-37. Tokyo: JALT. Feb. 12, 2010.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Sage.

Chase, S. (2005). Narrative inquiry: Multiple lenses, approaches, voices. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp.651–679). Sage.

Chawala, S. (2021, July 29). *Education in Japan*. WENR. Retrieved from https://wenr.wes.org/2021/02/education-in-japan

Chodkowski, W. M. (2012, November). *The United States Information Agency*. Fact Sheet. https://www.americansecurityproject.org/ASP%20Reports/Ref%200097%20-%20The%20United%20States%20Information%20Agency.pdf

Choi, W. H. (2011, December 14). English used very little by S. Koreans despite emphasis on importance. *Hangyoreh.* Retrieved from https://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_national/510085.html.

Choi, L. J. (2020). 'English is always proportional to one's wealth': English, English language education, and social reproduction in South Korea. *Multilingua, 40*(1), 87–106. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2019-0031

Choon, C. M. (2021, October 7). Many South Koreans feel they are 'living' The squid game. *The Straits Times.* Retrieved from https://www.straitstimes.com/asia/east-asia/many-south-koreans-feel-they-are-living-the-squid-game

Chosun Ilbo. (2013, February 2). *Crammer staff indicted for test questions.* Retrieved from http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2012/02/07/2012020701154.html

Chosun Ilbo. (2013, May 3). *Cheating on tests rampant.* Retrieved from http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2013/05/03/2013050301160.html

Churella, A. J. (2012). *The Pennsylvania Railroad, Volume 1: Building an Empire, 1846-1917*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. Jossey-Bass.

Clancy, Patricia. 1986. The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In Schieffelin, Bambi and Ochs, Elinor (eds.), Language Socialization Across Cultures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 213-250.

Clarke, M., & Morgan, B. (2011). Education and social justice in neoliberal times. In M. Hawkins (Ed.), *Social justice language teacher education* (pp. 63•-85). Multilingual Matters.

Clavel, T. (2014, January 19). China, South Korea face familiar woes in English quest. *Japan Times.*Retrieved January 26, 2021, from https://www.japantimes.co.jp/community/2014/01/19/issues/china-south-korea-face-familiar-woes-in-english-quest/

Clayton, J. D. (1985). *The Years of MacArthur Vol. 3: Triumph and Disaster 1945-1964*. Houghton Mifflin Co.

Clements, K. (2014). *Life of Herbert Hoover: Imperfect visionary 1918 -1928*.Palgrave Macmillan.

Clinton, R. L. (2018, October 07). Elitism and Judicial Supremacy. Retrieved from https://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2010/10/1742/

Coates, Jennifer. (2017). Socializing the Audience: Going to the Cinema in Postwar Japan. *Participations* 14 (2): 590–607.

Cole, A. & Ferrarese, E. (2018) How capitalism forms our lives, *Journal for Cultural Research*, *22*(2), 105-112.

Conway, J. N. (1993). *American literacy: Fifty books that define our culture and ourselves.* W. Morrow.

Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. L. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Cotsworth, B., & Medlock, T. (2013). University student opinions on native English teachers using their L1 in the classroom. *Kansai University Forum for Foreign Language Education*, 12, 157–168.

Cramer, G., & Prutsch, U. (2006). Nelson A. Rockefellers Office of Inter-American Affairs (1940-1946) and Record Group 229. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, *86*(4), 785–806.

Crane, Daniel A. (2012) "Were Standard Oil's Railroad Rebates and Drawbacks Cost Justified?" S. Cal. L. Rev. 85, no. 3: pp. 559-72.

Crawford, J. (2001). *At war with diversity: US language policy in an age of anxiety*. Multilingual matters.

Crewdson, J.M. (1977, December 27). C.I.A. established many links to journalists in U.S. and abroad. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/1977/12/27/archives/cia-established-many-links-to-journalists-in-us-and-abroad-cias.html

Crookes, G. (2010). The practicality and relevance of second language critical pedagogy. *Language teaching*, *43*(3), 333-348.

Crookes, G. (2013). *Critical ELT in action: Foundations, promises, praxis*. Routledge.

Crookes, G. (2017). Critical language pedagogy given the English divide in Korea: A suite of practices, critique, and the role of the intellectual. *English Teaching*, *72*(4), 3-21.

Crowell, W. G. (2008). Official Soft Power in Practice: US public diplomacy in Japan. In *Soft Power Superpowers* (pp. 207-223). Routledge.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language.* Cambridge University Press.

Cumings, B. (1981). *Origins of the Korean war, vol. 1: Liberation and the emergence of separate regimes, 1945-1947*. Princeton University Press.

Cumings, B. (1993). 2. Japan's Position in the World System. In *Postwar Japan as History* (pp. 34-63). University of California Press.

Curran, N. (2018). Learned through labour: The discursive production of English speakers in South Korea: A case study of Koreans with high spoken proficiency and low test scores. *English Today*, *34*(3), 30-35.

D'Angelo, J. F. (2017). The status of ELF in Japan. In *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 165-175). Routledge.

The Dailey Item. (2014, August 5). *In multiracial Hawaii, Obama faced discrimination.* Retrieved from https://www.dailyitem.com/in-multiracial-hawaii-obama-faced-discrimination/article_90896170-a775-5360-8b45-6a98bf738799.html

Davies, A. (1996). Review Article: Ironising the Myth of Linguicism, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 17*(6), 485-496.

Denzin, N.K. (2004). Prologue: Online environments and interpretive social research. In S.L.S. Chen, G.J. Hall, & M.D. Johns (Eds.), *Online social research: Methods, issues, and ethics* (pp. 1 – 12). Peter Lang.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2008). *The landscape of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Dizard, W. P. (2004). *Inventing public diplomacy: the story of the U.S. Information Agency*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Domhoff, G. W. (2019). *The corporate rich and the power elite in the twentieth century: How they won, why liberals and labor lost*. Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). New themes and approaches in second language motivation research. *Annual review of applied linguistics, 21*, 43-59.

Dower, J. W. (1999). *Embracing defeat: Japan in the wake of World War II*. WW Norton & Company.

Dowie, M. (2002). *American foundations: an investigative history*. The MIT Press.

Driscoll, M. (2010). *Absolute erotic, absolute grotesque: The living, dead, and undead in Japan's imperialism, 1895-1945.* Duke University Press.

Duff, P. A. (2019). Social dimensions and processes in second language acquisition: Multilingual socialization in transnational contexts. *The Modern Language Journal*, *103*, 6-22.

Dyrbye, C. (n.d.). Second International Eugenics Congress held at the American Museum of Natural History in New York. Retrieved July 15, 2019, from http://eugenicsarchive.ca/discover/timeline/517228a6eed5c600000000

Eagleton, T., & Bourdieu, P. (1992). Doxa and common life. *New left review*, (191), 111.

Eckart, W. U. (2006). *Man, medicine, and the state: The human body as an object of government sponsored medical research in the 20th century*. Steiner.

Elsesser, K. (2019, December 11). *Lawsuit claims sat and Act Are Biased-Here's what research says*. Forbes. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/kimelsesser/2019/12/11/lawsuit-claims-sat-and-act-are-biased-heres-what-research-says/.

Emmott, B. (2020, October 11). How to make Japan great again. *The Japan Times.* https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2020/10/11/commentary/japan-commentary/japan-great-again-economy-yoshihide-suga/?utm_source=piano&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=72&pnespid=YdArmFi8bCsAmKE0hXjdVIxTZU.u1ZjsjbLo

Erikawa, H. (2002). Mombusho chosaku Let's Learn English no henshu to sono shuhen [Compiling Let's Learn English, authored by the Ministry of Education]. Nihon Eigo Kyoiku-shi Kenkyu, 17, 95-108.

Erler, E. J., Jones, T. R., Masugi, K., Carrese, P., Claeys, E. R., West, J. G., & Marini, J. (2005). *The Progressive Revolution in Politics and Political Science: Transforming the American Regime*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Erling, E., & Sergeant, P. (2013). *English and development: Policy, pedagogy and globalization*. Multilingual Matters.

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American journal of theoretical and applied statistics*, *5*(1), 1-4.

Evans, D., & Peattie, M. (2015). *Kaigun: Strategy, Tactics, and Technology in the Imperial Japanese Navy, 1887-1941*. Naval Institute Press.

ExxonMobil. (2019). *Our history.* Retrieved from https://corporate.exxonmobil.com/About-us/Who-we-are/Our-history.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Language and power*. Routeledge.

Fallon, T. J., & Weyand, C. H. (2015). The Use of Students' L1 in the ESL/EFL Classroom and the Role of the Native Speaking Teacher of English. *Journal of Nagoya Gakuin University*, *26*(2), 149-156.

Falout, J. (2013). 7. Forming Pathways of Belonging: Social Inclusion for Teachers Abroad. In *Native-Speakerism in Japan* (pp. 105-116). Multilingual Matters.

Fayzrakhmanova, Y. (2016). English in South Korea: Two sides of the same coin. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *236*, 168-173.

Fellow, A. R. (2008). Muckraking. *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*. doi:10.1002/9781405186407.wbiecm094.

Fellow, A. R. (2013). *American media history*. Wadsworth.

Ferguson, C. A. (1992). Foreword to the first edition. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed., pp. xiii–xvii). Oxford University Press.

Fifield, A. (2013, March 18). Contractors reap $138bn from Iraq war. *Financial Times.* Retrieved from https://www.ft.com/content/7f435f04-8c05-11e2-b001-00144feabdc0?fbclid=IwAR2P4i4b2R9mxSNMdUJgkc6VUo5PuyhUcTmUq70nwL0w5Zo-UUsNyWyMotQ

Foner, E. (2017). *Give me liberty!: an American history*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Fujiwara, G. (2018). Japan ranked 49th in English proficiency, rated low again: *The Asahi Shimbun*.

Fukushima, S. (2000). *Requests and Culture: politeness in British English and Japanese*. Peter Lang Publishing.

Fukushima, S., & Haugh, M. (2014). The role of emic understandings in theorizing im/politeness The Metapragmatics of Attentiveness, empathy and anticipatory inference in Japanese and Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 74*, 165-179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.08.004

Galloway, N. & Rose, H. (2018). Incorporating Global Englishes into the ELT classroom. *ELT Journal*. 72. 3–14.

Garcia, C. (2010). Rethinking Walter Lippmann's legacy in the history of public relations. PRism 7(2): http://www.prismjournal.org

Gates, F. T. (1912).The country school of tomorrow: In which young and old will be taught in practicable ways how to make rural life healthful, intelligent, fruitful, recreative, beautiful, and joyous. *The North Carolina High School Bulletin*, *3*(3), 99-111.

Gates, F. T. (1970, January 1). *The Country School of to-Morrow: Gates, Frederick Taylor, 1853*. Internet Archive. https://archive.org/details/countryschoolof00gate/page/6/mode/2up

Gates, M. (2019, November 12). *A civil rights challenge to standardized testing in college admissions*. Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review. Retrieved from https://harvardcrcl.org/a-civil-rights-challenge-to-standardized-testing-in-college-admissions/

Gay, L. (2010, November 7). Grounding the JETS. Retrieved March 07, 2021, from https://japantoday.com/category/features/opinions/grounding-the-jets

Gee, J. P. (2004). Discourse analysis: What makes it critical?. In *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 49-80). Routledge.

Gee, J. (2007). Reflections on assessment from a sociocultural-situated perspective. *Teachers College Record*, *109*(13), 362-375.

Gee, R. (2015). Assessing TOEIC As A Measure Of Business English : Does TOEIC Content Reflect Workplace English Needs ? Sugiyama Jogakuen University Research Journal. 46,111-119.

George Bush's address on the start of war. (2003, March 20). Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/20/iraq.georgebush

Geuss, R. (1981). *The idea of a critical theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt school*. Cambridge University Press.

Ghilarducci, T. (2019, April 11). Five Good Reasons It Doesn't Feel Like The Trump Tax Cut Benefited You. *Forbes.* Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/teresaghilarducci/2019/04/09/five-good-reasons-it-doesnt-feel-like-the-trump-tax-cut-benefited-you/#4856d58813e0

Gibney, G. (2015). Blame George Keenan for Abe's bad history. *Bloomberg View.* Retrieved from https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2015-04-29/diplomat-george-kennan-is-behind-shinzo-abe-s-history-problems

Giroux, H. A. (2001). *Theory and resistance in education: Towards a pedagogy for the opposition*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

Giroux, H. A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy.* Continuum International.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. Longman.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life.* Doubleday.

Goodman, R. (2009). The Japanese professoriate. In *Higher Education in East Asia* (pp. 13-32). Brill Sense.

Goto Butler, Y. (2015). English language education among young learners in East Asia: A review of current research (2004-2014). *Language Teaching*, *48*(3), 303-342.

Grant, M. (1901). *Passing of the Great Race.* Forgotten Books.

Grant, J. (2018). *Corrupted science: Fraud, ideology, and politics in science*. See Sharp Press.

Gross, D., & Forbes. (1997). *Forbes greatest business stories of all time*. J. Wiley.

Hagerman, C. (2009). English language policy and practice in Japan. 大阪女学院大学紀要 *6* 号*[Osaka Jogakuin University Journal, vol. 6]*, 47–64.

Halberstam, D. (1992). *The best and brightest*. Random Housing Publishing.

Hale, C. (2002, July 1). The Hula Movement. *The Atlantic.* Retrieved January 26, 2021, from https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2002/07/the-hula-movement/302538/

Hammond, C. (2007). Culturally responsive teaching in the Japanese classroom: A comparative analysis of cultural teaching and learning styles in Japan and the United States. Retrieved from https://kyotogakuen.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=pages_view_main&active_action=repository_view_main_item_detail&item_id=890&item_no=1&page_id=13&block_id=21

Hannigan, R. E. (2002). *The new world power: American foreign policy, 1898-1917*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hanson, E., Levine, A.J., & Rockefeller, D. (2000). *The Rockefeller University achievements: A century of science for the benefit of humankind 1901-2001*. New York: The Rockefeller University Press.

Hara, K. (2006). The concept of omoiyari (altruistic sensitivity) in Japanese relational communication. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, *15*(1), 24.

Harr, J. E., & Johnson, P. J. (1988). *The Rockefeller century: Three generations of America's greatest family*. New York, NY: Scribner.

Harris, H. E., Moffitt, K. R., & Squires, C. R. (Eds.). (2010). *The Obama effect: Multidisciplinary renderings of the 2008 campaign*. SUNY Press.

Hashimoto, K. (2013). 11. The construction of the 'native speaker' in Japan's educational policies for TEFL. In *Native-speakerism in Japan* (pp. 159-168). Multilingual Matters.

Hatori, R. (2005). Policy on language education in Japan: Beyond nationalism and linguicism. *University of Hawai'I Second Langauge Studies Paper 23(2)*.

Haugh, M. (2005). The importance of "place" in Japanese politeness: Implications for cross-cultural and intercultural analyses. *Intercultural Pragmatics 2*(1): 41-68.

Hawaii DOE. (n.d.). Hawaii DOE: History of Hawaiian education. Retrieved from http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/StudentLearning/HawaiianEducation/Pages/History-of-the-Hawaiian-Education-program.aspx

Hawke, D. F. (1980). *John D.: The founding father of the Rockefellers*. Harper & Row.

Hawkins, M. (2011). *Social justice language teacher education.* Multilingual Matters.

Heath, S.B. (1983). American English: Quest for a model. In B.B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 237-249). Pergamon Press Ltd.

Held, D. (1980). *Introduction to critical theory: Horkheimer to Habermas*. University of California Press.

Hindmarsh. R. (1978) 'English as an International Language'. *ELT Documents* 102. Modem English Publication: 40-43.

Hine, C. (Ed.). (2005). *Virtual methods: Issues in social research on the internet*. Berg.

Hino, N. (1992). The yakudoku tradition of foreign language literacy in Japan. *Cross-cultural literacy: Global perspectives on reading and writing*, 99-111.

Hino, N. (2012). Negotiating indigenous values with Anglo-American cultures in ELT in Japan: A case of EIL philosophy in the Expanding Circle. In *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education* (pp. 157-173). Springer, Dordrecht.

Hino, N. (2018). Pedagogy for the post-native-speakerist teacher of English. In *Towards Post-Native-Speakerism* (pp. 217-233). Springer, Singapore.

Hino, N. (2020). ELF education for the Japanese context. In *English as a Lingua Franca in Japan* (pp. 27-45). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Hirokawa, Y. (2020, November 17). 「ブライアント報告書」には何が記されていか？—ELEC 成立史の一断面—. 「ブライアント報告書」には何が記されていのか？—elec 成立史の一断面—. Retrieved from https://www.elec.or.jp/teacher/communication/criticism/ronko_hirokawa.html

Hoffman, M. (2011, December 25). Soseki leaps to defense of Japanese literature. *The Japan Times.* Retrieved from https://www.japantimes.co.jp/culture/2011/12/25/books/book-reviews/soseki-leaps-to-defense-of-japanese-literature

Hofstadter, R., & Foner, E. (2006). *Social Darwinism in American thought*. Beacon Press.

Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.

Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT journal*, *60*(4), 385-387.

Holliday, A. (2010). Cultural descriptions as political cultural acts: An exploration. *Language and intercultural communication*, *10*(3), 259–272. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708470903348572

Holliday, A. (2013). 1.'Native Speaker' Teachers and Cultural Belief. In *Native-speakerism in Japan* (pp. 17-26). Multilingual Matters.

Holliday, A. (2018). Native-Speakerism. *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*, 1-7.

Holstein, J., & Gubrium, J. (2000). *The self we live by: Narrative identity in a postmodern world.* Oxford University Press.

Honna, N. (2008). Challenging issues in English language teaching in Japan. *Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo, 2008. pg 1, 6.*

Honna, N. (2009). English as a multicultural language in Asian contexts: Issues and ideas. *World Englishes, 28*(4), 555–557.

Honneth, A. (1979). Communication and reconciliation Habermas' critique of Adorno. *Telos, 1979*(39), 45–61.

Horiguchi, S. Imoto, Y. & Poole, G.S. (2015). *Foreign Language Education in Japan: Exploring Qualitative Approaches.* Rotterdam: Sense.

Horkheimer, M. (1976). Traditional and critical theory. In P. Connerton (Ed.), *Critical sociology: Selected readings*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Hosaka, T. (2010, August 11). Budget cutters target JET. *The Japan Times.* Retrieved March 06, 2021, from https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2010/08/11/national/budget-cutters-target-jet/

Houghton, S., & Rivers, D. J. (2013). *Native-speakerism in Japan: intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*. Multilingual Matters.

Houghton, S. A., & Hashimoto, K. (2018). *Towards post-native-speakerism*. Springer.

Houghton, S. A., Rivers, D. J., & Hashimoto, K. (2018). *Beyond native-speakerism: Current explorations and future visions*. Routledge.

Howe, B. (1982). The Emergence of Scientific Philanthropy, 1900–1920: Origins, Issues, and Outcomes. In Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad. Robert F. Arnove, ed. Pp. 25–54. Indiana University Press.

Hu, S. (1995). *Stanley K. Hornbeck and the open door policy, 1919-1937*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Hughes, D. M., Chon, K. Y., & Ellerman, D. P. (2007). Modern-day comfort women: The US military, transnational crime, and the trafficking of women. *Violence Against Women*, *13*(9), 901–922.

Hunt, E. (2021, May 28). *Japan's karoshi culture was a warning. we didn't listen*. WIRED UK. https://www.wired.co.uk/article/karoshi-japan-overwork-culture

Hurworth, R. E. (2008). *Teaching qualitative research: Cases and issues*. Sense.

Hyland, K. (2019). English for specific purposes: Some influences and impacts. *Second handbook of English language teaching*, 337-353.

Iacobelli, T. (2022). *Early 20th century reforms of medical education*. Retrieved from https://resource.rockarch.org/story/early-20th-century-reforms-of-medical-education-worldwide/

Ide, Sachiko. 1989. Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. Multilingua 8: 223–248.

Igarashi, Yuko. (2018). Standardization and Japanese people's perception toward languages. 立命館国際研究 *31*(2) 61-76.

Ihara, H. & Tsuruoka, T. (2001). TOEIC: Seikou no himitsu maaketinguteki shiten kara no bunseki. [The secret behind the success of TOEIC: An analysis from a marketing viewpoint]. Nagano University Bulletin, *32*(2), 32-52.

Iino, M. (2020). Revisiting LPP (Language Policy and Planning) Frameworks from an ELF (English as a Lingua Franca) Perspective. In *English as a Lingua Franca in Japan* (pp. 47-70). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Ike, M. (1995). A historical review of English in Japan (1600–1880). *World Englishes*, *14*(1), 3-11.

Ikegashira, A., Matsumoto, Y. & Morita, Y. (2009). English education in Japan- From kindergarten to university. In Reinelt, R. (Ed.), *Into the Next Decade with (2nd) FL Teaching Rudolf Reinelt Research Laboratory EU*. Japan, 16-40.

Ikenberry, G.J. (2004). American hegemony and East Asian order. *Australian Journal of International Affairs, 58*(3), 353-367.

The Immigration Act of 1924 (The Johnson-Reed Act). Retrieved from https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/immigration-act

Inagaki, K. (2007). Jogakko to jogakusei: Kyoyo, tashinami, modan bunka [Girls' high schools and students: Their knowledge, acquaintance, and modern culture]. Tokyo, Japan: Chuo Koron Shinsha.

Ishikawa, T. (2018). From English native-speakerism to multilingualism: A conceptual note. *JACET ELF SIG Journal*, *2*, 9-17.

JALT. (2019a). Retrieved from https://jalt.org/main/history

JALT. (2019b). Retrieved from https://jalt.org/main/sponsors

James, R. (2013). *Rockefellerocracy: Kennedy assassinations, Watergate and monopoly of the "philanthropic" foundations*. AuthorHouse.

Japan Times. (2015, March 28). *Disappointing levels of English.* Retrieved from https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2015/03/28/editorials/disappointing-levels-english/

Japan Times. (2019, July 2). *Toeic won't provide English tests for Japan's new university entrance exam*. Retrieved from https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2019/07/02/national/toeic-wont-provide-english-tests-japans-new-university-entrance-exam/

Japan Times. (2019, November 9). *Japanese ranked 53rd in English skills in annual world-wide survey.* Retrieved from https://newstral.com/en/article/en/1139295983/japanese-ranked-53rd-in-english-skills-in-annual-worldwide-survey

Japan Times. (2019, December 6). *Private English tests for Japan University Entrance Exams delayed after minister's gaffe.* Retrieved from https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2019/11/01/national/private-english-tests-for-university-exams-delayed-gaffe/#:~:text=The%20government%20decided%20Friday%20to,a%20gaffe%20on%20the%20matter

JCIE. (2019). Retrieved from http://www.jcie.or.jp/thinknet/rop/2parts.html

Jenkins, J. (2009). Exploring attitudes towards English as a lingua franca in the East Asian context. In K. Murata & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Global Englishes in Asian contexts: Current and future debate* (pp.40-56). Palgrave Macmillan.

Jenkins, J. 2015. Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice 2*(3), 49–85.

Jenkins, J., Baker, W., & Dewey, M. (Eds.). (2017). *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca*. Routledge.

Jenks, C. (Ed.). (2002). *Cultural reproduction*. Routledge.

Jeon, M. (2009). Globalization and native English speakers in English programs in Korea (EPIK). *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, *22*(3), 231–243.

Joinson, A. (2005). Online interviewing and the online relationship. In C. Hine (Ed.), *Virtual methods: Issues in social research on the internet* (pp. 21–34). Berg.

Johnson, C., Schlei, N. A., & Schaller, M. (2000). The CIA and Japanese politics. *Asian Perspective*, *24*(4), 79-103.

Jones, B. A. (2019). The role of English education in Japan. *Memoirs of Learning Utility Center for Konan University Students*, (4), 21-31.

Joseph, J., & Wetzel, N. A. (2012). Ernst Rüdin: Hitler's Racial Hygiene Mastermind. *Journal of the History of Biology*,*46*(1), 1-30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10739-012-9344-6

Josephson, M. (1934). *The Robber barons: The great American barons, 1861-1901*. Harcourt, Brace.

Joun, P. (2015). Caught in the crossfire: Working in South Korea as an English teacher. *The Asian EFL Journal, 84,* 1-141. Retrieved from https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/thesis/caught-in-the-crossfire-working-in-south-korea-as-an-english-teacher/

Jowett, G. S., & O'donnell, V. (2018). *Propaganda & persuasion*. Sage publications.

Jun, J. (2012). Why are Asian Americans silent? Asian Americans' negotiation strategies for communicative discriminations. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, *5*(4), 329-348.

Jung, M. (2013, October 15). ETS vows legal action against Korean language institutes. *Korea Times*. Retrieved from http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/culture/2013/10/516_144334.html

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11 – 30). Cambridge University Press for The British Council.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. B. (2005). *Asian Englishes beyond the canon*. Hong Kong University Press.

Kame'eleihiwa, L. (2004). *Islands in Captivity: The international tribunal on the rights of indigenous Hawaiians*. In W. Churchill, & S. H. Venne (Eds.). South End Press.

Kapur, N. (2018). *Japan at the Crossroads*. Harvard University Press.

Kariya, T. (2010). From credential society to “learning capital” society: A rearticulation of class formation in Japanese education and society. In H. Ishida, & D. H. Slater (Eds.), Social class in contemporary Japan: Structures, sorting and strategies (pp. 87–113). Routledge.

Katz, M. (1997). *Revolution and revolutionary waves.* St Martin’s.

Keith, J. (. (2003). *Mass control - engineering human consciousness*. Adventures Unlimited Press.

Kelly, Mark. (2005). Motivation, the Japanese freshman university student and foreign language acquisition. *JALT Hokkaido Journal*, 9, 32-47

Kennedy, P. (1987). *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*, Vintage Books.

Khubchandani, L. M. (1983). *Plural languages, plural cultures: communication, identity and sociopolitical change in contemporary India*. Univ. of Hawaii Press.

Kikuchi, K., & Browne, C. (2009). English educational policy for high schools in Japan: Ideals vs. reality. *RELC Journal*, *40*(2), 172-191.

Kim, E. G. (2011). English educational policies of the US Army Military Government in Korea from 1945 to 1948 and their effects on the development of English language teaching in Korea. *Language policy*, *10*(3), 193.

Kim, H. K. (2017). Critical thinking and critical pedagogy in English language teaching. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, *25*(4), 41-58.

Kim, T. (2008). Higher-education reforms in South Korea: Public-private problems in internationalizing and incorporating universities. *Policy Futures in Education,* (*6*)5, 558–568.

Kim, T. (2013). The (un)changing relationship between the state and higher education in South Korea: Some surprising continuities amid transition. In R. Goodman, T. Kariya, & J. Taylor (Eds), *The changing relationship between the state and higher education in France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Korea and the UK, Oxford Studies in Comparative Education Series* (pp. 235–260). Oxford, UK: Symposium Books.

Kimura, Y., Nakata, Y., & Okumura, T. (2001). Language learning motivation of EFL learners in Japan: A cross-sectional analysis of various learning milieus. *JALT Journal*, 23(1), 47-68.

Kincheloe, J. (2005). *Critical pedagogy primer.* Peter Lang.

King, J. (2013). Silence in the second language classrooms of Japanese universities. *Applied linguistics*, *34*(3), 325-343.

Kitahara, M. (1989). Douglas MacArthur as a Father Figure in Occupied Japan After World War II. *International Social Science Review*, 20-28.

Kitamura, Hiroshi. (2012). America's Racial Limits: U. S. Cinema and the Occupation of Japan. *Japanese Journal of American Studies, 23*, pp. 139-162.

Kitao, K., & Kitao, S. K. (1995). *English Teaching: Theory, Research and Practice*. Eichosha, Kusaka Bldg., 2-28 Kanda Jimbocho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101, Japan.

Kivits, J. (2005). Online interviewing and the research relationship. In C. Hine (Ed.), *Virtual methods: Issues in social research on the internet* (pp. 35 – 49). Berg.

Kiyama, S., Tamaoka, K., & Takiura, M. (2012). Applicability of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory to a non-western culture. *SAGE Open, 2*(4), 215824401247011. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2158244012470116

Knowlton Flanders, Jesse. (1925), *Legislative Control of the Elementary Curriculum*, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

Koike, I. (1978). *The Teaching of English in Japan*. Eichosha.

Konakahara, M., & Tsuchiya, K. (2020). Introduction: English as a Lingua Franca in Japan—Towards Multilingual Practices. In *English as a Lingua Franca in Japan* (pp. 1-23). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Kondo, T. (2015). Challenging government policy on English language teaching in Japan through collaborative action research: theory and method. In *Proceedings of the British Association for Applied Linguistics Annual Meeting 2015*, 3-5 September 2015, Aston University.

Koshino, K. (2019). Tempted by whiteness?: Linguistic Capital and Higher Education in Japan. *Educational Foundations, 32*, 49-71.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Kubota, R. 1998. Ideologies of English in Japan. *World Englishes*, 17, pp.215-223.

Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(1), 9-35.

Kubota, R. (2002). The impact of globalization on language teaching in Japan. In: D. Block and D. Cameron, (Eds.), *Globalization and Language Teaching*. (pp.13-28). Routledge.

Kubota, R. (2011a). Learning a foreign language as leisure and consumption: enjoyment, desire, and the business of eikaiwa. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *14*(4), 473-488.

Kubota, R. (2011b). Questioning linguistic instrumentalism: English, neoliberalism, and language tests in Japan. *Linguistics and Education*, 22, 248-260.

Kubota, R. (2011c). The politics of school curriculum and assessment in Japan. In Y. Zhao (ed.) *Handbook of Asian Education: A Cultural Perspective.* Routledge, pp. 214–30.

Kubota, R. 2013. 'Language is only a tool': Japanese expatriates working in China and implications for language teaching. *Multilingual Education*, *3*(4).

Kubota R. (2017) Globalization and Language Education in Japan. In: Van Deusen-Scholl N., May S. (eds) *Second and Foreign Language Education. Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (3rd ed.). Springer, Cham.

Kubota, R. (2019). English in Japan. In *Routledge handbook of Japanese sociolinguistics* (pp. 110-126). Routledge.

Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (2009). Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Introduction to research and practice. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 1–23). Routledge.

Kushner, B., & Masaharu, S. (2005). Digesting postwar Japanese media. *Diplomatic history*, *29*(1), 27-48.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews.* Thousands Oaks.

Lagotte, B. (2003). Because we said so: Educational reform in occupied Japan. *Sunkyun Journal of East Asian Studies, 6*(2), 239-256.

Laitinen, M. (2020). Empirical perspectives on English as a lingua franca (ELF) grammar. *World Englishes*, *39*(3), 427-442.

Landis, M. T. (2018, November 06). The United States isn't a democracy - and was never intended to be. *The Washington Post.* Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2018/11/06/united-states-isnt-democracy-and-was-never-intended-be/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.8d7f673fa69a

Lang, B. (2020, September 10). *Hollywood films are dominated by straight white men, and new Oscar rules may not help*. Variety. Retrieved from https://variety.com/2020/film/news/hollywood-films-study-usc-diversity-oscars-1234765024/

Language Institute of Japan. (2003a). About LIOJ. Retrieved from http://www.mrafoundation.or.jp/CD/CD35/1/HTM/02/INDEX.HTM

Language Institute of Japan. (2003b). LIOJ activites (Introduction to activities). Retrieved from http://www.mrafoundation.or.jp/CD/CD35/1/HTM/03/INDEX.HTM

Language Institute of Japan. (2003c). Forward. Retrieved from http://www.mrafoundation.or.jp/CD/CD35/1/HTM/01/INDEX.HTM

Layder, D. (1993). *New strategies in social research*, Polity Press.

Lebra, T. S. (1976). Japanese patterns of behavior. University of Hawaii Press.

Lee, I. (2011) Teaching how to discriminate: Globalization, prejudice, and textbooks. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *38*(1), 47–63.

Lee, J., Wha Han, M., & McKerrow, R. (2010). English or perish: How contemporary South Korea received, accommodated, and internalized English and American modernity. *Language and International Communication, 10*(4), 337–357.

Lee, J. S. (2011). Globalization and language education. 어학연구, *47*(1), 123–149.

Lee, Y. N. (2020, September 3). *'Abenomics' fell short - Japan's new prime minister will have to pick up the slack.* CNBC. https://www.cnbc.com/2020/09/03/charts-show-successes-and-failures-of-abenomics-in-lifting-japans-economy.html

Lee, S., & Brinton, M. C. (1996). Elite education and social capital: The case of South Korea. *Sociology of Education*, *69*, 177–192.

Leonard, T. C. (2005). Retrospectives: Eugenics and economics in the Progressive Era. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *19*(4), 207–224.

Leung, R. C. Y. (2020). Understanding the in-class behavior patterns of Japanese university students in EFL classes: A foreign English teacher's perspective. *Jissen Women's University CLEIP Journal*, *6*, 9-22.

Leung, C., & Lewkowicz, J. (2017). Pedagogic reconnection with the social dimension. *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, 54.

Levin, M. B. (1976). *Political hysteria in America: the democratic capacity for repression*. Basic Books.

Levine, G., & Phipps, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy: Issues in language program direction*. Heinle.

Levinson, S., Sparrow, B., Brands, H. W., Burnett, C. D., Currie, D. P., Freehling, W. W., Seidman, G. (2005). *The Louisiana Purchase and American Expansion, 1803-1898*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Levinson, S. C. (1996). Relativity in spatial conception and description. *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, 177-202.

Li, C.N. (1963). *Zhong Guo Jin Bai Nian Zheng Zhi Shi: 1840-1928 = The Political History of China: 1840-1928*.Princeton, N.J.: D. Norstrand Co.

Little, Clarence Cook (1922) *The second international congress of eugenics. Eugenics Review, 13* (4). 511.

Lo Bianco, J. (2016). *Conflict, language rights, & education: Building peace by solving language problems in Southeast Asia*. LPREN Brief.

Lombardo, P. A. (2011). *A century of eugenics in America: From the Indiana experiment to the human genome era*. Indiana University Press.

Lombardo, P.A. (n.d.). Eugenic sterilization laws. http://www.eugenicsarchive.org/html/eugenics/essay8text.html

Low, E. L., & Ahn, H. (2017). *Attitudes to World Englishes: Implications for Teaching English in South Korea*. Routledge.

Lowrie, A. (1998). *Ambassador Eileen R. Donovan* . Retrieved from https://adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Donovan,%20Eileen%20R.%201989.toc.pdf

Mainichi Shinbun. (2018, March 18). *System of private English tests for university entrance on rocky path.* Retrieved from https://mainichi.jp/english/articles/20180327/p2a/00m/0na/012000c

Marcuse, H. (1991). *One-dimensional man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society* (6th ed.). Beacon Press.

Margolis, E. (2020, May 26). *Japan doesn't want to become another casualty of English*. Foreign Policy. Retrieved from https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/26/japan-doesnt-want-to-become-another-casualty-of-english/

Marini, J. A., & Masugi, K. (2005). *The progressive revolution in politics and political science: Transforming the American regime*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Markham, A.N. (1998). *Life online: Researching real experience in virtual space* (Vol. 6). Rowman Altamira.

Markham, A. (2013). Fieldwork in social media: What would Malinowski do? *Journal of Qualitative Communication Research*, *2*(4) 434– 446. https://doi.org/10.1525/qcr.2013.2.4.434

Markham, A., & Baym, N. (2009). *Internet inquiry: Conversations about method*. Sage.

Marks, S. (1986). 1918 and after: The postwar era. In G. Martel (Ed.), *The origins of the second World War reconsidered* (pp. 17–48). Allen & Unwin.

Martin, P. (2006). *A Critical Analysis of Japanese Eikaiwa Within the Context of Linguistic Imperialism* [Doctoral dissertation, King's College London].

Masutani, Y. (2021). The Foreign Language Anxiety of Japanese EFL Learners: Focusing on Anxiety When Speaking English. *LET Kansai Chapter Collected Papers*, *19*, 1-14.

Matsuda, T. (2007). *Soft power and its perils: U.S. cultural policy in early postwar Japan and permanent dependency*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena. *Japanese Journal of Pragmatics*, 12, 403–426.

Matsuoka (2015). An internship in communicative English teaching. In S. Horiguchi, Y. Imoto, & G. S. Poole (Eds.), *Foreign language education in Japan: Exploring qualitative approaches* (pp. 133-145). Sense Publishers.

Mauranen, A. (2003). The corpus of English as lingua franca in academic settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(3), 513-527.

May, T. (2008). Corruption and other distortions as variables in language education. *TESOL Law Journal, 2*, 84–110.

McClellan, E. (1959). An Introduction to Sōseki. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, *2*, 150-208.

McConnell, D. (2008) 'Japan's image problem and the soft power solution', in Y. Watanabe and D. McConnell (eds), *Soft Power Superpowers: The Cultural and National Assets of Japan and the US*, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, pp. 18–33.

McCrostie, J. (2009a, August 11). TOEIC no turkey at 30. *The Japan Times*. Retrieved April 12, 2010 from. http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgibin/fl20090811zg.html

McCrostie, J. (2009b, August 18). TOEIC: Where does the money go? *The Japan Times*. Retrieved April 12, 2010 from. http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgibin/fl20090818zg.html.

McCrostie, J. 2010. "The TOEIC in Japan: A Scandal Made in Heaven." Shiken: JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter, Vol. 14, No. 1, Feb. pp. 2-11. Tokyo: JALT. Mar. 2, 2010.

McCully, E. A. (2014). *Ida M. Tarbell: The woman who challenged big business-- and won!* Boston: Clarion Books/Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

McDonald, M., & Zeichner, K. (2009). Social justice teacher education. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn & D. Stovall (Eds.) *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 595–610). Routledge.

McGregor, R. (2017). The vicious triangle: CLT, native speakers, and "English-only" classrooms. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.*), Transformation in language education.* JALT.

McKay, S. (2002). Teaching English as an international language. Oxford University Press.

McLaren, P. (1989). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education.* Longman.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.

Metcalf, T. (2019, May 22). Rockefeller was almost three times richer than Bezos. *Bloomberg Businessweek.* Retrieved from https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-05-21/john-d-rockefeller-was-almost-three-times-richer-than-bezos

MEXT. (2012). *University action reform plan.* Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/en/news/topics/detail/1372697.htm

MEXT (2014). *English education reform plan corresponding to globalization*. Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/en/news/

Midgley, N. (2004). Sailing between scylla and charybdis: Incorporating qualitative approaches into child psychotherapy research. *Journal of Child Psychotherapy*, *30*(1), 89–111.

Miller, G. (1997). Building bridges: The possibility of analytic dialogue between ethnography, conversation analysis and Foucault. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 24–44). Sage Publications Ltd.

Miyagi, K., Sato, M., & Crump, A. (2009). To challenge the unchallenged: Potential of non-"standard" Englishes for Japanese EFL learners. *JALT journal*, *31*(2), 261-273.

Miyashita, H. (2017). Critical analysis of English education policies in Japan focusing on two discourses: Developing human resources and nurturing Japanese identity. *World Journal of English Language*, *7*(2), 10-21.

Mizutani, O., Mizutani, N. (1987). How to be polite in Japanese. Japan Times

Mock, J., Kawamura, H., & Naganuma, N. (Eds.) (2016). *The impact of internationalization on Japanese higher education: Is Japanese education really changing?* Sense.

Molina-Guzmán, I. (2016). #oscarssowhite: How Stuart Hall explains why nothing changes in Hollywood and everything is changing. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, *33*(5), 438–454.

Mohammed, M. A. A. (2020). English language and globalization. *International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning*, *7*(1), 5-11.

Moody, P. (2017). Embassy cinema: what WikiLeaks reveals about US state support for Hollywood. *Media, Culture & Society*, *39*(7), 1063–1077. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0163443716686673.

Morikawa, T. (2019). Native-speakerism or English as a lingua franca?: on the future direction of English as a foreign language education in Japan. *Komaba Journal of English Education*, 25-25.

Morita, L. (2017, May 22). Why Japan needs English. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/23311886.2017.1399783

Morrow, R.A., & Torres, C.A. (2002). *Reading Freire and Habermas: Critical pedagogy and transformative social change*. Teachers College Press

Mounk, Y. (2018, January 31). America Is Not a Democracy. *The Atlantic.* Retrieved from / https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2018/03/america-is-not-a-democracy/550931/

Mueller, T. (2013). The Rockefeller Foundation, the Social Sciences, and the Humanities in the Cold War. *Journal of Cold War Studies*, *15*(3), 108-135.

Murata, K., & Iino, M. (2017). EMI in higher education: An ELF perspective. In *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 400-412). Routledge.

Muramoto, R. (2015, April). The English language education market in Japan. Retrieved from https://build.export.gov/build/groups/public/@bg_jp/documents/webcontent/bg_jp_0893 46.pdf

Nagy, T. (2016). English as a lingua franca and its implications for teaching English as a foreign language. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, *8*(2), 155-166.

Nairn, A., & Nader, R. (1980). *The Reign of ETS: The corporation that makes up minds: The Ralph Nader Report on the Educational Testing Service*. R. Nader.

Nakamura, K. 2004. Naze Eigo ga Mondai nanoka?: Eigo no Seiji Syakairon (なぜ「英語」が問題なのか ?: 英語の政治社会論). Sangensya.

Nakamura, R. (2020, October 22). *Onscreen diversity on the rise, but white men still dominate TV executive ranks, study says*. The Wrap. Retrieved from https://www.thewrap.com/on-screen-diversity-on-the-rise-but-white-men-still-dominate-tv-executive-ranks-study-says/

Newman, G. (2020, May 21). Bad english in Japan: A conspiracy theory. *The Japan Times.* Retrieved from https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2020/05/16/commentary/japan-commentary/bad-english-conspiracy-theory/

Ng, P. C. L. (2018). Overcoming institutional native speakerism: The experience of one teacher. *Towards post-native-speakerism* (pp. 3-15). Springer, Singapore.

Ninomiya, A., Knight, J., & Watanabe, A. (2009). The past, present, and future of internationalization in Japan. *Journal of Studies of International Education*, *13*(2), 117-124.

Nishi, T. (1982). *Unconditional democracy: Education and politics in Occupied Japan.* Hoover Institution Press.

Nishino, R. (2011). *Changing histories: Japanese and South African textbooks in comparison*. V&R Uni-Press.

Nogami, Y. (2020). Understanding the ELF phenomenon through narrative inquiry: A diary study on identities of Japanese ELF users 1. In *ELF Research Methods and Approaches to Data and Analyses* (pp. 241-257). Routledge.

Nonaka, N. (2020, May 30). *Untying the knot of Japan's bureaucratic and Diet Dysfunction*. nippon.com. Retrieved June 30, 2022, from https://www.nippon.com/en/in-depth/d00539/untying-the-knot-of-japan%E2%80%99s-bureaucratic-and-diet-dysfunction.html

Nordheimer, J., & Frantz, D. (1997, September 30). Testing giant exceeds roots, drawing business rivals' ire. New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/1997/09/30/us/testing-giant-exceeds-roots-drawingbusiness-rivals-ire.html

Norton, B. & Toohey, K. (2004). Critical pedagogies and language learning: An introduction. In Norton, B. & Toohey, K. (Eds.), Critical pedagogies and language learning. (pp. 1-19). Cambridge University Press

Norwood, S. H. (2002). *Strikebreaking and intimidation mercenaries and masculinity in twentieth-century America*. University of North Carolina Press.

Nuttall, L. (2019). Comparative Education: Why does Japan continue to struggle with English? *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, *19*(1), 74-92.

Nye, J. S. (1993). *Harness the Rising Sun: An American Strategy for Managing Japan's Rise as a Global Power*. University Press of America.

Nye, J. S. (2002). *The paradox of American power*. Fondation Latsis Internationale.

Nye, J. S. (2008). Public Diplomacy and Soft Power. *The annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 616*(1) (March 1): 94–109.

O'Hara-Davies, B. (2011). English only? inda kali eh! (not likely!) Changing the paradigm. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, *13*(4), 288–299.

Oda, M. (2017). Native-speakerism and the roles of mass media in ELT. In *Native and non-native teachers in English language classrooms* (pp. 99-116). De Gruyter Mouton.

Oh, K. Y. (2013, December 17). Student caught trying to hack into professor's computer. *Korea Herald.* Retrieved from http://www.koreaherald.com /view.php?ud=20131217000846

Ohara, M. (2016). *The influence of politics and culture on English language education in Japan during World War II and the Occupation* (Doctoral dissertation).

Ohashi, Jun. (2003). Japanese culture specific face and politeness orientation: A pragmatic investigation of yoroshiku onegaishimasu. *Multilingual,* 22: 257–274.

Ooiwa-Yoshizawa, A. (2018). Implications of EFL critical pedagogy: Theory, practice and possibility. *Learning*, *19*, 245-253.

Osgood, K. A. (2008). *Total cold war: Eisenhower's secret propaganda battle at home and abroad*. University of Kansas.

Ota, Y. (1994). The "decline" of English language competence in modern Japan. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *5*(4), 201-206.

Owen, D. (1983). 1983: The last days of ETS. *Harper's*.

Pacific Century. (2016, May 26). *Reinventing Japan.* [Video]. YouTube.www.youtube.com/watch?v=LK738CDh21g

Park, J. K. (2009). English fever in South Korea: Its history and symptoms. *English Today*, *97*(25), 50–57

Parmar, I. (2012). *Foundations of the American century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller foundations in the rise of American power*. Columbia University Press.

Pearl, R. (1912). The First International Eugenics Congress. *Science, 36* (926), 395-396.

Pederson, R. (2019). A Theoretical Analysis of How Critical Literacy May Support the Progressive Goals of the Korean National Curriculum. *English Teaching, 74*(4), 51-74.

Pells, R. (1997). *Not like us: How Europeans have loved. hated, and transformed American culture since World War II*. Basic Books.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Longman.

Pennycook, A. (1995). English in the world/The world in English. In A. Burns & C. Coffin (Eds.), *Analyzing English in a global context* (pp. 78-89). Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (2006). Language education as translingual activism. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 26*(1), 111-114.

Pennycook, A. (2007). Language, localization, and the real: Hip-hop and the global spread of authenticity. *Journal of language, identity, and education, 6*(2), 101-115.

Pennycook, A. (2017). The cultural politics of English as an international language. Routledge.

Pérez, L. A. (2007). *The war of 1898: the United States and Cuba in history and historiography*. The University of North Carolina Press.

Perloff, J. (1989). *The shadows of power: the Council on Foreign Relations and the American decline*. Western Islands.

Perry, J. (1984). Private philanthropy and foreign affairs: The case of John D. Rockefeller 3rd and Japan. *Asian Perspective, 8*(2), 268-284.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2013). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. Routledge.

Phillipson, R., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2009). The politics and policies of language and language teaching. *The handbook of language teaching*, 26.

Piller, I., & Cho, J. (2013). Neoliberalism as language policy. *Language in Society*, *42*(1), 23–44.

Piller, I. & Takahashi, K. (2006). A passion for English: Desire and the language market. In Pavlenko, (ed.), pp. 59-83.

Piller, I., Takahashi, K., & Watanabe, Y. (2010). The dark side of TESOL: The hidden costs of the consumption of English. *Cross-cultural Studies, 20,* 183–201.

Poole, G. S. (2010). *The Japanese professor: An ethnography of a university faculty*. Sense.

Quint, H. H. (1964). *The forging of American socialism; origins of the modern movement*. Bobbs-Merrill.

Reesor, M. (2003). Japanese attitudes to English: Towards an explanation of poor performance.

NUCB Journal of Language, Culture, and Communication, 5(2), 57-65.

Ricento, T. (2012). Critiques of language planning. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics 3rd edition*. Longman.

Risager, K., (2006). *Language And Culture*. Multilingual Matters.

Ritzer, G. (1996). McUniversity in the Postmodern Consumer Society. *Quality in Higher Education, 2*(3), 185-199.

Rivers, D. J. (2016). Employment advertisements and native-speakerism in Japanese higher education. *LETs and NESTs: Voices, views and vignettes*, 79-100.

Rivers, D. J. (2017). Native-speakerism and the betrayal of the native speaker language-teaching professional. In *Isms in Language Education* (pp. 74-97). De Gruyter Mouton.

Rivers, D. J. (2018a). Foreword: Probing for a post-native-speakerist future. *Towards post-nativespeakerism: Dynamics and shifts (intercultural communication and language education).* Springer.

Rivers, D. J. (2018b). "Introverted Psychosis" and the Psychology of Native-Speaker Interaction: Social Representation, Status and Threat Perception. In *Beyond Native-Speakerism* (pp. 59-81). Routledge.

Rivers, D. J., & Ross, A. S. (2013). Idealized English teachers: The implicit influence of race in Japan. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 12*(5), 321–339.

Roberts, P. (1983, December). The American 'Eastern Establishment' and foreign affairs: A challenge for historians. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313161317_The_American_'Eastern_Establishment'_and_Foreign_Affairs_A_Challenge_for_Historians_Part_1_SHAFR_Newsletter_XIV_December_1983_9-28

Robrecht, L. C. (1995). Grounded theory: Evolving methods. *Qualitative Health Research,5*(2), 169–177.

Rockefeller, R. (2002). *Memoirs.* Random House.

Rockefeller Archive Center. (n.d.). Charles B. *(Charles Burton) Fahs*. DIMES. Retrieved from https://dimes.rockarch.org/agents/8fgdhQozzVZpzKucKCQP9W

Rockhill, G. (2017). *Counter-history of the present: Untimely interrogations into globalization, technology, democracy*. Duke University Press.

Rockhill, G. (2017, December 13). The U.S. is not a democracy, it never was. Retrieved from https://www.counterpunch.org/2017/12/13/the-u-s-is-not-a-democracy-it-never-was/?fbclid=IwAR3QlvGNq4Z_ybUPblt3_AHKEIG-pcGjbuDjq15-ZwKBGxgHMlfZZFI8ock

Roosevelt, T. (1910). *The strenuous life.* The Review of Reviews Company.

Rosenkjar, P. (2015). An internship in communicative English teaching. In S. Horiguchi, Y. Imoto, & G. S. Poole (Eds.), *Foreign language education in Japan: Exploring qualitative approaches* (pp. 147–166). Sense Publishers.

Rudolph, N. (2013). *English and discourses of identity in Japan*. 武庫川女子大紀要.

Ryan, S. (2009). Ambivalence and commitment, liberation and challenge: Investigating the attitudes of young Japanese people towards the learning of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *30*(5), 405-420.

Saegusa, Y. (1983). TOEIC and in-company training. Cross Currents: A Journal of Communication/ Language/Cross-cultural Skills, 10(1), 71-90.

Saeki, C. (2007). *US cultural propaganda in Cold War Japan promoting democracy 1948- 1960*. E. Mellen Press.

Salam, M. (2018, August 2). *Hollywood is as white, straight and male as ever*. The New York Times. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/02/arts/hollywood-movies-diversity.html

Salmon, J. (Ed.). (2012). *Cases in online interview research.* Sage.

Samaan, A. E. (2013). *From a "race of masters" to a "master race" 1948 to 1848*. CreateSpace.

Samuels, R. 2001. *Kishi and corruption: an anatomy of the 1955 system*. JPRI working paper, no. 83. Japan Policy Research Institute.

Santucci, A. (2010). *Antonio Gramsci*. Monthly Review Press.

Sasaki, M. (2008). The 150-year history of English language assessment in Japanese education. *Language Testing*, *25*(1), 63-83.

Sawa, T. (2020, January 21). Japan going the wrong way in English-education reform. Retrieved from https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2020/01/21/commentary/japan-commentary/japan-going-wrong-way-english-education-reform/

Schambra, W. A., & West, T. (2017, July 18). *The Progressive Movement and the transformation of American politics*. Retrieved from https://www.heritage.org/political-process/report/the-progressive-movement-and-the-transformation-american-politics

Schulzinger, R. D. (1984). *The wise men of foreign affairs: the history of the Council on Foreign Relations*. Columbia University Press.

Scollon, R., Scollon, S. B., & Scollon, S. W. (1981). *Narrative, literacy, and face in interethnic communication* (Vol. 7). Praeger Pub Text.

Seagrave, S., & Seagrave, P. (2003). *Gold warriors: America's secret recovery of Yamashita's Gold.* Verso.

Seargeant, P. (2009). *The idea of English in Japan: Ideology and the evolution of a global language*. Multilingual Matters.

Seargeant, P. (Ed.). (2011). *English in Japan in an era of globalization*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Seargeant, P. (2014). *English in Japan in the era of globalization*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Seth, M. J. (2002). *Education fever: Society, politics, and the pursuit of schooling in South Korea*. University of Hawaii Press.

Shaanan, J. (2017). *America's Free Market Myths: Debunking Market Fundamentalism*. Springer.

Shabad, R. (2017, January 20). *In inauguration speech, Trump vows to give power back to the people*. CBS News. Retrieved June 27, 2022, from https://www.cbsnews.com/news/in-trump-inauguration-speech-trump-vows-to-give-power-back-to-the-people/

Sherlock, Z. (2016). Japan's textbook inequality: How cultural bias affects foreign language acquisition. *Power and Education, 8*(1), 73-87.

Shin, H. (2006). Rethinking TESOL from a Sol's perspective: Indigenous epistemology and decolonizing praxis in TESOL. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 3*(2 & 3), 147–167.

Shin, H. (2007). ELT in Korea: Toward globalization or glocalization? In J. Cummins, & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 75–86). Springer.

Shin, H., & Lee, B. (2019). "English Divide" and ELT in Korea: Towards Critical ELT Policy and Practices. *Second Handbook of English Language Teaching*, 73-90.

Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. University of Chicago Press.

Shorrock, T. (2019, December 2). *Welcome to the Monkey House*. New Republic. Retrieved January 26, 2021, from https://newrepublic.com/article/155707/united-states-military-prostitution-south-korea-monkey-house

Shoup, L. H., & Minter, W. (2004). *Imperial brain trust: the Council on Foreign Relations and United States foreign policy*. Authors Choice Press.

Sklar, M., & Hauser, N. (2017). The Philippines, China, and US global objectives (The Conant factor). In *Creating the American century: The idea and legacies of America's twentieth-century foreign policy founders* (pp. 3-64). Cambridge University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Silva, E. T. (1982). Looking backwards: How foundations formulated ideology in the Progressive period. In *Philanthropy and cultural imperialism: The foundations at home and abroad* (pp. 55-86). Indiana University Press.

Smith, N. (2003). *American empire*. University of California Press.

Smith, N. (2019, July 30). Stop blaming America's poor for their poverty: In Japan, people work hard, few abuse drugs, crime is minimal and single mothers are rare. The country still has lots of poverty. Retrieved from https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-07-30/u-s-economy-personal-bad-behavior-isn-t-what-causes-poverty?fbclid=IwAR12m5N1uku10b2jQ-15L2VomCbYLpv5xrRoLjHw4PdSyG6LSMqEpduB5eM

Smith, M. D. (2019). A Bourdieusian interpretation of English language learning: The case of Korea. *Korea TESOL Journal*, *15*(2), 3-22.

Smith, W. (2001). E. L. Thorndike. In P. Jarvis (Ed.), *Twentieth century thinkers in adult and continuing education* (2nd ed., pp. 77–93). Kogan Page.

Snyder, A. A. (1995). *Warriors of disinformation: American propaganda, Soviet lies, and the winning of the Cold War*. Arcade.

Soares, J. (2021, March 26). Dismantling white supremacy includes ending racist tests like the SAT and act. *Teachers College Press Blog*. https://www.tcpress.com/blog/dismantling-white-supremacy-includes-racist-tests-sat-act/

Song, J. J. (2011). English as an unofficial language in South Korea: Global English or social malady? *Language Problems & Language Planning, 35*(1), 35–55.

Sorensen, C. W. (1994). Success and education in South Korea. *Comparative Education Review, 38*(1), 10–35

Spiechowicz, M. (2016). Omoiyari–the key word of harmonious Japanese communication. In *New ways to face and (im) politeness* (pp. 169-186). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Spiro, J. P. (2009). *Defending the master race: Conservation, eugenics, and the legacy of Madison Grant*. University of Vermont Press.

Srodes, J. (1999). *Allen Dulles: master of spies*. Regnery.

Stanlaw, James. (2004). *Japanese English: Language and culture contact.* Hong Kong University Press.

Stead, W.T. (1902). *The Americanization of the world; or, The trend of the twentieth century.* Markley.

Srodes, J. (1999). *Allen Dulles: master of spies*. Regnery.

Stukan, D., & Torres, P. V. (2019, February). Racial Bias within the TESOL Profession and its Implications in the EFL context: Interview with Ryuko Kubota. http://mextesol.net/journal/index.php?page=journal&id_article=5693

Sugita, Y. (2003). The rise of an American principle in China: A reinterpretation of the first Open Door Notes toward China. In *Trans-Pacific relations: America, Europe, and Asia in the twentieth century* (pp. 3–20). Praeger.

Suzuki, A. (2020). ELF for global mindsets? Theory and practice of ELT in formal education in Japan. In *English as a Lingua Franca in Japan* (pp. 71-89). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Suzuki, A., Liu, H., & Yu, M.H. (2017). ELT and ELF in the East Asian contexts. In *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 494-505). Routledge.

Suzuki, D. & Oiwa, K (1996) *The Japan we never knew: A journey of discovery.*. Stoddart.

Tahira, M. (2012). Behind MEXT's new course of study guidelines. *The Language Teacher*, *36*(3), 3-8.

Takano, S. (2005). "Re-examining linguistic power: strategic uses of directives by professional Japanese women in positions of authority and leadership." *Journal of Pragmatics, 37,* 633–666.

Tamachi Tokyo. (2015, March 23). Our Job in Japan. [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fEZW_6EM1Ms

Tepco's 'deal with the devil.' (2011, October 21). *Sydney Morning Herald.* Retrieved from http://www.smh.com.au/business/world-business/tepcos-deal-with-devil-20111021-1mc3k.html.

Thompson, J. A. (1992). Another Look at the Downfall of "Fortress America." *Journal of American Studies*, *26*(3), 393–408. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021875800031133

TOEFL IBT. (n.d.). *Test and score data summary.* Retrieved from https://e-dokumen.id/dokumen/86d_toefl-ibt-test-and-score-data-summary-2019.html

Toh, G. (2013a). Locality, re-localization,structure-to-structure localism,and the TOEIC test: Implications for English language education at tertiary level in Japan. In R.S. Webster & S.A. Stolz. (Eds.), *Measuring up in education* (pp. 215-226). Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia.

Toh, G. (2013b). 13. Scrutinizing the native speaker as referent, entity and project. In *Native-Speakerism in Japan* (pp. 183-195). Multilingual Matters.

Toh, G. (2015). English in Japan: Indecisions, inequalities, and practices of relocalization. In R. Tupas (Ed.), *Unequal Englishes*, (pp. 111–129). Springer.

Toh, G. (2016) *English as medium of instruction in Japanese higher education: Presumption, mirage or bluff?* Springer.

Torikai, K. (2020, May 30). *Chronic reforms and the crisis in english education*. nippon.com. https://www.nippon.com/en/currents/d00412/?pnum=2

Tracy, J. F. (2012, April 29). Early "Psychological Warfare" Research and the Rockefeller Foundation. Retrieved from https://www.globalresearch.ca/early-psychological-warfare-research-and-the-rockefeller-foundation/30594

Travis, C. (1998). Omoiyari as a core Japanese value: Japanese-style empathy? In A. Angeliki & T. Elzbieta (Eds.), *Speaking of emotions: Conceptualization and expression* (pp. 55-81). Mouton de Gryyter.

Trumpbour, J. (2007). *Selling Hollywood to the world: U.S. and European struggles for mastery of the global film industry, 1920-1950*. Cambridge University Press

Tsuboya-Newell, I. (2017). Why do Japanese have trouble learning English. *The Japan Times*. https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2017/10/29/commentary/japan-commentary/japanese-trouble-learning-english/

Tsuchiya, Yuka. (2002) 'Imagined America in occupied Japan: (Re-)Educational films shown by the U.S. Occupation Forces to the Japanese, 1948–1952.' *The Japanese Journal of American Studies, 13*, 193-213.

Tsuneyoshi, R. (Ed.). (2017). *Globalization and Japanese exceptionalism in education: Insiders' views into a changing system*. Routledge.

Turnbull, B. (2017). Learner perspectives on national identity and EFL education in Japan: Report of a questionnaire study. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 14*(2), 211.

United States Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards. (1971). *U.S. Metric Study Interim Report, Federal Government: Civilian Agencies* (Special Publication 345-2).

US Commercial Service, US Department of Commerce. (2015). *The English language education market in Japan.* Retrieved from https://build.export.gov/build/groups/public/@bg_jp/documents/webcontent/bg_jp_089346.pdf

U.S. Department of State. (n.d.). *American Isolationism in the 1930s*. U.S. Department of State. Retrieved June 28, 2022, from https://history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/american-isolationism

Ushioda, E. (2013). 1. Foreign language motivation research in Japan: An 'insider' perspective from outside Japan. In *Language Learning Motivation in Japan* (pp. 1- 14). Multilingual Matters.

Vaughn, S. L. (2017). *Holding fast the inner lines: Democracy, nationalism, and the Committee on Public Information*. UNC Press Books.

Vine, David. (2015, November 3). *My body was not mine, but the US military's*. Politico. www.politico.eu/article/my-body-was-not-mine-but-the-u-s-militarys/

Von Esch, K., Motha, S., & Kubota, R. (2020). Race and language teaching. *Language Teaching, 53*(4), 391-421. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/language-teaching/article/race-and-language-teaching/A9FE1FE5A4CF5ED72C716C296FCE6955

Waller, Douglas (2011). *Wild Bill Donovan: The Spymaster Who Created the OSS and Modern American Espionage.* Free Press.

Wang, Y. (2011). Shattering the hierarchal education system: The creation of a post-structural feminist English classroom. *Asian EFL Journal, 14*(4), 256–287.

Watanabe, Y. (2003). 125 sai made watashi wa ikiru. [I'll live to 125]. Sony Magazines.

Weinberg, S. (2008). *Taking on the trust: The epic battle of Ida Tarbell and John D. Rockefeller*. Norton.

Weininger, E. B., & Lareau, A. (2007). Cultural capital. *The Blackwell encyclopedia of sociology*.

Weiner, T. (1994). CIA spent millions to support Japanese right in the 50's and 60's. *New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/1994/10/09/world/cia-spent-millions-to-support-japanese-right-in-50-s-and-60-s.html?pagewanted=all

West, T. G., & Schambra, W. A. (2007). *The progressive movement and the transformation of American politics*. Heritage Foundation.

White, R. (1997). Going round in circles: English as an international language, and cross-cultural capability. In *Cross-Cultural Capability Conference '97.* Leeds, England: Leeds Metropolitan University. Retrieved from https://digilander.libero.it/interculture/boylan/text/white01.htm

White, S. (1989). Backchannels across cultures: A study of Americans and Japanese. *Language in society*, 59-76.

Whitsed, C., & Wright, P. (2013). English language learning in the Japanese higher education sector: towards internationalisation. *Intercultural Education*, *24*(3), 222-236.

Wicaksono, R. (2012). Raising students' awareness of the construction of communicative (in) competence in international classrooms. In *Cross-Cultural Teaching and Learning for Home and International Students* (pp. 241-250). Routledge.

Wikimedia Foundation. (2021, July 12). *Jet programme*. Wikipedia. Retrieved September 16, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/JET_Programme#cite_note-20

Wilcox, D. L., Cameron, G. T., Reber, B. H., & Shin, J. H. (2013). *Think public relations*. Pearson Higher Ed.

Williams, M., & Robson, K. (2004). Re-engineering focus group methodology for the online environment. In S.L.S. Chen, G.J. Hall, & M.D. Johns (Eds.), *Online social research: Methods, issues, and ethics* (pp. 25 – 46). Peter Lang.

Winkler, A. M. (1978). *The politics of propaganda: the Office of War Information, 1942-1945*. Yale University Press.

Worth, R. H. (1995). *No choice but war: The United States embargo against Japan and the eruption of war in the pacific*. McFarland Publishing.

Wray, H. (2000). From the banning of moral education to the creation of social studies in occupied Japan, 1945-1947. *Japan Studies Review Volume 4*, 53-83.

Yamagami, M., & Tollefson, J. W. (2011). Elite discourses of globalization in Japan: The role of English. In *English in Japan in the era of globalization* (pp. 15-37). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Yamamura, K., Gakutani, R., Karpinska, M., Tanojiri, T., & Gally, T. (2019). The discourse of kyōyō and English Education in Japan. *Komaba Journal of English Education, 10*(3), 23-39.

Yano Research Institute. (2016). *Gogaku bijinesu shijô ni kansuru chôsa kekka 2016* [Results of the 2016 survey on the foreign language learning market].

Yano Research Institute. (2019). *Gogaku bijinesu shijô ni kansuru chôsa kekka 2016* [Results of the 2019 survey on the foreign language learning market].

Yano, Y. (2019). ELF research can liberate the Japanese from native-speakerism. *English as a Lingua Franca in Japan,* 313-322. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-33288-4_15.

Yara T. (2012) Exploring solutions to the US military-base issues in Okinawa Eurasia Border. *Review 3*(2):119–131.

Yergin, D. (2009). *The prize: The epic quest for oil, money and power*. Free Press.

Yokoyama, I., Kodama, N., & Higuchi, Y. (2016). *What Happened to Wage Inequality in Japan During the Last 25 Years?: Evidence from the FFL Decomposition Method*. RIETI.

Yoo, Y., & Namkung, G. (2012). English and American Linguistic Hegemony: A Case Study of the Educational Testing Service. *The Korean Journal of International Studies, 10*(2), 221-253.

Yoon, K. (2014). The change and structure of Korean education policy in history. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education*, *6*(2), 173–200.

Yoshida, Kensaku. (2003). Language education policy in Japan—the problem of espoused objectives versus practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, *87*(2), 290-292.

Yoshida, Kensei. (2008, August 1). US bases, Japan and the reality of Okinawa as a military colony. Retrieved from https://apjjf.org/-Yoshida-Kensei/2857/article.html

Yoshino, Y., and Taghizadeh-Hesary, F. (2015). Japan's lost decade: Lessons for other economies. ADBI Working Paper 521Asian Development Bank Institute.

Zeichner, K. (2011). Teacher education for social justice. In M. Hawkins (Ed.), *Social justice language teacher education* (pp. 7–22). Multilingual Matters.

Zhang, Q. (2007). Teacher misbehaviors as learning demotivators in college classrooms: A cross-cultural investigation in China, Germany, Japan, and the United States. *Communication Education*, *56*(2), 209-227.

Zhong, Y. (2018). *Is Freire's critical pedagogy applicable to China's higher education? a philosophical examination* [Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia].

Zinn, H., & Damon, M. (1998). *A people's history of the United States*. New York: New Press.

Zotzmann, K. (2013). Bourdieu, language, and linguistics. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 13*(2), 252–255.

Zubrin, R. (2013). *Merchants of despair: Radical environmentalists, criminal pseudo-scientists, and the fatal cult of Antihumanism*. Encounter Books.

日本テレビとCIA－発掘された正力ファイル. (2006, October 20). Retrieved from http://www.rui.jp/ruinet.html?t=5200&o=10512&s=72