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Abstract

This thesis highlights the sociopolitics of English as a dominant/colonial language by focusing on the linkage between language, power, and race. Grounded in critical language theory, comparative education theory, and anti-racism research methodology, this research examines the inextricable relationship between language, power, and race. With this in mind, this thesis argues that language, specifically English, is not a neutral tool of communication but a highly contentious issue that is deeply embedded in sociopolitical ideologies and practices. The contexts of Japan and Trinidad and Tobago are used to illustrate how colonialism continues to impact English language policy, practice, and perceptions. In sum, this research aims to bridge the gap between critical language theory, comparative education theory, and anti-racism studies in a way that (1) highlights the complexity of language politics, (2) explores ideological assumptions inherent in the discourse of the “native” language, and (3) underscores the overlooked ubiquity of race.
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Introduction

This thesis intends to bridge the theoretical and philosophical gaps between critical language theory, comparative education theory, and anti-racism studies in a way that (1) highlights the complexity of language politics, (2) explores ideological assumptions inherent in the discourse of the “native” language, and (3) underscores the overlooked ubiquity of race within the aforementioned fields. This research makes an ambitious attempt to identify the intersections between the three fields of critical language theory, comparative education theory, and anti-racism studies. In particular, this thesis highlights the parallels of these three theoretically disconnected fields by applying multiple methodological approaches which are borrowed from critical language theory, comparative education theory, and anti-racism studies, respectively. By using multiple methodological approaches, this research is able to shed light on their connectedness, identify their theoretical gaps, and raise high-level philosophical questions that may be of interest to language politics scholars, language and education policymakers, and educational practitioners. As a whole, this thesis strives to be an insightful resource to help stimulate conversation around language policy and education policy in both theoretical and practical arenas.

To begin this conversation, I preface with a brief auto-ethnographic account of my linguistic identity (identities). This discussion on linguistic identity provides readers with context as to how I, as a researcher, view and unpack particular experiences that have shaped the way I perceive language, power, and race. By first discussing the concept of linguistic identity from an auto-ethnographic approach, relevant themes of power, equality, language production, language commodification, racialized embodiments of language, and post-colonial histories of (re)making linguistic identities are brought to light. Moving forward, the contexts of Japan and Trinidad and
Tobago are used to further illustrate how those particular themes help inform our understanding of the way language policies, educational practices, and social perceptions of English develop and operate within society.

The qualitative data present in this project is based on a comprehensive scope of language education policies/guidelines, language policy research, and language policy analyses. Sociopolitical/historical context descriptions, social narratives, and first-hand experience with language education encounters are also part of this data. In particular, the Education for All Report (UNESCO, 2010); the Ministry of Education of Trinidad and Tobago (MOE); and the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Japan (MEXT) are used to highlight the complexities of language education and bring to light the hidden controversies and contradictions present in translating language ideologies to policy and practice. The secondary sources applied in this research are, for the most part, qualitative and are used to inform the key research questions outlined below. It is important to note that this research does not aim to make recommendations on specific language or education policies referenced in this thesis; instead, suggestions in the form of questions will be raised throughout to help better inform language education policymakers and education practitioners of how sociopolitical issues around language, power, and race have a direct impact on what we learn, how we learn, and who is afforded the opportunity to learn. Overall, through the use of multiple methodological approaches—critical language theory, comparative education theory, and anti-racism theory—this thesis specifically aims to illuminate patterns present in dominant English-speaking nations (Trinidad and Tobago) and non-dominant English speaking nations (Japan) by exploring the following key research questions and discussing the sociopolitical implications that arise:
1) What are the challenges in establishing (my) linguistic identity (identities), and how are those challenges relevant to language ideology and the sociopolitics of English?

2) How is “global English” perceived, and what are the sociopolitical implications of global English language policies within the context of education and national identity construction?

3) Within the context of education, what role does language ideology play in the formation of language policy in Japan, a non-dominant English speaking nation and Trinidad and Tobago, a dominant English speaking nation?

4) How can critical language theory, comparative education theory, and anti-racism research methodology illuminate parallel, yet distinct, perspectives to better inform high-level policy decisions?

5) In considering the potential of this research, what other methodologies or framings could be used to enrich and add value to this study, and what gaps has this research left to be discussed?

It is my hope that the above questions help guide and situate this thesis by teasing out the overlapping themes around power, equality, language production, language commodification, racialized embodiments of language, and post-colonial histories of (re)making linguistic identities. As previously mentioned, as a preface to the chapters, below you will find a brief, auto-ethnographical approach of my linguistic identity (identities) where I walk you through my experience as a middle class (class), brown-skinned (racialized), English-speaking (linguistic identity), West Indian girl (gendered) from Trinidad and Tobago.
The Challenge of Situating (my) Linguistic Identity

The rationale behind describing my linguistic identity is twofold: (1) first, I would like readers to see how my particular experiences and encounters with language and race have greatly shaped and continue to shape my linguistic identity (identities); (2) second, I would like readers to see how subtle exchanges and seemingly meaningless encounters have a profound impact on the way we are socialized into performing in order to be accepted, included, and recognized as a person who carries legitimate knowledge. Working through my own linguistic identity is an on-going journey that proves to be a continuous challenge. This challenge, however, is essential to the discussion of language politics as it brings to light pertinent questions regarding not only linguistic identity and (re) making but also underlying issues of language, power, and race. The following portion introduces my own challenges in thinking through my linguistic identity and brings forth why I am particularly drawn to language politics, comparative studies, and anti-racism as budding fields of intersecting research. By working through my own linguistic identity, relevant questions about legitimacy (power) and perceived power are raised. These particular questions help introduce issues of power and show how deeply relevant they are in the fields of language politics, comparative education, and anti-racism studies.

My linguistic identity begins in the West Indies on the island of Trinidad and Tobago where I was born. Being immersed in a culture that has colonial roots and a history of linguistic pluralism and imperialism has greatly informed the way I acquired, produced, and perceived my first language—Trinidadian English. When I immigrated to Canada at the age of four, I never questioned why English became my mother-tongue, but I often had people question me. Some would look at me curiously and ask me, “Are you sure English is your first language?”, or question, “Where are you from anyway? You must speak another Indian language.” It was clear
that their curious eyes could not see past my dark skin; I, a racialized brown body, felt the need to legitimate my linguistic knowledge and prove that I could speak English just as well as my white skinned peers. As a result, I would engage in conversations to prove my English capability and, to some extent, flaunt my linguistic capital and competency. However, with a look of disgust, I was often called a Paki and felt a sense a shame in situations where language was not my safety net. I wanted to dis/identify myself from the brown-skinned people who could not speak “proper” English like I did. To the people who called me “Paki”, all I wanted to say was, “Allyuh, dottish¹ or what? I’m not a Paki. I speak ‘proper’ English”, but all I really said was “No, I’m not. No, I’m not.” It was then that I began producing another way to speak English—a way that was valued, accepted, acknowledged, and legitimated in the social institutions I belonged to (school, that is to say). Although I was not conscious of exactly how, when, or even why this linguistic shift occurred, I was intuitively aware that I needed to speak in a particular way in order to be understood and accepted by my peers and my teachers.

In retrospect, I first perceived this shift as natural, as something that just occurs when the geographical and relational histories of race/class/gender context changes. However, my view is now more in line with scholars such as Rubdy (2008), Canagarajah (2005b), Tollefson (2008), Crawford (2000), and Phillipson (2008) who all highlight that acquiring language, specifically English, is not politically neutral² but embedded in politics and ideologies that have the ability to include and exclude voices. These scholars highlight forms of exclusion that I can relate to as I soon realized that speaking Trinidadian English was not enough to be “included” at school. By adjusting how I spoke, I was immediately afforded more legitimacy in social situations, and, ultimately, became recognized as person whose knowledge counts. To my

¹ Trinidadian English: “Allyuh” literally means “all of you” or “everyone”. “Dottish” can be translated as “silly” in this context, but sometimes it can mean “stupid”. An appropriate translation here is “Are you crazy?”.
² Neutral in a sense that Standard English is perceived as the norm and is often left unquestioned.
confusion, though, Trinidadian English no longer became good enough to speak at home either. When I spoke Trinidadian English at school, people would call it “improper”, “broken”, or “slang”. When I spoke Trinidadian English at home or imitated other Englishes I heard in school, I was scolded and told to speak “proper” English. I tried a few more times to speak other Englishes, sometimes to poke fun at my own language, sometimes to imitate other languages, but this attempt was not socially acceptable at home or at school (unless it was in the playground). Speaking “proper” English was synonymous with speaking Standard English because it was perceived as more legitimate than Trinidadian English. Furthermore, I was encouraged to remake my linguistic identity by not just reproducing the language of the colonizer, but by reproducing the exact way the colonizers used the language. In essence, in my eyes anyway, I needed to sound like “them” (my white skinned teachers, my white skinned friends) if I wanted to be perceived as equal. This inherent legitimacy or power allotted to English is recognized by scholars who engage in the politics of language. For example, Phillipson’s (2008) theory of linguistic imperialism and Canagarajah’s (2005b) discussion of local languages as well as Bourdieu’s (1991) notion of symbolic power are three key concepts that help illustrate how power and perceptions of power can be marginalizing at its best and oppressive at its worst, especially for minority language speakers. Before this research discusses Bourdieu’s (1991) notion of symbolic power, it is necessary to decipher and articulate what this research views as power. For this, I turn to Fishman (2006) who recognizes the ambiguity of theorizing power. Fishman (2006) attempts to semantically dismantle what is meant by power and acknowledges

---

3 The term “Standard English” warrants its own discussion because it is embedded in problematic notions of hierarchical languages and linguistic evolution. Having said that, the term Standard English here and hereafter is referencing the form of English that is taught in the majority of formal education institutions in the West such as Canada, the United States, Australia, and England. This type of Standard English also happens to be a one of the English varieties that is taught globally. Although tempting, the term “global English” is not synonymous with Standard English, which will be further unpacked in the first chapter.
that “[i]n order to advance sociolinguistic research on “power” and to keep it from becoming “just about anything to everyone”…it would be highly desirable to specify in each case the rare resource the control of which leads to power. It would also be desirable to specify the outcomes of power, be they material or non-material” (Fishman, 2006, p.10). In this utterance, Fishman (2006) draws attention to “the material” and “non-material” ways power operates, and in this sense, he is essentially drawing attention to the abstract ways control over resources (such as language) can be exacted tangibly through language restriction (e.g. in the case of Trinidad we will see how language restriction was enacted through deliberate policies to eradicate linguistic pluralism in favor of only English policies). In this sense, controlling what languages are legitimated in social institutions is a covert act of power. More insidiously and seductively, however, power can be enacted in “non-material” ways. For example, power can be covertly enacted when economic benefits are attributed to particular language over others. In this sense, power operates as a gatekeeper to preserve the value of a particular language, while subtly negating the value of the others. By conceiving power as both deliberate practices of language inequality and indirect practices that reflect language inequality, this thesis is able to articulate and illuminate the multiplicity of ways power and perceived power are embedded in language education policies and practices. Furthermore, these concepts help illuminate why linguistic shifts are not merely natural occurrences but instead are embedded in interests of power. Phillipson (2008) also highlights power and inequality through his notion of linguistic imperialism where the power of the dominant language and culture are strengthened while non-dominant languages are exploited. For Phillipson (1992), linguistic imperialism “attempts to capture the way one language dominates others, with anglocentricity and professionalism…in which unequal power and resource allocation is effected and legitimated” within the context of
English Language Teaching (p. 54). This unequal power is a theme that arises in Canagarajah’s (2005b) discussion and Bourdieu’s (1991a) as well. Non-dominant local languages, as Canagarajah (2005b) points out, were given the status of *primitive* since they were “ranked hierarchically according to the phases [Trinidadian English] has to pass through to reach the advanced stage representing modernity” (p. 5, insertion mine). On the other hand, dominant languages, such as Standard English, are typically associated with perceived notions of modernity and legitimacy. For Canagarajah (2005b), local people are not restricted to fully determining frames of colonial power; the local people are fully capable of disrupting the dominance of an oppressive colonial power. This kind of legitimacy and authority is what Bourdieu (1991a/b) terms symbolic power. For Bourdieu (1991a), symbolic power “refer[s] not so much to a specific type of power, but rather to an aspect of most forms of power as they are routinely deployed in social life. For in the routine flow of day-to-day life, power is seldom exercised as overt physical force: instead it is transmuted into a symbolic form, and thereby endowed with a kind of legitimacy that it would not otherwise have” (p. 23). Thompson (1991) explains that Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic power does not refer simply to oppressive dominance; on the contrary, “[d]ominated individuals are not passive bodies to which symbolic power is applied, as it were, like a scalpel to a corpse. Rather, symbolic power requires, as a condition for its success, that those subject to it believe in the legitimacy of power and the legitimacy of those who wield it” (Bourdieu, 1991a, p. 23).

Aligned with Fishman (2006), Phillipson (2008), Canagarajah (2005b), and Bourdieu (1991), this thesis acknowledges that unequal power exists. However, one major difference that this thesis highlights in its conception of power is that in addition to power being both symbolic and tangible, power is not always exerted from one direction. That is to say, the social actors are able
to challenge, resist, and (re)claim power. With this in mind, this thesis sees power as deeply connected to colonial legacies of racialized knowledge and as deeply connected to transformation and resistance. Furthermore, this thesis also challenges hierarchical notions of “linguistic evolution” because it not only undermines linguistic pluralism but negates the validity of varieties of Standard English or Englishes\textsuperscript{4}. Based on my learnings and experiences, my linguistic shift from Trinidadian English to Standard English did not occur “naturally” as a result of a mere geographical shift; instead the language shift was more complexly rooted in legitimacy, authority, and, ultimately, power, and privileges allotted to speaking Standard English.

Through formal and informal settings, it was easy to see that speaking Standard English granted me more legitimacy and more access to social spheres, and because I never fluently learned another language, Standard English became a strong part of my linguistic identity. Since the beginning of my academic life, I was taught only in Standard English. By the time I was in grade three, French was introduced as a second language. At the time, I was excited to learn a new language. However, in reflection, the subject French was merely a token subject, simply there to satisfy Canada’s commitment to bilingualism. There was no immediate relevance to learning French: I did not belong to a French speaking community; I did not see the economic value of learning French; I did not understand why I needed to learn French. Even though French was institutionalized as a required subject, there was no real incentive for me to continue cultivating a new language. For me, clearly, French did not have the same symbolic power or market value as English did. The symbolic power English carried stayed with me throughout my academic

\textsuperscript{4} The term “Englishes” will be used throughout this paper to show support for the need to legitimize indigenized varieties that are too often negated as sub-standard. Another noteworthy point is that “Englishes” is not to be confused with Kachru’s (1996) “World Englishes”—where purely geographical explanations of indigenized varieties are used to describe language spread.
career. I became fascinated by the way language works and pursued studies in English and Professional Writing during my undergraduate career at York University. After completion, I was interested in using the English language skills I acquired in a place where it would be highly valued and sought-after, so I moved to Japan in 2006 and began teaching English at primary, secondary, post-secondary, and adult education levels. When I first moved to Japan, I was naively under the impression that teaching English was a good thing, even somewhat philanthropic. I thought I was helping children learn a useful language and improve their grades. I thought I was simply helping students learn a new way of communicating, and I truly felt I was doing a social good. What I did not expect was the commodification of English language education or the celebrity status associated with (mostly white skinned although this is changing) English speakers. However, unlike French, I immediately saw the economic incentives of learning Japanese, which in this context was the dominant language. For example, there were more career opportunities available to me. There was also a social incentive to feel included as part of the linguistic community. Therefore, learning basic conversational Japanese and being able to speak Canadian English helped me build a social community of both Englishes and Japanese speakers and increased my cultural and linguistic capital. Unlike French, there were direct and immediate incentives for learning Japanese. Interestingly, though, both linguistic shifts seemed to occur “naturally” and, therefore, were not overtly intertwined with issues of power or inequality. In fact, these types of seemingly everyday language shifts are commonly considered a natural phenomenon by some linguists, who negate the underlying power and politics that drive language change. In contrast, Rubdy (2008) draws attention to the role of power and echoes Canagarajah (2005b), Tollefson (2008), Crawford (2000), and Phillipson (2008) by positioning English as a value-laden, politically informed, and ideologically-loaded issue:
The power wielded by English as the primary language of globalization is further boosted by its perceived ‘neutrality’ amidst competing interest groups of diverse ethnic and linguistic affiliations in these multilingual and multicultural contexts and its potential, as lingua franca, for bringing about social and national cohesion among these peoples—a role which frequently hides the fact that, in these contexts, English is far from neutral in terms of social class and has equal potential for dividing people (p. 6).

The above statement further highlights the perceived neutrality of English and brings to light the dimension of power that is too often negated. By negating the issue of power, there is an implicit assumption here that language change just happens and should be viewed as a neutral communication tool. In contrast, this thesis is predicated on the following assumption: language is not neutral. By extension, this assumption also implies that identity and race, which are inextricably tied to language, are also not neutral but highly politicized and contentious. The Education for All 2010 Report (UNESCO, 2010) addresses language policy and clearly draws attention to the role language plays in access to social and economic mobility, thus supporting the underlying assumption of this research:

[Language policy in education raises complex issues and potential tensions between group identity on the one hand, and social and economic aspirations on the other. Parents in many countries express a strong preference for their children to learn in the official language, principally because this is seen as a route to enhanced prospects for social mobility (UNESCO, 2010, p. 25).]

Although the above refers to language in the standardized sense (as a mere tool of communication) rather than a dynamic sense (as a sociopolitical issue tied to identity, power, and race), the tensions between language as identity markers and language as a means to enhanced
social mobility remains clear. With this in mind, I hope that this section on “The Challenge of Situating (my) Linguistic Identity” has been able to articulate that attempting to construct (my particular) linguistic identity/racial identity is challenging because my lived experiences with language shifts are intertwined with issues of power that permeate formal and informal social realms. In the next section, I provide an overview for each chapter and identify the key themes of language, power, and race within each.

Chapter Overview

Chapter One.

In chapter one, the first objective is to explore language ideologies through tracing traditional ideological debates in order to suggest a more dynamic typology that accounts for resistance, transformation, autonomy, and agency than traditional Marxist notions. The second objective is to describe why critical language theory, comparative education theory, and anti-racism research methodology are particularly useful. With language ideology and research methodology in mind, the third objective is to explore what “global English” is and how the implementation of “global English” language policies affect cultural and national identities as well as education policy in dominant and non-dominant English speaking countries. Specifically, a wide scope of case studies that span various geographical contexts will be referenced. The purpose of including a wide scope of these particular countries is addressed in the case study section (see page 41). The implications for doing a diverse sample of cross-comparative analysis will also be considered in the case study section. In essence, this chapter aims to challenge the perceived neutrality of English and provide a solid foundation of research that engages in issues of language politics.

Specifically, Malaysia, Singapore, South Korea, Hong Kong, Pakistan, and South Africa will be referenced in the case study section.
language politics and helps set the context for understanding how language policies are linked to themes of power, equality, language production, language commodification, racialized embodiments of language, and post-colonial histories of (re)making linguistic identities.

**Chapter Two.**

Chapter two reinforces the idea that language policy is value-laden by focusing on how English language policies in Japan inform national and cultural identities within the context of education. This chapter examines how English language policy influences cultural and national identity as well as education policy in Japan. To round out this dialogue, the section will engage in a discussion that highlights the issue of language equality within the context of English language education. Even though social perceptions will be emphasized throughout, the politics of English as a global language will play an essential role in understanding the implications of English language policy in shaping national and cultural identities and education policy. Based on what scholars have said, I conclude this chapter by further highlighting the inextricable relationship between language policy, national and cultural identity, education policy, and equality. These themes lend themselves to opening a discussion on how language intersects with race, which will be more thoroughly discussed in the third chapter with specific reference to the context of Trinidad and Tobago.
Chapter Three.

Chapter three focuses on English language planning and policy within the context of education in Trinidad and Tobago, highlighting underlying factors that gave rise to the legitimacy and, ultimately, the institutionalization of the English language. In order to facilitate this discussion, I first provide a brief overview of the British language education/colonization process that brought the predominantly non-English speaking populations to Trinidad. With this context in mind, I then address the neutrality of English as a lingua franca and challenge apolitical, ahistorical ideologies of English. More specifically, I explore how English teaching was used as an instrument of oppression by the colonizers and English learning was used as an instrument of resistance by the colonized. The questions raised throughout this discussion are heavily grounded in an anti-racism research methodology, centering questions of race and power to illuminate the connection between language and race and, ultimately, to expose issues of power. This chapter aims to further challenge the neutrality of English and expose its ties to whiteness and Eurocentricity by naming race and by bringing to light political, social, and institutional dimensions of English that have helped to perpetuate and sustain its symbolic power in Trinidad and Tobago at the expense of indigenous knowledges, languages, and cultures.

Conclusion.

The fourth chapter concludes by recapping how various geographical contexts, in addition to Japan and Trinidad and Tobago, illustrate how language, power, and race are inextricably intertwined. To enrich the scope of this research, I address some of the methodological and theoretical limitations of using secondary resources and highlight how alternative research methodologies such as Indigenous research methodology could further enhance this research. To end, I offer suggestions for future avenues of research that will benefit the fields of language
politics, comparative studies, and anti-racism studies in order to bring together relevant themes that offer insight into how the politics of language play an integral role both within sociopolitical spheres and the context of education.
Chapter One: A Comparative Approach to (Global) English Language Policies on Cultural and National Identities

This chapter begins with an essential discussion on language ideolog(ies) and research methodologies before addressing the concept of “global English”. Because language ideolog(ies) are fundamental to identifying attitudes and beliefs systems around language in society, understanding the ways language ideologies operate is key to unraveling what “global English” is and how it is perceived. With reference to Hall (1988) and Blommaert (1999) and my own encounters with language, I present a revised approach to conceptualizing language ideology which recognizes that multiple language ideologies can work simultaneously and is more reflective of resistance. Resistance and transformation are key components to the revised typology because it affords more agency and autonomy to the subjects (social actors), which is essential to anti-racism research methodology. In the methodologies section, I provide a rationale for employing critical language theory, comparative education theory, and anti-racism research methodology. With language ideology and research methodologies established, this chapter moves forward to consider how “global English” language policies affect national and cultural identities within the context of education. Since much of the research concerning language politics identifies English as a global language, it is appropriate to begin by examining the concept of “global English” on its own: what exactly is “global English” and how is this concept tied to cultural and national identities? How do “global English” language policies affect cultural and national identities as well as education policy in dominant and non-dominant English speaking countries? To address these questions, this thesis analyzes a range of case studies that span various geographical contexts, focusing more closely on six case studies: Malaysia, Singapore, South Korea, Hong Kong, Pakistan, and South Africa. The purpose of including a
wide range of these particular countries is to illustrate the saliency of language politics in dominant and non-dominant English-speaking contexts (See Case Studies on page 41 for a complete rationale). In essence, this chapter aims to challenge the perceived neutrality of English and provide a solid foundation of research that engages in issues of language politics language politics and helps set the context for understanding how language policies are linked to themes of power, equality, language production, language commodification, racialized embodiments of language, and post-colonial histories of (re)making linguistic identities.

**Language Ideolog(ies)**

Blommaert (1999) and Hall (1988) provide a solid footing for deconstructing competing notions of language ideologies that are deeply-rooted in the way language in society is viewed. Blommaert (1999) offers a comprehensive case study approach in *Language Ideological Debates*. This work proves to be a useful starting point for three reasons. First, Blommaert (1999) does an especially thorough job of synthesizing and identifying language ideological debates across a global context. He recognizes that “[ideologies] are being reproduced by means of a variety of institutional, semi-institutional and every day practices: campaigns, regimentation in social reproduction systems such as schools, administration, army, advertisement publication (the media, literature, art, music)” (Thompson, 1990 as cited in Blommaert, 1999, p. 10). Second, Blommaert (1999) recognizes that because orientations around language ideology are so deeply-rooted in institutional and informal practices, it is imperative that research be critical and remember that the “point is precisely to reach a more refined understanding of the process of power, by identifying the actors, the practices, and the contextual factors involved in historical processes” (Blommaert, 1999, p. 11 emphasis mine). Third, by acknowledging the process of power, identifying the social actors, and recognizing the socio-historical context, Blommaert
(1999) provides a useful framework for ideological orientations around language ideologies: (1) Instrumentalist Ideology: “language is seen as tool for transforming ideas into a new linguistic pattern” (Blommaert, 1999, p. 13); (2) Romantic Ideology: “language is an abstract idea inextricably linked to a people’s ‘soul’” (Blommaert, 1999, p. 13); (3) Essentialist/Homo-genistic Ideology: “Homo-genistic Ideologies appear better suited for nationalistic purposes” (Blommaert, 1999, p. 18); (4) Hegemonic Ideology: “One language …is constructed as in ‘everyone’s best interest’” even though “[i]t is the high status language of the socio-economic elite and middle class” (Blommaert, 1999, p. 20). This useful framework clearly outlines and identifies key orientations toward language in society; however, this framework alone is not able to highlight transformation and resistance that Hall (1988) suggests.

Hall (1988) recognizes the importance of theorizing language ideology in a multifaceted light and maintains that theorizing is meant to “…inform our practices so we may transform it” (p. 3 emphasis mine). Hall (1988) critiques the classical Marxist notion of the “false consciousness” ideology—“because it assumes an empiricist relation of the subject to the knowledge” (p. 7). In arguing that “[Marx’s false consciousness ideology] is a highly unstable theory…as it has to assume that the vast numbers of ordinary people…can simply be thoroughly and systematically duped into misrecognizing where the real interests lie”, he admits that he retains Marx’s notion of classes and social relations of production but does not view the subjects as passive beings. By affording autonomy and agency to the subjects themselves, his approach recognizes “the struggle and contestation for the space in which to construct an ideological hegemony” (p. 9 emphasis mine). This struggle and contestation is reminiscent of the resistance that anti-racism methodology speaks to and affords social actors autonomy and agency that is not afforded in traditional Marxist interpretations of “false consciousness”. With this in mind, this thesis
attempts to move toward a more dynamic understanding of language ideology that still acknowledges Blommaert’s (1999) framework (described above), yet moves beyond traditional Marxist notion of “false consciousness” and beyond the production of subjects as passive beings. This research also recognizes subject autonomy and agency as well as recognizes that notions of ideology can work simultaneously. Although ideology can be considered “material because it operates in and through the production of subjects” (Hall, 1988, p. 9), it does not mean that language ideologies are fixed products that social actors merely reproduce. Sociopolitical context is important as ideology “cannot function on its own” (Hall 1988, p. 5), and should not be viewed as theoretically detached from the social actors that help produce, sustain, resist, and transform it. Within the context of language, this means that social actors are not solely viewed as mere passive receivers and producers of languages. Instead, social actors are part of a larger sociopolitical process that enables them to negotiate their linguistic identity through performing acts of resistance, making conscious language production choice(s), and forming individual and collective perceptions of language based on social, historical, and political contexts. Negotiating my own linguistic identity in the introduction is a prime example of me, a social actor, making a conscious choice to speak “proper” English. My acts of resistance (i.e. imitating other Englishes or speaking Trinidadian English at home and at school) were not considered socially acceptable or legitimate forms of communication, so I made a conscious choice to acquire/reproduce the colonial language without deeply understanding the sociopolitical context of doing so. The choice to produce “proper” English was/is more complex than a geographic shift from Trinidad to Toronto. I acquired English not just in an instrumentalist way but in multiple/simultaneous ways: yes, as tool for communication; yes, as a marker of social class (albeit middle class); yes, as a sought-after commodity; and, yes, as a marker of dis/identification (i.e. “Allyuh, dottish or
what? I’m not a Paki. I speak ‘proper’ English.”). These varying language ideological orientations described here must be viewed as part of a broader sociopolitical context that acknowledges social actors as beings who have autonomy, agency, and the ability to resist and transform social and institutional practices. Therefore, although this section does not attempt to synthesize the long-standing language ideological debates as Blommaert (1999) does, nor does it theorize language ideology the exhaustive way Hall (1988) does, this thesis does recognize that understanding language ideologies is a fundamental and critical task needed to situate this research within the broader contexts of power, equality, language production, language markets, racialized embodiments of language, and post-colonial histories of (re)making linguistic identities.

**Research Methodologies**

Critical language theory, comparative education theory, and anti-racism research methodology are three methodologies that effectively illuminate the themes central to this research: power, equality, language production, language markets, racialized embodiments of language, and post-colonial histories of (re)making linguistic identities. On its own, each methodology offers unique characteristics and features that help guide the discussion on language in society, but together, these three methodologies offer a deeply critical strategy to unpacking the sociopolitics behind language education policies and practices. 

First, critical language theory offers unique ways of conceptualizing language ideolog(ies) and expanding on traditional explanations that limit social actors’ abilities to show resistance, transformation, autonomy, and agency (as explained above). Unlike purely ahistorical linguistic approaches to language, critical language theory aims to expose the hidden sociopolitics behind language education and is concerned with theoretical questions around language use in society.
Second, comparative education theory allows this research to include a range of geographical contexts that go beyond simply comparing two sites, Japan (non-dominant English speaking) and Trinidad and Tobago (dominant English speaking). By referencing a range of language education issues within specific geographical contexts and then narrowing the scope to focus on two specific sites, this thesis is better able to bring to light the multiplicity of ways language education policy issues require critical attention both within linguistically plural nations and seemingly linguistically “homogenous” nations. The implications of conducting such a broad selection of cases should not be viewed as a traditional (albeit generalized) approach to social science research because it does not assume that any given set of countries can or should be easily compared. More importantly, comparative education research does not assume that any given set of minority language users should be viewed simply as language rights activists. Instead, this approach to comparative education theory recognizes and identifies specific features of the local sociopolitical/socioeconomic contexts in much the same way critical language theory and anti-racism research seeks to do. Comparative education researchers, such as Joseph Farrell, are particularly critical of traditional comparative social science research that aims to analyze broad patterns in order to implement a “one size fits all” model of education policies. Similarly, critical language theory and anti-racism theory are also highly skeptical of language education and policy models/guidelines that do not consider sociopolitical histories and local contexts.

Furthermore, anti-racism research recognizes the importance of addressing sociopolitical histories and considers the local contexts (both past and present). Anti-racism as a conceptual, methodological, and analytical tool is particularly useful in highlighting power relations, resistance, and sites of transformation that allow for a deeper, more ideologically-rooted understanding of the relationships between language, power, and race. It aims to
unapologetically name “race” and critically examine the role of “race” in sociopolitical contexts that have been typically treated as ahistorical/apolitical. Unlike critical language theory and comparative education, anti-racism research methodology acknowledges the biases of the researcher and views the researcher as a possible change agent. This acknowledgment of the researcher as “the self” is somewhat characteristic of auto-ethnography; however, anti-racism goes beyond purely narrative approaches that depict how “the self” is part of the research. Instead, anti-racism highlights sites transformation in both the research subjects and the researcher herself by acknowledging how class, gender, and race simultaneously operate; acknowledging class, gender, and race is a necessary part of decolonization process. This is a particularly distinctive feature because it allows me, the researcher, to critically revisit my own language encounters as a middle class, dark-skinned female who speaks English.

In sum, all three methodologies enhance this research and offer great insight on the sociopolitics of language within the context of education and across global boundaries. However, the discussion of research methodologies does not end here. Throughout this research, appropriate references to specific methodological features will be woven into the discussion to in order to establish and develop a more cohesive understanding of the way in which critical language theory, comparative education theory, and anti-racism research methodology shed light on language, power, and race.

Social Actors

This thesis recognizes the limits of identifying rigid categories of social actors that do not acknowledge the complexity of linguistic identit(ies) or reproduce hegemonic ideologies. For example, “native” English speakers, “non-native” English speakers, and non-English speakers are three social actors that broadly inform this study; however, this research also challenges the
categories themselves by exposing false assumptions about what it means to be an English speaker and by challenging stereotypes around “non-native” Englishes. From an education perspective, the key social actors are English language teachers and English language learners. These categories are also more complex than they first appear because there are assumptions that English language teachers are/or should be Standard “native” English speakers and that English language learners will never be able to fully adopt the “Standard” or “native” sounding English they are exposed to because of a learner’s perceived “accent”. Instead of disregarding the categories all together, this thesis sees this perception as an opportunity to challenge the categories through a critical language theory and anti-racism lens as it seeks out more inclusive terminology to describe the Englishes and more sociopolitical explanations of its spread.

The Spread of Englishes: A Colonial Discourse and Practice

Languages are rarely acquired for their own sake. They are acquired as keys to other things that are desired (Fishman et al., 1977, p. 115).

In The Spread of English, Fishman, Conrad, and Cooper (1977) discuss the relationship between minority languages and international languages as it relates to power, ideology, and attitudes. Fishman’s chapter (1977) appropriately titled “Language Maintenance and Language Shift” discusses how minority languages adopt English as an additional language, as a language of wider communication (LWC), and how English itself is maintained. He describes how education, specifically schools, has historically been a mechanism for the organized spread of language. Fishman (1977) suggests that English is not associated with a specific ideal or identity marker: “English is, of course, identified by some with capitalism, colonialism, and bourgeois values” but he asserts that there is no direct relationship to any one particular marker as, for example, Arabic is with Islam, Russian with Marxist communication, Chinese with Maoist communism, or as was Spanish with Catholicism (Fishman, 1977, p. 119). Instead, Fishman (1977) asserts that in
much of the Third World English is perceived as ethnically and ideologically neutral because the image of English is related to what Fishman (1977) calls *process variables*: modernization, urbanization, technological know-how, consumerism, and a high standard of living in general (p. 119). For Fishman (1977), even though English may be perceived as neutral, this neutrality is in stark contrast to the attitudes toward English. He asserts that, “[o]bviously, languages are not liked or disliked in a vacuum, but rather liked or disliked as symbolic values, of peoples, of ideologies, of behaviors” (Fishman, 1977, p. 123). In contrast to immigrant languages in the USA and in Australia, Fishman (1977) posits that English is language that is used but not much liked (p. 123): “On the whole, English as an additional language is more learned than used and more used than liked. The three (learning, using, and liking) are little related to each other” (Fishman, 1976 as cited in García et al., 2006, p. 27). This raises the question: if English is not very much liked as Fishman argues, then what factors contribute to the spread of English? In “English as World Language”, Fishman et al. (1977) summarize their findings and conclude that there are six markers that may help illustrate why English continues not only to spread but continues to grow in non-English mother-tongue countries:

1) Countries under political or economic hegemony use English for official purposes.

2) For countries that do not have political or economic hegemony of the English-speaking powers (past or present), there are few English schooling at the primary and secondary level in non-English mother-tongue countries.

3) More than 40% of the non-English speaking world’s foreign students chose to study in English mother-tongue countries.
4) The highest number of students come from less-developed countries and from distant countries (Asian or African countries, for example) to study English in English mother-tongue countries (Canada or the United States, for example).

5) English-language press is widely circulated in countries that use English for official purposes (Note: In countries that use English as an official language, English-language papers are published by those said countries and distributed in Asia).

6) English book production figures show that it is double that of French in the non-mother tongue countries of Europe and greatly more in Latin America (Fishman et al., 1977, p. 56).

In addition to Fishman et al. (1977), Kachru (1996) and Sonntag (2003) also discuss the spread of English; however, Kachru and Sonntag, use different linguistic/sociolinguistic approaches to illustrate how and why English is acquired, maintained, and spread. From a linguistic perspective, Kachru (1996) examines “World Englishes” (or Wes) and is concerned with how English has been appropriated or transformed, whereas Sonntag is more concerned with highlighting the power and dependency associated with the spread of English/Englishes. Kachru’s most famous typology consists of three concentric circles that are particularly illustrative of the diffusion of English (on a macro scale): the expanding circle, the outer circle, and the inner circle (See Appendix 1 for a list of countries included in each circle. Also, see Kachru, 1996, p. 137). Sonntag (2003) analyzes Kachru’s (1996) typology and concludes that the expanding circle includes countries where “global English” is not the dominant language, for example, Japan; the outer-circle includes countries where “global English” has been indigenized, for example, India; and lastly, the inner-circle includes countries where English is the native language of most of the population, for example, Canada (Sonntag 2003). Like Fishman et al.
Kachru (1996) recognizes that English has become a language of wider communication (LWC). However, using a descriptive linguistic approach, Kachru (1996) highlights that the “demographic distribution of English surpasses that of Latin in the medieval period, that of Sanskrit in what was traditional South Asia, and of Spanish, Arabic, and French”, not even artificial languages such as Esperanto have spread in the same way (Kachru, 1996, p. 138). Similar to Fishman et al. (1977), Kachru points out that English is being diffused not only through native English speakers but also through “nonnative users who are now responsible for its spread and teaching, and uses” (Kachru, 1996, p. 139). Although Sonntag (2003) agrees with Kachru’s (1996) linguistic description of inner/outer/expanding circles, Sonntag (2003) is more concerned with the sociopolitical dimensions of power relations that Fishman et al. (1977) and other scholars in critical language theory observe. With sociopolitical dimensions in mind, Sonntag (2003) modifies Kachru’s typology and presents the following revised typology:

1. **Inner Circle**: An English-speaking country which consists of global powers, where historically the dominant culture has been Anglo-Saxon but which are increasingly becoming multicultural.

2. **Outer Circle**: A group of countries that are historically linked, in dependent relations, to the English speaking core, but which have attempted to sunder that dependency. In these countries, English is usually an official language; however, unlike the core countries, English has no pretensions of being the cultural bonding glue of the nation.

3. **Expanding Circle**: Countries in which the use of English has been historically marginal. In these countries, English is increasingly learned by more and more people, but it remains a foreign language without any recognized official status (pp. 2-4).
Sonntag (2003) maintains that the above typology offers a more illuminating perspective that will help to highlight the social and political factors that some (socio) linguists disregard. She maintains that from a linguistic perspective, language spread is often seen as a natural phenomenon, “whereby once a language reaches a take-off or tipping point, its spread generates its own momentum” (Sonntag, 2003, p. 3). Fishman also finds fault with a purely linguistic description of language; in *Language, Loyalty, Continuity and Change* scholars note that Fishman “signaled that the sociology of language had entered a mid-life crisis” (García et al., 2006, p. 9) and it was Fishman who emphasized the “socio”. Thus, for scholars like Fishman, Sonntag, and to some extent linguists like Kachru, there is wide agreement that the study of language should focus more on the sociological and political factors in order to help facilitate discussions that speak to the spread of English. It should also be noted here that Kachru’s (1996) typology, even with Sonntag’s (2003) revisions, conceals more than it reveals because according to Holborow (1999), the flawed nation-based model fails “to take adequate account of social factors and social difference within the circles” (Holborow, 1999, as cited in Pennycook, 2007, pp. 59-60). By overlooking social differences within the circles (gender, class, race), Kachru’s (1996) typology is a reductionist approach that oversimplifies the development/spread of World Englishes by rationalizing that varieties of English simply emerge wherever a nation state is formed. This framework is unable to illuminate and challenge nationally-defined identities within the circles because, as Pennycook (2007) argues with the support of Bruthiaux, the Three Circle Framework has “outlived its usefulness” (Bruthiaux, 2003, p. 161) (Pennycook, 2007, pp. 21-22). In “TESOL at Forty: What are the Issues?”, Canagarajah (2006) discusses some of the current debates and controversies around the spread of English language teaching and English language learning, highlighting how English is either resisted or readily adopted. For example,
Canagarajah (2006) highlights how “in communities where the vernacular has been given primacy as a form of affirmative action against the disparities suffered during colonization, local people subtly resist in favor of English” (For Malaysia, see David & Govindasamy, 2005; for Iran, see Riazi, 2005 as cited in Canagarajah, 2006, p. 22). In contrast, however, “communities where policy makers have encouraged English in deference to the economic and educational opportunities it may provide in the context of economic globalization, there is a near-chauvinistic resurgence of nationalism” (For Brazil, see Rajagopalan, 2005; for India, see Ramanathan, 2004 in Canagarajah, 2006, p. 22). Where the past issues have focused on globalization from a colonial lens, which originally spread English over 500 years ago, more recent forms of globalization are creating new challenges to what might be called postmodern globalization (see Appadurai, 1996; Hall, 1997 as cited in Canagarajah, 2006, p. 24). A key challenge for scholars and practitioners here, as Fishman (1977) and Sonntag (2003) also acknowledge, is how to teach English, or other languages in wide communication like French, in a manner that complements instead of competes with minority languages. In light of the new challenges that globalization presents, I turn the discussion of the spread of English to “global English” and examine what scholars have to say about English as the global language.

What is “Global English”?

When considering language education issues on a global scale and within nation-states themselves, the term “global English” seems to appear throughout a vast array of literature in the field of critical language theory and in the field of sociolinguistics. Although there is no particular consensus on an appropriate definition of “global English”, there is a wide range of useful interpretations that help reveal the relationship between the term globalization and English in conceiving English as “global English”.

Phillipson (2001), Lo Bianco (2003), Prendergast (2008), and Arnold (2006) all explore the role of English in the process of globalization. For Lo Bianco (2003), language education policy debates are often synonymous with English language education debates. He calls for more linguistically inclusive responses to “the succession of English-centered global technocapital with English-based empire [that has] converted English into the common, convenient, instrumentally demanded global language” (Lo Bianco, 2003, p. 287). Arnold (2006) shares a similar sentiment; however, the focus is on electronic convenience of global English. In other words, the geographic colonization that helped English spread is now also electronic colonization through computers. Bill Gates’ response is particularly illustrative of English hegemony: “One world: one dictionary”—should this also mean “one world: one language”? (Morrison, 2002, p. 26 in Arnold, 2006, p. 4). This question is the focus of Phillipson’s (2001) “English for Globalization or for the World’s People?”. Phillipson (2001) is particularly interested in challenging dominant perceptions of English. He argues that scholars should be more critical in analyzing the factors that create the impression that English serves all citizens equally well. In this sense, Phillipson (2001) challenges the notion that “global English” should be viewed as a hegemonic language ideology that positions English as something “convenient for everyone”. For instance, he reminds us that many decisions made by transnational companies or government agencies such as UNESCO, the European Union, and, especially, the World Bank (as a key player in transnational education policy) make decisions for the world’s population—and these decision are made in English. Phillipson (2001) also points out that the English speaking haves consume 80% of the available resources, where the non-English speaking have-nots are left in poverty (p. 189). This stark statistic exposes a correlation between English language speakers and socioeconomic status. This reality also sheds light on the glaring
inequalities between English speakers and non-English speakers. As a hegemonic solution to lessen this inequality gap, language unification education policies are often implemented as bandage solutions. Below is one example that highlights how consolidating languages in a multilingual context completely neglects linguistic diversity:

The World Bank’s real position…encourages the consolidation of the imperial languages in Africa…the World Bank does not seem to regard the linguistic Africanisation of the whole of primary education and beyond as an effort that is worth its consideration. Its publication on strategies for stabilizing and revitalizing universities, for example makes absolutely no mention of the place of language at the tertiary level of African education (Mazrui, 1997, p. 39 as cited in Phillipson, 2001, p. 190).

More than neglecting the existing linguistic diversity, however, the above critique highlights how the World Bank, and other multilateral companies like the World Bank, are informed by hegemonic language ideologies that impose a one language model in the name of equality. For Phillipson (2001), English language education and English language spread is not just about the corporate/commodification/convenience/global nature of English imposition that is discussed in Lo Bianco (2003), Prendergast (2008), and Arnold (2006). Phillipson (2001) is more concerned with how globalization maintains and perpetuates the perceived power of English. In considering power and language, the scholars discussed in this section seem to agree that the relationship between English and globalization is premised on Fishman’s (1977) explanation of power and language. This recognition of power and politics is furthered by Sonntag’s *The Local Politics of Global English* (2003). In the next section, this thesis further examines the concept of “global English” by drawing on Sonntag’s case study approach to language politics.
Sonntag’s *The Local Politics of Global English* offers a case study approach to sociolinguistic globalization. In her first chapter, she begins her discussion by addressing a simple question: what is Global English? This question is what lies at the heart of her explorations in understanding the relationship and influences of English, globalization, and politics. Sonntag narrows her cases to five countries and focuses on one theme per country: United States of America is an example of *Hegemony*; France is an example of *Resistance*; India is an example of *Elites and Subalterns*; South Africa and Nepal are examples of *Liberalization*. In each case study, she focuses on hegemony, integration, power, democracy, diversity, and resistance as it relates to each country. To illustrate the political dimension of global English, Sonntag (2003) observes the strategic way English communications are used to deliver messages to particular groups of people:

> A New York Times article in August of 2002 carries the headline “China Issues new Warning to Taiwan, Just in English” Why is mainland China using English to communicate with its “aberrant” province? Because the language of global politics is English: The warning is clearly meant for the international community not to interfere in Chinese internal affairs and is not meant for Taiwan (Sonntag, 2003, pp. xi-xii).

> Protesters around the globe invariably carry placards in English, as the cameras of the international media roll (Sonntag, 2003, p. xii).

The above excerpts clearly reveal the degree to which “English is a global card played in local contestations for power” (Sonntag, 2003, p. xii). Thus, Sonntag (2003) defines *global English* “as part of globalization. It is part of the cause, the process, and the product of globalization” (p. xii). In the United States, for example, attempts to officialise English demonstrate that “for
English-Only advocates, [the] greater good is national unity defined in linguistic and cultural terms, i.e., a “common ‘Americanness’” (Sonntag, 2003, p. 22). In other words, it is an example of a hegemonic language ideology that positions English as a common good. In France, 1994 Touban law attempts to prevent the spread of English as Leila Wexler notes, “the principles underlying the law’s adoption are clear: (i) to protect the French language by mandating its use in French territory and (ii) to ensure its ‘linguistic purity’ by outlawing the introduction of foreign (read English) elements into its lexicon”—thus, resistance (as cited in Sonntag, 2003, p. 46). In India, global English signifies elite status as it functions in two ways: one, it shows that subalterns have appropriated the global English, not Indian English, and, two, it unifies a multilingual country with the over 1500 languages in India (Sonntag, 2003, pp. 61-73). For Nepal and South Africa, language marks group identity, and, in both of these countries English was seen as the language of freedom and liberation: “[i]n both apartheid South Africa and monarchical Nepal, the official language of the State was the mother tongue of the group identified as innately superior to others—Afrikaans (and English) in South Africa and Nepali in Nepal” (Sonntag, 2003, p. 80). Through specific case studies, Sonntag (2003) critically analyzes how global English relates to issues of local politics and contestations of power, thus provoking thought and insight into on hegemony, resistance, liberation, and, ultimately, power within the context of language. Indeed, Sonntag’s (2003) case studies here are particularly illustrative of the different ways English language ideologies have played out within local contexts. However, it must be recognized that even though Sonntag (2003) identifies each nation as a particular example of a specific language ideology (hegemony, resistance, liberation), Sonntag’s (2003) account does not highlight how language ideologies can work simultaneously within nations and does not draw attention to the inequality gap within each local context. This omission is very
problematic if the aim is to illuminate the complexity of language issues within local contexts. In
the next section, I turn to other critical language theory scholars for a further look at the way
high-level language policies and English language policies play out in local contexts and what
this means for the social actors involved in each case. Although brief, the case studies below are
an illustrative way to comparatively examining issues of language education inequality by

**A Revised Model of Education Inequality**

This section identifies Farrell’s (2007) Model of Education Inequality, which draws on 50 years
of comparative evidence and carefully considers the way schooling functions as a “social
screening mechanism”. By identifying the recognition behind this framework, this research is
able to use this model as a partial foundation for building a revised model that is informed by
critical language theory and anti-racism thought. Before we address the model itself and what it
recognizes, I would like to express how this research conceives “equality”. Specifically, why
“inequality” opposed to “inequity”? This research perceives equality, and by extension language
equality, as an un-admirable goal. Despite popular belief that Equality of Education is a common
good, this research is skeptical of approaches that aim to provide unrealistic high-level
“solutions” to language equality rights that affect local, individualized experiences. The reason
for the skepticism is because the very nature of “equality” presumes that all people have the
same and are the same. That is, they live the same life, come from the same social and economic
background, and are part of the same culture. Such a definition of language equality negates
difference and casts aside local context. Equity, on the other hand, acknowledges that differences
exist and seeks to understand what the differences are so that a locally-relevant, meaningful
dialogue and action can take place. Having distinguished between equality and equity (briefly), this research is open to considering what can be learned from Farrell’s (2007) Model of Inequality, and to do so, it is first important to acknowledge what Farrell (2007), along with other comparativists, recognizes:

We recognize that schooling, whatever else it may do, operates as a selective social screening mechanism. It enhances the status of some children, providing them with an opportunity for upward social or economic mobility. It ratifies the status of others, reinforcing the propensity for children born poor to remain poor as adults, and for the children born into well-off families to become well-off adults (p. 136).

The above recognition of schooling as a social screening mechanism focuses on an aspect of socio-economics that Sonntag (2003), Lo Bianco (2003), Prendergast (2008), and Arnold (2006) do not consider. Applying Farrell’s model to the context of language schooling allows this research to tease out social and economic inequalities in a way that highlights how language schooling (or language education) also functions a social screening mechanism as described above. To illustrate this claim, this research turns to six case studies (Malaysia, Singapore, South Korea, Hong Kong, Pakistan, and South Africa) and brings to light four key facets of equality shown below:

1. Equality of **access**—the probability of children from different social groupings getting into the school system, or some particular level or portion of it.

2. Equality of **survival**—the probability of children from various social groupings staying in the school system to some defined level, usually the end of a complete cycle (primary, secondary, higher).
3. Equality of **output**—the probability that children from various social groupings will learn the same things to the same level at a defined point in the schooling system.

4. Equality of **outcome**—the probability that children from various social groupings will live relatively similar lives subsequent to and as a result of schooling (have equal incomes, have jobs of roughly the same status, have equal access to sites of political power, etc.) (Farrell, 2007, p. 136).

The above features offer great insight into one way comparative education seeks to unpack social inequalities when performing global comparisons. Three noteworthy mentions become relevant here: (1) The premise of the above model is that equality is not something that can be measured; (2) The intention of the above model is not to provide a framework for achieving global “equality” but to bring to light the fact that each context is innately different; (3) as such, the aim of the model does not argue that equality is something that can (or should) be achieved. Instead, this model makes an ambitious attempt to highlight that context matters, that local matters, and that other factors (socio-economic status, for example) matter. What this model does not draw attention to, however, is language, race, and the local histories/lived experiences. Therefore, in order to make this model of inequality more relevant to this study, it is necessary to revise this model to better highlight how language and race (and the histories and lived experiences of language and race) can be used to understand how social screening operates within classrooms and within society as a whole:

A. Equality of **access**—the probability of racialized children from various language/social groupings getting into the school system, or some particular level or portion of it.
B. Equality of **survival**—the probability of racialized children from various language/social groupings staying in the school system to some defined level, usually the end of a complete cycle (primary, secondary, higher).

C. Equality of **output**—the probability that racialized children from various language/social groupings will learn the same things to the same level at a defined point in the schooling system.

D. Equality of **outcome**—the probability that racialized children from various language/social groupings will live relatively similar lives subsequent to and as a result of schooling (have equal incomes, have jobs of roughly the same status, have equal access to sites of political power, etc.)

By including language and race in the model of education inequality, this thesis is better able to shed light on how language and race (and the histories/lived experiences of language and race) factor into a discussion on comparative education inequality. With the revised Model of Education Inequality in mind, this thesis now considers the case studies.

**Case Studies**

In addition to the revised Model of Education Inequality above, Tsui and Tollefson’s (2007) collection entitled *Language policy, culture and identity in Asian contexts*, provides a partial framework for analyzing language policy, globalization, national cultural identity, and the role of English. This thesis finds their framework a useful starting point to engage in discussions around language education and policy in dominant and non-dominant English-speaking countries:

1. In what ways have Asian countries responded to globalization, and what roles have their language polices played?
2. Do these policies lead to the democratization of English or do they exacerbate the inequality\(^6\) between the *haves* and the *have-nots*?

3. Do these policies foster [multilingualism\(^7\)] or do they legitimate the hegemony of English over other languages, hence aggravating the cultural domination of the West over the rest of the world?

4. How do governments in Asian countries resolve the paradox of preserving or building national cultural identities and promoting a foreign language that embodies different values, cultures, and traditions?

5. What is the relationship between language and national cultural identities, and what role does language policy play? (Tsui & Tollefson, 2007, p. 3)

Although the above framework is a useful way to open up a discussion around language politics, the framework itself does not provide a rationale for my selective case studies, which warrants particular attention here before I (re)address the case studies themselves. First of all, selecting particular case studies and providing a rationale for each case study is not an undertaking this comparative research, which is informed by critical language theory and anti-racism research methodology, takes lightly. Selecting case studies (and by extension excluding other case studies) requires deep thought and critical thinking around what makes these particular case contexts relevant to the discussion opposed to others. Admittedly, this thesis recognizes that theorizing case studies as particular location and geographies is an inadequate (mis)representation that implies that linguistic/cultural identities are constructed and

---

\(^6\) The use of “inequality” by Tsui and Tollefson is referring to socio-economic inequality. However, this research will also consider the revised Model of Education Inequality above in its analysis.

\(^7\) The original text states “multilingualism” and “multiculturalism”; however, the word “multiculturalism” has been removed here because this research sees “multiculturalism” as a euphemism for tolerating racial diversity. This view is aligned with a growing body of literature in anti-racism research and decolonizing thought, and, therefore, is extremely critical of using the terms “multiculturalism” and “diversity” as they are embedded with exclusionary meanings and false representations of social and national cohesion.
(re)constructed only within national/geographical spaces irrespective of social and political factors such as government policies and laws. Recognizing this, this thesis acknowledges that linguistic/national/cultural identit(ies) are much more flexible, multidimensional, and malleable than the locations and space they are prescribed in the world. To help facilitate this understanding, Razack (2002) stresses the importance of understanding how location (place) and race work as part of a meta-narrative that idealizes national stories. Razack posits that these national stories “enable citizens to think of themselves as part of a community, defining who belongs and who does not belong to the nation” (Razack, 2002, p. 2). It is this notion of belonging (or not belonging) to a nation that inform one’s sense of “citizenship”. In the context of Canada, Razack (2002) points out meta-narratives of the enterprising white settler and uncivilized indigenous peoples and the assimilative laws that supported this narrative “reveal…the racialized structure of citizenship” (Razack, 2002, p. 5). By examining space through an anti-racism lens, Razack (2002) is able to bring to light space as a racialized project and questions how space becomes raced\(^8\) or e/raced\(^9\). Indeed, the analysis of these case studies as well as the proceeding chapters do not directly address the relationship between space and race, but as I continue to examine the theoretical and philosophical gaps between critical language theory, comparative education theory, and anti-racism research methodology, it becomes clear that there is an important need to contextualize the histories of spaces and understand how particular spaces develop into racialized spaces (which are usually at the periphery with limited access to social services) and white spaces (which are usually at the center with easy access to social services). For this reason, this research would like to acknowledge that it is not doing justice to spatial theory (within an anti-racism discourse);

\(^8\) The term “raced” means taking into account embodied racial experiences as a factor.

\(^9\) The term “e/raced” is a play on words I have heard in many discussions around anti-racism. The term itself is a play on words that highlights how race is often erased (or negated) from the conversation.
however, it does intend to revisit the significance of conceptualizing race, space, and citizenship in the chapter three and in the conclusion in order to highlight the future potential of research possibilities.

Returning to the rationale for the case studies themselves, I, as a researcher, am able to exercise a certain degree of control and power because it is through my choices, my revelations, and my omissions that you, the reader, are guided through the discussion and encouraged to engage in it. For this reason, I would like to set the stage by firstly admitting that I am conscious that, despite my attempts to include a range of dominant and non-dominant English-speaking language contexts, any comparative case study approach risks muddling up the historical, social, and political dimensions if attention is not afforded to the local contexts and differences (such as space, race, and citizenship or such as gender and class). Secondly, I also recognize that by labeling particular countries dominant or non-dominant English-speaking countries could cause some confusion because there are some cases where English, although not an officialised language (such as in South Korea), is so entrenched in education that it is understood to have a dominant language presence in institutional settings. Similarly, there are other cases where English is an officialised language (such as in Hong Kong); however, the language in use in social and institutional settings is not only English. Acknowledging the confusion between dominant and non-dominant English speaking contexts, however, I aim to unravel the multilayered complexities using five case studies from Tsui and Tollefson (2007) and one from Ridge (1996) in order to illustrate four broad themes that specifically relate to English language policy in dominant and non-dominant English-speaking contexts. Attention to local context and differences in social, political, historical contexts will be made; however, since these case studies are meant to simply introduce readers to the theme of English and globalization, the case study
analyses themselves are brief and revolve around four distinct themes to help add focus. The four themes described hereafter are derived from the five central questions (found on page 3) and help introduce, situate, and contextualize the scope of this critical research investigation on the sociopolitics of English:

(1) Malaysia, Singapore, and South Korea underscore the theme of English and globalization within the context of national identity and culture. These case studies highlight specific language and education policies in order to introduce how multiple language ideologies, namely hegemonic and homo-genetic language ideologies operate in society and inform education policy and national identity.

(2) Hong Kong further underscores the theme of English and globalization, but it is also represents a unique way that language ideologies can work simultaneously as hegemonic, homo-genistic, and romanticized in the (re) construction of a hybrid identity.

(3) Pakistan further underscores the theme of English and globalization but it does so by highlighting the unrivaled legitimacy afforded to the elites who use English to maintain power and control in political and social relations, which is done at the expense of other minority and home languages.

(4) South Africa further underscores the theme of English and globalization; however, from a policy perspective, it is the only country in this case study section that has 11 official languages, one of which is English. For this reason, this case study is able to shed some light on the challenges of linguistic pluralism and the optimism of language as resistance.

Therefore, in order to go beyond a summative review of the case studies that have already been conducted by Tsui and Tollefson (2007) and Ridge (1996), the objective of this section is to
recap some of their key findings, re-interpret them, and raise questions using a critical language theory, comparative education theory, and anti-racist lenses.

**Malaysia**

In chapter 4 of *Language Policy, Culture and Identity in Asian Contexts*, David and Govindasamy consider how textbooks in Malaysia affect national identity and address globalization in a multilingual country: Malaysia is a multiethnic, multilingual country with a population of about 22 million people and at least a hundred languages. Mandarin and various Chinese dialects, as well as Tamil and other Indian languages are also widely spoken (David & Govindasamy, 2007, p. 56). The linguistic diversity is exemplified in this excerpt, however, is not reflected in the language education in Malaysia nor in government language policy: “[t]he Chinese and Tamil primary schools were allowed to continue teaching content subjects in the medium of their choice. However, all national secondary schools, which were government funded, were required to use Malay as the medium of instruction” (David & Govindasamy, 2007, p. 57). Like English, Malay in Malaysia plays a dominant role; however, when considered more closely, the role of English has gradually made an impact on language education:

In the Malay-medium national schools, where a majority of Malaysian children (75.9%) are currently enrolled, English is a compulsory second language and is taught daily in the first year of schooling. In addition, Chinese or Tamil languages are taught as subjects if the parents of at least 15 children in a school request this (David & Govindasamy, 2007, p. 57).

Despite long periods of time devoted to English language learning, many Malaysian students have a difficult time attaining proficiency, David and Govindasamy report. The authors emphasize that “[w]hile ethnic minority groups have been shifting towards the use of English, it
must be emphasized that for about 60% to 70% of the school-going population, mainly those living in rural areas in Malaysia, English is a foreign language (David & Govindasamy, 2003 in David & Govindasamy, 2007, p. 56). These statistics highlight the linguistic divide between rural school children and urban school children. What these statistics do not reveal, however, is the socio-economic and linguistic diversity within each group. In essence, what these statistics highlight is not a lack of English proficiency but a lack of understanding around why rural areas (space) do not have equal access to the kind of education that is perceived as socially and economically desirable. Another challenge English language policies raise in Malaysia is regarding achievement: “[In 2000] [t]he passing rate in English examination…in national schools in rural areas was 51.9%, whereas the passing rate of students in the same type of school in urban areas was 67.6%” (David & Govindasamy, 2007, p. 58). Since “achievement” here is measured using an English examination, it is reasonable to assume that “achievement” is merely a reflection of language competency as it has little to do with learning achievement. Underlying differences in equality of access, survival, output, and outcome for various language users are negated. Despite these glaring realities of education inequalities, the Malaysian government implemented a hegemonic language ideology language education policy that views language as a competitive tool: “elected representatives from the various parties of the ruling Barisan National government, as well as industry and union leaders, advocated the reintroduction of English-medium instruction in schools” and the public strongly supported the promotion of English MOI. Because English was promoted as a means of staying competitive in the global market even the Malaysian Employers Federation Executive Director, Shamsuddin Bardan, offered his support for an English improvement campaign to stress the importance of communicating well in English (David and Govindasamy, 2007, p. 59). This combination of public, corporate, and government
support demonstrates that despite linguistic diversity and social inequality between poor/rural spaces and rich/urban spaces, English language education policy was seen as necessary and beneficial for the nation’s economic good. Even though “Malay was promoted at the expense of other languages, including English”, after 30 years, English once again became the MOI for science and math in all schools: “[t]hese changes were responses to globalization”, as David and Govindasamy (2007) point out. More importantly, however, this response makes a false assumption that adopting English as the MOI will unquestionably solve linguistic/racial diversity issues and lead to a more globally competitive country (not a more socially-inclusive country). In the next section, this research considers how the standardization of “native” English works hand in hand with hegemonic language ideologies that identify English as a high-value, sought-after commodity.

**Singapore**

“Language, like other commodities, possesses a particular value. It is a form of capital and has a potential capacity to produce profits and reproduce itself” (Chew, 2007, p. 74); this appears to be the political view Singapore takes in its global outlook around English language education just as Prendergast (2008) *Buying into English* critiques in the earlier section. Chew notes that:

In 1959, at the point of independence, Singapore was segmented by deep ethnic and linguistic segmentation. It was poor, had a rapidly rising birthrate, and possessed few prospects for economic survival. Political identity was contested terrain and it was dependent largely on external trade. To ensure its survival, it was deemed imperative that it should have a dominant language that would enable it to survive politically. English was seen as a language that would attract foreign investment and give the society a
leading edge in education, academic achievement, international trade, and business (Chew, 2007, p. 76).

The above observation identifies English as a social, political, and economic “life-saver” that would strengthen Singapore’s footing in the global market. This hegemonic language ideology brought about significant educational changes. By the 1970s, enrollment in English medium schools had increased 8:1 (Chew, 2001 as cited in Chew, 2007, p. 77). These statistics show that English used as a home language, not just an official language, increased significantly from 8.9% in 1980 to 23% in 2000. Chew (2007) calls this the shift in using English over Mandarin, Tamil, and Malay as the MOI a “bottom-up” process, underscoring that language policy was not superimposed or created through colonization. In a sense, Chew (2007) seems to be suggesting that Singapore’s acceptance to linguistic diversity and affiliation for English is a choice that was initiated for the people, by the people because society as a whole believed in the social, political, and economic benefits that would come about; however, as Chew (2007) points out, this acceptance to English was restricted to the adoption of standard “native” English (i.e. from “inner-circle” countries). Attributing the adoption of English to economic incentives downplays the ways in which every day acts of racism devalue other languages. In 2000, the Speak Good English Movement (SGEM), chaired by Colonel David Wong, initiated a branding campaign to promote Singaporean English (Singlish) despite the Prime-Minister Goh Chok Tong (PM Goh) cautions against Singlish: “[w]e cannot be a first-world economy or go global with Singlish…Poor English reflects badly on us and makes us seem less intelligent” (Goh, 1999 as cited in Tsui & Tollefson, 2006, p. 79). He continued that sentiment in the following speech:

Investors will not come if their supervisors and managers can only guess what our workers are saying. It will be hard for Singapore to be a financial center. TV programmes
and films will be difficult to succeed because foreigners do not understand Singlish—this will affect the first-world economy we hope to achieve (Goh, 2000 as cited in Chew, 2007, p. 79).

The above PM’s position exposes denigrating sociological attitudes toward a standard variety of English (Singlish) and reinforces the perceived legitimacy of “Standard” English. Singlish draws from Chinese, Malay, Tamil, and English and promotes a sense of national solidarity through humour in popular poems, plays, or sitcoms. Because of the contexts Singlish is used in, Standard English is perceived as having a more linguistic/social capital, and, therefore, was easy to buy into the perceived legitimacy of the SGEM (even if it meant the loss of Singlish). Through ENTHUSE (Encouraging the Use of Standard English), “the mass media has discreetly cut down on their use of Singlish, especially in popular television sitcoms” (Chew, 2007, p. 79). This response can be interpreted as Phillipson’s (1992) “linguistic imperialism” (as cited in Chew, 2007, p. 81). In one particularly telling question, respondents were asked whether they perceived English as a threat to local language and culture: “most of them said that English was non-threatening,” because it was merely a “tool” to improve their livelihood and social position, further highlighting that linguistic knowledge is inextricably linked to social/symbolic capital; interestingly, English was viewed as a “global” and not a “Western” language which simply provides a means to improve one’s socio-economic mobility (Chew, 2007, p. 87). Although Singapore is probably the only “country in the world [that] has ever wittingly sought to make its citizens a minority” due to lenient immigration policies (Chew, 2007, p. 74), this leniency does not reflect racial/linguistic inclusivity. In fact, one could argue that Singapore’s attitude toward migration (although more open than South Korea and Malaysia) was driven by a superficial attempt to stimulate the global economy by acknowledging racial diversity, while at the same
time denying linguistic diversity: Minister Mentor Lee Kuan Yew (MM Lee), known as the father of modern Singapore, openly acknowledges racial diversity and welcomes integration in his following remarks:

We are multiracial. So absorbing new migrants of different races and religions and cultures doesn’t worry us. In fact, it makes us more attractive as a cosmopolitan center, and makes us more relevant to the world (Straight Times, December 22, 2004, p. H6 as cited in Chew, 2007, p. 74).

The above further highlights the superficial, politically-driven attempt at acknowledging racial diversity as way of connecting to the global world. In essence, this English language education policy initiative created a resurgence of legitimizing “standard” “inner-circle” English, while local language diversity is overlooked. In the same way, this research considers the context of South Korea.

South Korea

In chapter three of Tsui and Tollefson (2007), Sungwon argues that “English language education reform in Korea, as a response to globalization, has promoted Westernization and nationalism” (Sungwon, 2007, p. 50). To facilitate this understanding, a historical approach to the salience of language policy in South Korea is addressed by Sungwon (2007) as he notes that except during the Japanese occupation in 1940, a national language policy did not exist in Korea until 1945. Sungwon (2007) informs us that since independence, South Korea has been attempting to purify its language by resisting Chinese and Japanese characters and monitoring the inclusion of foreign loan words. Here language as a form of resistance is not articulated in Sungwon (2007). Instead, he positions this resistance as a mere response to dominance. He explains, because of South Korea’s international exposure, in the 1980s due to the 1986 Asian Games and 1988 Olympic
Games and its successive 1990s globalization campaign, English had become increasingly important. In 1995, Kim Young Sam declared that South Korea had entered “an era of globalization”, emphasizing the importance of competition in the international arena (Sungwon, 2007, p. 37). Soon after South Korea announced its globalization policy, the government proposed English education as a required subject from third grade onward and new textbooks were administered in 2001 (Sungwon, 2007, p. 39). However, increasing English fluency proved problematic: English speaking and listening skills were lacking because “[m]ost English teachers have been educated in Korean universities, where English curriculum emphasizes translation skills and the study of English and American literature”, not conversation or listening skills (Sungwon, 2007, p. 39), although more recently, reforms have been made to improve English language communicative competency (much like in the context of Japan). Sungwon informs us that “[p]rior to that, English was learnt only in extra-curricular activities (Kwon, 2000 in Sungwon, 2007, pp. 39-40). As a result of the teacher employment test, a competitive exam to enter the profession of teaching, and evaluation systems to evaluate teacher-training programs in South Korea, post-secondary institution have allocated resources for improving English language teaching. Even graduate students are now encouraged to write their thesis in English and publish in internationally recognized journals (Sungwon, 2007, p. 40). The English language teaching business has also demonstrated significant growth in South Korea. Sungwon points out that “[m]ost companies now include English proficiency test in their recruitment examinations, the results of which not only determine employability but also benefits awarded and future promotion” (Sungwon, 2007, p. 40). This emphasizes the financial benefits and motivations behind learning English and highlights how English competency is perceived as a key indicator of social and economic mobility. Interestingly, however, even though there are clear rewards for
learning English as described previously, when English was proposed as an official language by a novelist (Pok Ko II), nationalists had a negative response. The South Korean nationalists “have asserted that a national language is not just a tool for communication and business, but the nation’s soul and identity” (Sungwon, 2007, p. 41); evidently, a romanticized language ideology orientation is at work here. The negative responses to the proposal are expected, as Sungwon (2007) highlights, because during the Japanese occupation (1910-1945), South Koreans’ national identity, culture, and language were demoralized. Imposing Japanese as the sole language, eliminating the Korean language, coercing Koreans to adopt Japanese names, and using Japanese as the MOI (medium of instruction) are among some examples Sungwon (2007) highlights that demonstrate the assimilative, oppressive colonizing affect the Japanese language hegemony had on South Korean national, cultural, and linguistic heritage: “[t]his experience of Japanese occupation shows that language itself is not merely a tool of communication” (Sungwon, 2007, p. 42). With that in mind, making English an official language might be seen as a second crisis (the Japanese occupation being the first crisis); however, the difference is that the English proposal itself was initiated by Koreans, as Sungwon (2007) clarifies. Sungwon (2007) attributes this as a response to globalization, and like many of the other authors in the case studies above and below, he does not draw attention to how language choice is a form of language resistance.

Sungwon also argues that diversity is not reflected in foreign language education even though the ethnic and linguistic diversity in South Korea includes 37 000 migrant works in China, South Asia, and Southeast Asia (Moon, 2000 in Sungwon, 2007, p. 43). Horibe (1998) identifies a profound misconception that learning English as an international language “brings about international and intercultural understanding” (as cited in Sungwon, 2007, p. 43); “[t]his can be seen from the fact that the cultural contents represented in the English curriculum materials in
Korea are narrowly confined to White middle-class cultures in Western English-speaking countries, mainly those of the United States” (Sungwon, 2007, p. 43). Sungwon finds that the English textbooks in Korea present globalization as “Westernization” and, thus, reinforce the White upper-middle-class of European descent images, and promote students’ awareness of the roles and responsibilities which “aim at projecting Korea as a major player in the international arena” (Sungwon, 2007, p. 50).

Because “[d]ominant cultures represented in these textbooks are based mainly on Western English-speaking countries, particularly the United States”, “Western” life has been misrepresented as lavish, upper-middle-class White males (Sungwon, 2007, pp. 50-51). The overwhelming Eurocentricity is e/raced from the curriculum and not critically engaged in standard communicative classroom practices. More poignantly, these Eurocentric images appear in the textbook in opposition to an essentialized Korean national identity. To further highlight the prevalence of national identity construction at the institutional level, the textbook study conducted on first-year middle school English textbooks demonstrate Korea’s sense of pride, show prevailing images of Koreans as hardworking, and highlight Korean culture, and geography as points of reference in the introduction of foreign countries (Sungwon, 2007, p. 49).

The following excerpt from a reading passage is an illustrative example of how English textbooks in Korea promote cultural identity: “[s]ome of my friends like western food, but I like rice better than any other food. Oh, and kimchi is my favorite, too. It’s a kind of vegetable we eat with almost everything. It’s a little hot and spicy, but that’s my favorite part” (Sungwon, 2007, p. 49). In this excerpt, the speaker embodies essentialist notions of what it means to be “Korean” by reducing the character’s likings to two stereotypical food items: He likes rice and he likes Kimchi. More significantly, however, the Korean character clearly identifies himself as different
from some of his friends who like Western food. By distinguishing himself from his other friends who like Western food (and perhaps Western values?), the character is portrayed as being an “authentic” Korean who takes pride in his culture (and loves his Korean food). The textbook itself (much like what will be referenced in the Japanese section, also highlights how English is being used in an instrumental way to teach the global world about what it means to be Korean and assumes that all learners are Korean as in the following exchange between two textbook characters: “Cathy: Min-su, what are you doing? That’s your bag./Min-su: She will hold it for me. It is common here in Korea./Cathy: Really? Koreans are very helpful” (First Year Middle School Textbook, 2000a, p. 42 as cited in Sungwon, 2007, p. 50). Clearly, the preceding textbook communication exchange exemplifies how Koreans are situated as “the other” and that there is an underlying equality assumption that all students in Korea are part of a homogenous nationalistic Korean linguistic and cultural identity.

Hong Kong

In chapter 7, Tsui points out that the teaching of English did not only focus on language. Instead, teaching English comprised of teaching Western knowledge and ideas, especially in science and literature (Report of the Education Commission, 1882 as cited in Tsui, 2007, p. 123). This reinforces the idea that learning English “was not just a means of providing the local elite with a communication tool, but also a process of acculturation” (Tsui, 2007, p. 123). For the people of Hong Kong, the British education system failed to include their Chinese historical roots and created a picture of Hong Kong as a “cultural desert”; deprived of a historical past, Tsui notes that “Hong Kong literary writers in the 1970s depicted Hong Kong as a place where its people had no nationality, only citizenship, and no national consciousness” (see Chan, 2001, p. 126 as
10. The term “citizenship” in this context is referring to legal citizenship, not to feelings of belonging to a homogenous “national consciousness”.

By identifying with a lack of national identity, there is an underlying assumption that there should be a unifying “homogenous” nationality. This sense of lacking a true Chinese identity becomes more prominent in the 1970s as Tsui (2007) explains. During this time, Hong Kong’s sense of national pride in their Chinese heritage was raised due to China’s involvement in the international arena—China as a member of the United Nations in 1971 can be seen as just one of the reasons for Hong Kong’s renewed sense in its national pride and linguistic history; the “Chinese as an Official Language Movement” prolonged for seven years (from 1964-1971) because of the prior extensive use of English for official communication, including household bills (Tsui, 2007, p. 127). This pervasive use of English was especially difficult for English as a foreign language speakers because it marginalized the non-English speakers from being able to conduct day-to-day affairs such as bills and government forms. In 1968, university students brought the debate to the Legislative Council; even though the government agreed to work on a bilingual policy, “it was not until a number of pressure groups decided to hold demonstrations that the government conceded to form a Chinese Language Committee in 1970 to study the issue and make recommendations” (Tsui, 2007, p. 128): “[t]he Education Green Paper recommended that Chinese should be used as a medium of instruction for junior secondary levels and that English should be learnt as a subject rather than used as medium of instruction” (Tsui, 2007, p. 128). The policy was not adopted but left up to individual schools’ discretion. “The government’s refusal to make language policy changes in response to sustained and clearly expressed demands from the community showed that it was key that language policy would not be a catalyst to the budding nationalistic sentiments, and that the supremacy of English be maintained” (Tsui, 2007, p. 129). English as a hegemonic language
during British colonization denied Hong Kong people of the cultural and linguistic heritage and ignored the linguistic diversity present in Hong Kong as Potonghua, Hakka, Chiu Chau, Fukien, Hoklo, Sze Yap, Shanhainese, and other Chinese languages beyond just Cantonese (Tsui, 2007). Because of the recommendation to include Chinese as an MOI, 75% of government-funded secondary schools at the junior and secondary levels became Chinese MOI schools, whereas 25% could adopt English as the MOI if parents preferred it (Tsui, 2007, p.136). This was paradoxical even though an attempt was made to balance between mother-tongue and English, despite strong demands for English MOI. On one hand, a keen interest in Chinese culture emerged, but on the other hand, the supremacy of English had been maintained for so long that the public was unsatisfied with the new policy as English was perceived as a global language (Tsui, 2007). Tsui (2007) maintains that Hong Kong’s dual identity is still today a marker of its solidarity and a representation of its cultural, national, and linguistic heritage, but it is also important to keep in mind that this dual identity that many Hong Kong citizens claim to identify with assumes that only two languages are legitimated in society. Next this thesis turns to Pakistan, where like Malaysia, Singapore, South Korea, and Hong Kong, there exists an underlying linguistic hierarchy of language superiority that places a higher-value on the dominant language as legitimated languages in society.

Pakistan

In chapter 12, reminiscent of Sonntag’s elite and subaltern discussion, Rahman (2007) considers how English empowers and privileges the elite in Pakistan. In 1992, a survey in Lahore found that students have a “linguistic hierarchy in mind with English at the top followed by Urdu, with their mother tongue, Punjabi, at the bottom: the study confirms positive attitudes towards English among Pakistani students, their teachers and parents, and university administrators” (Rahman,
According to Rahman (2007), in Pakistan, English is taught as a mandatory subject in schools that use the vernacular. Students also learn English for two years during years 13 and 14. In Pakistan, three types of schools are identified by Rahman (2007): (1) private elitist, (2) public/college cadet and (3) non-elitist. According to Rahman (2007), 26.66% of private elitist schools are upper-middle class, whereas 53.33% are upper class (Rahman, 2004, pp. 157-158 as cited in Rahman, 2007, p. 223). Rahman (2007) describes some telling consequences if language policies continue to marginalize and create wider gaps between the lower-middle class and the upper class. He highlights the imbalance of power and offers a series of cautions for language education policy planning; as a first caution, Rahman (2007) warns that “[i]f the vernacular proto-elite is empowered, it may bring its traditional, male-dominating values to the fore and curtail women’s rights even further” (Rahman, 2007, p. 232). This caution reinforces the concept that language education is embedded with values that privilege the upper-class (male) in regard to employment access. This caution also reinforces the idea that language education goes beyond simply an instrumental use of English. A second caution, if the westernized elite are denied jobs in Pakistan, they would likely leave the country, leaving the proto-elite who learn English as a school subject to be the English language teachers. In Rahman’s (2007) view, this would be detrimental because it would prevent learners from acquiring a standard “inner-circle” “native” form of English. Third, “Islamized” students will not have access to liberal (or not so liberal) values they come across on the Internet. Rahman (2007) makes it clear that the aforementioned implications are indeed worth considering before any language policies are implemented, but he fails to acknowledge that English spread is not and should not be restricted to the English teachers from “inner-circle” countries. Without problematizing the ideology of the “native” standardization discourse, Rahman (2007), like
many of the other scholars who talk about achievement and English fluency, attributes poor written, oral, and aural commands of the language to inappropriate dogmatic methods of instruction that focus on grammar/translation, and not a communicative approach. In contrast to an acritical approach to (English) language pedagogy, Canagarajah (1999) critically identifies communicative approaches to English language education as a Western framework for best practices unlike the other case study scholars who do not draw attention to the inherent dilemma in applying Western pedagogical approaches to teaching English in non-Western contexts. According to Canagarajah (1999), there is a well-documented power struggle in the EFL contexts where “non-native” speakers EFL teachers are less preferred than “native” speakers who are not trained to teach English as a foreign language. In the next part, this research aims to raise questions around what it means to plan language reform in a multilingual context, where competing national languages are at the heart of education debates.

South Africa

With 11 official languages, South African language policies offer insightful views into how language ideologies and language policies are conceived, but instead of turning attention to how language inequality functions or how resistance is enacted, Ridge (1996) is more concerned with the pragmatic challenges of English language education. This view is part of the Eurocentric “achievement” discourse seen in earlier case studies above. Ridge (1996) states that the implications of officialising English as the dominant language are also problematic in South Africa. According to one source, 31% of the population do not understand English in South Africa; “Any language policy concerned with equity and the ability of citizens to participate fully in the national life has to take these facts into account” (Ridge, 1996, p. 18). Ridge informs us that not only students have a home language but also teachers have (at least) one, adding further
complexity to language education. Again, the position Ridge (1996) seems to take on is one that views language diversity as problematic instead of as an opportunity for transformation and resistance. Yes, he acknowledges struggle and draws attention to the oversimplified solution to the English language education issue identified by the National Party government and the ANC:

English…should be studied by all children. The reasons are that it is a language of access to a vast range of resources nationally and internationally, to higher education, to technology, to economic opportunities, [and is] the mother tongue of a sizeable number of South African, and lingua franca both within the country and beyond its borders (Ridge, 1996, p. 28).

However, as a solution to multilingual “problems”, English is proposed as a bandage solution in this context and Ridge (1996) does not seem to question this because he conceives English as “valuable national resource” (p. 33). This approach marginalizes local languages and reinforces dominant perceptions that English is (the only?) high-value language that leads to economic and social mobility. As such, it is important to keep in mind that the scenarios we see in South Korea, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Pakistan are not limited to non-dominant English speaking countries. Singapore and South Africa are just two examples of (officialised) dominant English speaking countries that face similar challenges because the dominant language ideology seems to be one that is hegemonic, linked to utilitarian interests. English language education is, moreover, perceived to be the only avenue to access social and economic ability, which is perhaps why when given the choice “learners often prefer to study the dominant language” (UNESCO, 2011, p. 70). It is also imperative to note that acquiring English (or any other dominant language) is not always met with agreement and consensus as a hegemonic ideology might suppose. More poignantly, it is worthwhile to highlight the underlying social inequalities and injustices that
permeate language education on a global scale and are often sites of tension, struggle, and (violent) contestations due, in part, to language education policy conflicts. Unlike the cases reviewed previously, the below excerpts clearly identify language as one of the factors behind the tension in pre- and post-conflict situations. It also highlights that social actors do not blindly accept dominant language policies with a Marxist notion of “false consciousness”. The social actors are capable of consciously resisting and making efforts to challenge and transform oppressive language education policies because they value their local language(s) and want their local language(s) to be legitimated in society.

No issue better demonstrates the tough choices facing post-conflict governments than language policy. In some contexts, such as the United Republic of Tanzania, the use of a single national language as the medium of instruction in schools has helped foster a sense of shared identity. In others it has helped to fuel violence. In Guatemala, where language policy in education was a source of deep resentment for indigenous people, the Commission for Education Reform was created to address grievances, promote dialogue and set a course for the development of bilingual and intercultural education – an approach that may have wider relevance (UNESCO, 2011, p. 22).

Language is at the heart of several ongoing armed conflicts. In Thailand’s three predominantly Muslim southernmost provinces, language and education have been at the centre of a wider political conflict in which some insurgent groups are seeking secession and others greater autonomy. The conflict has resulted in grave violations of human rights as a result of attacks by insurgents against schoolchildren, teachers and schools (United Nations, 2010a). Public school teachers remain a prime target for insurgents, who
see them as agents of a system hostile to Malay culture. While public support for armed militias is limited, many Malay Muslims appear to view the use of Thai as the sole language of instruction in school as a threat to their cultural identity (Human Rights Watch, 2010d; Melvin, 2007 as cited in UNESCO, 2011, p. 168).

Even though at times it might seem that English language education policies are not problematic or not deeply-embedded in tangible and symbolic power structures, the passages above are meant to further underscore that English (and other dominant languages) is not a neutral, instrumental tool of communication. Now more than ever, “At a time when English is [continuing to expand] its role as a world language it is important to examine the impact of English in countries in which it is taken for granted” (Wren, 1997, pp. xxv, insertion mine). The preceding discussion served only as a brief glimpse into the multiplicity of ways English language education policies and practices inform national cultural identities and operate power. However, what’s missing from this prior discussion, then, is an explicit articulation of the relationship between language and race, which will be addressed here as well as more poignantly at the end of chapter two and throughout chapter three.

This thesis sees the relationship between language and race as an inextricable, mutually constitutive phenomenon. It sees language as inextricable from race, and race inextricable from language; they are never conceived as separate entities. This thesis sees both language and race as mutually constitutive because historical legacies and knowledge(s) are embodied in the languages people speak and in the way raced bodies perform those languages. It sees language and race as distinct features and markers of national, cultural, and social identities—and it views language and race as dynamic, changing, flexible entities that can be constructed, (re)constructed, challenged, and resisted based on where we are, who we speak to, and what our
underlying communicative intentions are. Language never acts alone; it is deeply-woven into the social, cultural, and national narratives that helps people express how we understand and experiences the world, and how the world understands and experiences us. Language can also be viewed as a euphemism for race because it is specifically through language that race can be realized. For instance, when I say, “Allyuh ready to talk about race yet?”, the words on the page (just as the sound of my voice and the image that is evoked in the mind) automatically tell you that it my racialized body speaking. Similarly, the same could be said about race, that race can be a euphemism for language. In the context of EFL (English as a foreign language), for example, racialized bodies are perceived to be “non-native” speakers. In each case study above, “native” speakers of English (or perceived “native” speakers) are marked as white bodies from the “inner circle”, whereas non-native speakers are marked as racialized bodies who have language “problems”. By marked, I am referring to the way in which racialized bodies and white (unracialized) bodies are either directly or indirectly linked to power (or lack thereof) over economic and social resources. However, instead of calling attention to race as an indicator of economic and social mobility as I do here, and because of the inextricable way this thesis views language and race, I am compelled to highlight the original case studies’ avoidance in naming race. Instead, the original case studies above drew attention to “native”, “inner circle” language proficiency as a perceived characteristic of social and economic mobility and neglected the relationship between language and race. Instead more palatable terms such as national identity were adopted to articulate the way racialized bodies experienced power. By neglecting to recognize the overwhelming ubiquity of how racialized bodies are continuously marked as “non-native”, illegitimate speakers of English, comparative case studies and critical language theory alone do not allow the social actors (and the subalterns) to speak, do not acknowledge the
existence of race, and do not shed light on language inequality in a way that is historically, socially, and politically relevant to the local context and to the lived experiences of the local people. Perhaps linguistic diversity is often seen as a more palatable topic for (English) language education policymakers, traditional comparative researchers, and linguistic rights activists because it is much more traditionally “acceptable” to problematize linguistic diversity in the form of language rights, language preservation, and language achievement scores than to trouble the underlying epistemological questions about how particular knowledges from particular groups of racialized/unracialized bodies come to be. Moreover, “[e]ven though the field of comparative education and, I add, linguistic researchers have traditionally been criticized for “covertly identifying themselves as “white saviors”, trying to “fix” developing countries”, Gromley (2005) argues that comparative education can inform anti-racism research (Gromley, 2005, p. 117). This thesis strongly agrees with this statement, but the issue remains: in order for this to happen, concerted attempts to re(t/race) how race, space, and the histories they entail must occur as part of the process of decolonization.

As a final thought for this chapter, it is imperative that the revised model of education inequality continue to acknowledge difference, and by difference I mean, more than just socioeconomic differences within language/racial groups, but difference in terms of how and why certain language policies come to be and how the local people perceive these changes. Because it is not logical to simply perform a comparative analysis without thoroughly examining the differences that exist within each local context (i.e. colonial legacies), it is imperative for social science research methods to recognize that the local context matters. In considering each case study above, and in recognizing the way language issues are a factor in pre- and post-conflict situations, it is imperative that comparative education research, critical language theory, and anti-
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1 Here I use the word (re)t/race to emphasize both (re)tracing and (re)racing language issues.
racism research seek to highlight language, race, and the histories/lived experiences of language and race within each context. Recognizing the importance of teasing out lived experiences and histories, this thesis acknowledges that the case studies themselves are not able to fully illuminate the intricate (sociohistorical) ways language ideologies occurred. However, it is my hope that this comparative section on global English as well as the case studies themselves (though brief) has provided a solid methodological and ideological ground to move forward with examining language, power, and race in two specific sites. In the next section, I consider the first context, Japan, and explore how the issues of English language education policies inform national and cultural identity within the context of education.
Chapter Two: The Context of Japan: An Exploration of National Identity Construction and “Native” English Language Ideology

This chapter focuses on how English language policies in Japan inform national and cultural identities within the context of education and aims to challenge dominant ideologies around the cultural and linguistic homogeneity of “Japaneseness” through a critical language theory and an anti-racism lens. To begin this chapter, this research considers sociopolitical factors during a period when Japan was in economic turmoil and then critically discusses the way English language education was introduced in Japan. Present day approaches to language education are also considered in order to highlight the disconnect between racial/linguistic pluralism and current language education policy and practices.

We are Japanese: Examining Japanese National Identity

“Ushinawareta jyuu nen” (the lost 10 years) refers to the last 10 years of the 20th Century where Japan was in economic turmoil; however, Hashimoto (2007), in chapter two, says that “if we look closely at the events that took place in Japan during the 1990s, we can see that what was “lost” was not confined to the political and economic arena: The confidence in the society as a whole was also undermined” (p. 28). Hashimoto questions what was lost and offers insights about the policy implications of that loss. She informs us that “initially it was financial loss after the economic bubble burst, which led to the loss of a sense of security, family stability, credibility of the nation’s leadership, and confidence in the future” (Kingston, 2004 as cited in Hashimoto, 2007, p. 25). Although Japan has been seen as a strong role model for countries fighting for cultural and political independence from Western superpowers, the underlying faith in the “Japanese way” of doing business and managing international affairs was brought into question. Since “Japanese education was designed to reduce the danger of dependency on the
West by restricting the introduction of Western ideas to technical matters” only, the slogan “Japanese spirit and Western knowledge” that Hashimoto suggests is just as alive in the 21st century as it was in the 19th (Hashimoto, 2007, p. 26). Hashimoto is particularly interested in how language policies (which translate into national/cultural policies) facilitate constructing national/cultural identity through language.

In order to underscore the exportability of Japanese culture to the world, Japan has embraced the term “internationalization”; “the Japanese conception of internationalization and the motivation for promoting the internationalization within the country were based on the view that Japan and the rest of the world are distinct entities. This view has not changed since the Lost Decade” (Hashimoto, 2007, p. 27). Hashimoto emphasizes that “Japan has been successful in maintaining cultural independence by removing English, the most powerful language in the world, from the core identity of Japan without excluding the language completely from Japanese society” (Hashimoto, 2007, p. 27). In the Prime Minister’s Commission on Japan’s Goal in the 21st Century, known as the PMC 2000, Japanese language and culture are stressed and the importance of international communication via “internationalization” is identified:

Lest there be any misunderstanding, we stress that Japanese is a wonderful language. We should nurture culture and cultivation, sensibility and thinking power, by treasuring Japanese and acquiring good Japanese language skills. But to argue that this means rejecting foreign languages reflects mistake, zero-sum thinking. It is a fundamental fallacy to believe that cherishing the Japanese language precludes studying other languages or that caring for Japanese culture requires rejecting foreign cultures. If we treasure the Japanese language and culture, we should actively assimilate other languages and cultures, enriching Japanese culture through contact with other cultures and showing
other countries the attraction of Japanese culture by introducing it in an appropriate fashion in their languages (PMC, 2000, as cited in Hashimoto, 2007, p. 31).

The above political rhetoric is riddled with a sense of romanticized language ideology of national pride. Informed by a romantic and instrumentalist language ideology, this above statement emphasizes the importance of learning other languages as a tool for communicating with non-Japanese speaking foreigners, not as tool for bringing about cultural understanding through reciprocal acts of communication. This speech focuses on enriching Japanese culture and language through contact with other languages and is underpinned with xenophobic connotations that (a) exclude the linguistic/racial diversity that exists within Japan and (b) downplay the richness of “other cultures” by indirectly boasting about the wonderfulness of Japanese culture and language. In this sense, xenophobia is not a covert form of racism but more tacit. Even more implicit is (mis)identification of which particular languages are being referred to in statements such as “other cultures” and “other countries”. The implicit xenophobic assumption here is that other cultures do not exist in Japan. It is clear that implicit in the PMC are suggestions to not only learn foreign languages but to view foreign languages as a tool for exporting and enriching Japanese culture. Although no explicit reference was made in the previous statement, an explicit reference to English can be found below:

English has become the international lingua franca, a process accelerated by the Internet and globalization. So long as English is effectively the language of international discourse, there is no alternative to familiarizing ourselves with it within Japan. Even if we stop short of making it as an official second language, we should give it the status of a second working language and use it routinely alongside Japanese. Publications and announcements of the National Diet and government organs [sic organizations] should be
published in English as well as Japanese as a matter of course. Transmitting them to the world via the Internet will be done in English (PMC, 2000 as cited in Hashimoto, 2007, p. 32).

The above quote further highlights the instrumentalist language ideology toward acquiring English, emphasizing how necessary (and compulsory it is) to become familiar with it. However, in response to the making English language the unofficial second language, the public expressed strong criticisms for four reasons: (1) English was seen as a threat to Japanese cultural identity; (2) English challenged the perceived unity of Japanese language, by dividing Japanese people into two groups, good English speakers and poor English speakers; (3) English fluency is not needed in daily life for most Japanese people; (4) Even TEFL teachers argued that bilingualism is not a goal of TEFL (Hashimoto, 2007, p. 33). In the report, linguistic and by extension cultural diversity (and racial diversity) is perceived as something external and sought after, resulting in the neglect of the linguistic/racial diversity that currently exists within Japan. It assumes that the “we” is linguistically and racially homogenous as shown below:

To avoid being left out of the world bypassing Japan, we must internationalize and diversify Japanese society [by increasing number of foreign students in Japan, and actively welcoming large numbers of able foreigners,] while making it creative and vibrant despite a falling birthrate and an aging population. Surely, doing so is the long-term national interest of [21st century] Japan (PMC, 2000, reorganization of inserted text is mine, as cited in Hashimoto, 2007, p. 33).

Immigration is viewed as the key to linguistic and racial diversity and is positioned as a national interest only because of the aging population. This orientation toward linguistic and racial diversification is superficial and excludes linguistic minorities. As Vaipae (2001) points out,
linguistic minorities in Japan are still socially and educationally disadvantaged because Japan’s language policies deny linguistic diversity and favour “internationalization”, thus reinforcing the perception of a homogeneous national identity. Kubota (1998) offers another interpretation that exposes how the concept of an essentialized Japanese national identity is tied to English acquisition challenges:

Kubota (1998) construes that many Japanese people’s ‘‘English ‘allergy’ and xenophobic attitudes reflect a reaction against excessive or unsuccessful attempts to acquire English and identify with English speakers’’ (p. 300) and claims that ‘‘nihonjinron [theories on Japaneseess] as cultural nationalism and ‘English allergy’ prevent a spread of English’’ (p. 300). Mabuchi (1998, 2002) also argues that the decades-long failure in English education/learning is constitutive of the Japanese government’s educational policy that rests on an essentialised view of Japanese citizens in which English education is situated as a means of nurturing the monolithic ‘Japanese’ poised to act in accordance with their country’s interests. Indeed, the prevailing ideological discourse seems to be that ‘we fail to acquire English because we are Japanese’ (as cited in Kobayashi, 2011, pp. 4-5).

In the above excerpt, Kobayashi (2011) identifies a clear connection between xenophobic attitudes, essentialized Japanese national identity, and challenges with English language learning. This essentialized homogenous national identity view is in stark contrast to the racial and linguistic pluralism that is “just beginning to appear on the horizon of public consciousness” (Cummins, 2000, p. 12). Even though foreigners account for only 1% of the total Japanese population, the Japanese government is (very slowly) beginning to recognize the existence of linguistic diversity and
has initiated research to address the educational issues faced by the inevitability of increasing diversity. Preliminary results from a large-scale study involving approximately 9000 teachers, 800 parents, and 1000 children from Portuguese-, Chinese-, Spanish-, and Vietnamese-speaking backgrounds led by Professor Suzuki Nishihara of Tokyo Women's Christian University were reported at the AILA Congress. Among the findings reported by Professor Toshio Okazaki (1999) is a significant positive relationship between parental attitudes favouring active maintenance of their children's home language and both L1 maintenance and L2 acquisition (Cummins, 2000, p. 12).

Interestingly, the above research is driven by immigration trends (as seen in the Singapore case) and the aging population in Japan; however, it does not acknowledge that racial/linguistic diversity exists in lieu of immigration. In fact, the Japanese government study itself draws attention only to immigrants who speak other languages and does not include Japan’s oldest indigenous minority the Ainu, of whom there are around 25 000 not recognized formally until 1997 under the Ainu New Law (Motobayashi, 2006). Motobayashi (2006) highlights that Japan is not a homogeneous country as stereotypically believed. Taking linguistic difference into account, she describes seven types of linguistic variation in Japan: 1) “pure” Japanese; 2) “Japanese raised abroad”; 3) “naturalized Japanese”; 4) “third-generation Japanese emigrants; 5) Koreans with Japanese upbringing; 6) the “Ainu; and 7) “pure non-Japanese”. Although these linguistic categories alone are not a thorough reflection of the linguistic variations that are characteristic to each Japanese region, the categories themselves are helpful in demonstrating that linguistic variation in Japan is vastly unique and certainly not homogeneous.

Motobayashi (2006) examines contemporary English language ideological orientations towards different languages and different forms of language education as she considers two key
educational policy documents, the Action Plan for Japanese with English Ability (or JEA Action Plan) and the Japanese as a Second Language Curriculum (or JSL Curriculum). Her examination of both policy documents show that foreign language policies reinforce social inequality for minority language speakers who do not possess Japanese language skills or legal citizenship and, thus, do not see their first language legitimated in the public or private schools; in contrast, those who do possess Japanese skills or citizenship are encouraged to learn a second language which can lead to the international world (Motobayashi, 2006, p. 62). Such “[e]fforts to make Japanese learners of English maintain their Japanese identity has shaped the way TEFL is structured in education” (Hashimoto, 2007, p. 28), considering that one of the program aims is “to promote internationalization at the local level by inviting young overseas graduates to assist in international exchange and foreign language education in local governments, boards of education and junior and senior high schools throughout Japan (JET, 1999 as cited in Gottlieb & Chen, 2001, p. 28). Motobayashi (2006), therefore, highlights how dominant Japanese language policies actually attempt to resist/negate linguistic diversity of minority languages, including English language speakers as they are considered a minority, and encourage the growth of Japanese as the language of wider communication.

Nunan (2003) provides a brief overview of the impact of English on education policy in Asia and touches upon issues of inequality and access to English language education. In Japan, English education is compulsory beginning at the age of 12 and is mandatory for at least three years; nevertheless, scholars like Yoshida (2003) have noted that even though English education is compulsory for three years during junior high school, most Japanese will have studied English for at least three more years in high school as well as two years at the tertiary level. As Nunan (2003), Yoshida (2003), and Matsuda (2003) point out (and also as seen in the previous case
studies), length of English language study does not necessarily correspond with success of English language acquisition or achievement. In fact, research has shown it is quite the contrary: Japanese are infamous for devoting an inordinate amount of time, money, and effort to learning English with remarkably disappointing results. Consequently, they then assume that they themselves, being on the other side of an impenetrable linguistic wall, cannot learn a foreign language. According to the logic of Japan’s linguistic nationalism, the Japanese language is to Japaneseness as English is to non-Japaneseness (the linguistic Other par excellence). This is why, to express it in extreme terms, to acquire English is to be contaminated by non-Japaneseness. (McVeigh 2006, pp. 244-245 as cited in Kobayashi 2011, p. 4).

Nishino (2008), Motobayashi (2006), Schneer (2007) and McVeigh (2002) further discuss the gap between English education policy and practice in Japan and offer thought-provoking reasons that offer valuable insights into the systemic, social, political, and ideological factors that foster and/or inhibit English language learning. Nishino (2008) offers four pragmatic reasons for difficulties in the class:

1. Secondary school teachers are not trained to teach communicative English since most majored in English literature.

2. Despite MEXT’s goal of a minimum of 550 TOEFL, most teachers are not proficient in English communication.

3. Japanese English teachers perceive their English communication skills as inferior, and as a result, fear making errors in front of their students, peers, or native speakers.
(4) Many Japanese English teachers adhere to traditional approaches to English teaching which rely on grammar and translation in order to help students succeed on high school or tertiary entrance examinations.

Above, Nishino (2008) emphasizes that Japanese teachers’ attitudes toward English pedagogy is a result of their lack of training English in more communicative approaches. Noteworthy, just as Rahman (2007) in the Pakistani context negates critically interrogating the merits of Western pedagogical practice that focus on communicative, instrumentalist language education pedagogy so does Nishino (2008). This failure to recognize that communicative approaches need to be critically examined and understood as an extension of Western pedagogical practices is a factor many critical educational theorists negate because the underlying assumption is that the communicative technique is an example of “best practices”. However, this critique on lack of communicative pedagogy and practice should more accurately be recognized as an example of “Western ideologically-informed best practices”, not criticized. In further considering how language policies influence English language teaching approaches, Schneer (2007) posits that when Shinzo Abe, the Japanese prime minister in 2006, revised the Fundamental Law of Education he emphasized patriotism in students: “it is here, at the juncture of national and international vantage points, where the discourse of kokusaika [internationalization] enters the English classroom” (Schneer, 2007, p. 601). Kokusaika, or internationalization, is widely used among modern Japanese, partly due to the Japanese Ministry of Education’s determined policy to work toward internationalization through education, especially through English education (Schneer, 2007, p. 601). In comparison, McVeigh (2002), as well as Matsuda (2003), suggests that English education in Japan presents students with the notion that there is a homogeneous Japanese identity and, thus, “functions as a moderator between Japan and the Outside” (Schneer,
2007, p. 602). In the chapter entitled “Self-Orientalism Through Occidentalism: How “English” and “Foreigners” Nationalize Japanese Students”, McVeigh (2002) problematizes the meaning of internationalization in the context of Japanese education and argues that “For many (but of course not all), the “internationalization” of Japanese society is actually a form of nationalization and is intimately bound up with issues of being Japanese/we/inside versus being non-Japanese/other/outside” (McVeigh, 2002, p. 149). This homogeneity language ideology further illustrates how English is othered in Japan. In a practical example, McVeigh (2002) faults the pre-tertiary educational pedagogy where pre-tertiary socialization with foreigners is limited to unrealistic conversations with outsiders such as on school trips or in classroom settings (McVeigh, 2002, p. 165). Furthermore, McVeigh’s research strongly suggests that foreign teachers (AETs) are not taken seriously by students or are idealized. McVeigh (2002) describes the differences between Japan-appropriated English and Fantasy English which further illuminate the perceptions behind how English itself is perceived and how “native” English speakers are perceived by the Japanese (McVeigh, 2002, p. 168). Similarly, Motobayashi (2006) criticizes essentialist views of foreigners as much as she criticizes essentialist views of Japanese.

Clearly, language ideological orientations around Japanese national identity reinforce linguistic and racial homogeneity and attribute an innately instrumentalist value to learning/speaking “native” English. Government rhetoric assumes that the “native” speaker is serving an instrumental purpose: to teach a “native” English variety as tool to facilitate the process of internationalization. The rhetoric also assumes that all English language learners belong to a single homogenous Japanese identity, and uses this assumption as a basis for encouraging the preservation of the Japanese language as the language of wider communication; this preservation of Japanese language and culture reinforces a romantic ideology that supposes an essentialized
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notion the Japanese national identity even though this supposition is not reflective of all its citizens. From an inclusive language education policy development standpoint, these monolithic linguistic assumptions undermine the linguistic/racial minorities and exclude linguistic pluralism. English is constructed and idealized as a “common good” irrespective of the clear bias that only the high-status (“inner-circle”) varieties are taught in Japan’s growing English language education industry. In the next section, I turn to public English language education in Japan and discuss specific policy guidelines that further reinforce themes of national identity and marginalize linguistic and racial minorities.

**English Language Education in Japan: An EFL Perspective**

Scholars agree that the impact of English on educational policies and practices around the world is hard to ignore, and Japan is no exception. Since the 19th century, Japanese students have studied English for a total of six years at junior and senior high school levels. Many of them continue with English language education at the tertiary level. The introduction of English language teaching in Japan was primarily for the purpose of introducing foreign ideas, particularly Western knowledge and technology (Nishino, 2008). The focus on English learning was primarily translation methods and grammar lessons (Nishino, 2008). In 1962, Tokyo University of Education published a “Report of Conference of Experts on the Teaching of English in Japan”. Under the “Other Problems” section, the report states that “For production, all that the teacher can expect to do will be to teach either British or American English he is most proficient in. It will be ideal if in addition students become able to understand the other variety” (p. 5). It is not quite clear whether “the other variety” is hinting at Englishes. Regardless to say, the report still manages to downplay the relevance of learning “the other variety” by deeming it
an ideal, thus implying its impracticality. Besides addressing English teaching objectives, the report also highlights challenges that Japanese teachers face which further demonstrates the primacy placed on learning a standard “native” form of English:

But we cannot think the pronunciation of average teacher is good. Moreover, social needs about increasing hearing and speaking abilities are becoming stronger. Teachers are expected to train the pupils so well that they will become to speak English as fluently as possible. Even the best Japanese cannot speak English as well as the natives. From this point, we can think of following two things:

(a) to use machines
(b) to hire many native speakers

As it may be hopeless, to hire many native speakers, we have to use machines (UNESCO, 1962, pp. 46-47).

A more critical look at the above report excerpt shows that there is a great concern for Western-informed interactive, spoken communication methods as well as a great contrast between the “native” English speakers and the “non-native” English learners (“the Japanese”). The “native” English speaker is attributed to perfection, whereas the “non-native” English learner—even though they might be the best English speakers—simply cannot speak like native English speakers, and, therefore, will always be dependent on “machines” (computerized translation methods) or on “native speakers”. This dependency places the learner in a vulnerable position of perpetual linguistic (racial) inferiority as most “native” English speakers come from “inner-circle” countries. As Rassool (2000) points out, “common languages, nevertheless, are socially constructed: they invariably represent the language(s) of the dominant cultural/political group” (p. 387). As such, the discourse of native/standard language further marginalizes linguistic
diversity and “accentuate[s] linguistic and social differences. They often set up linguistic barriers within social institutions and processes that contribute to the alienation and dissatisfaction of linguistic minority groups and, in the process, generate the potential for social disequilibrium” (Rasool, 2000, p. 387). This idealized “native” English speaker discourse is reflected in the language education policy and curriculum as well. Under Foreign Language Activities on the MEXT website, English teachers are provided with a set of guidelines that reinforce pedagogical themes of “enjoyment”, “fun”, and “usefulness” that further position English as a hegemonic, instrumentalist language.

1. Instruction should be given on the following items in order to help pupils actively engage in communication in a foreign language:

(1) To experience the joy of communication in the foreign language.

(2) To actively listen to and speak in the foreign language.

(3) To learn the importance of verbal communication.


Firstly, the above MEXT education policy states that “in principle English should be selected for foreign language activities” (MEXT, 2011, p.1), about which, Matsuda (2003) points out that English was and is still being taught as primarily an “inner-circle” language. Secondly, the above policy essentializes the role of the “native” speaker by assuming a level of linguistic expertise and competency in teaching “standard” varieties of English and places the learner in an inferior position of incompetency. Also, by assuming that the foreign language being learnt is English as MEXT notes, the policy implicitly reinforces “inner-circle” English as a high-status commodity. Matsuda (2003) emphasizes that not only are World Englishes not part of English language learning, but also that textbooks exclude dialogues and interactions between non-native speakers
(NNS) and non-native speakers. This observation reveals that textbooks tend to misrepresent the types of conversations that occur between NNS (Matsuda, 2003). The great disconnect between who communicates in English in real social situations and who is represented in the textbook is simply a gross inaccuracy. Furthermore, Matsuda (2003) shows that even the hiring practices of Assistant Language Teachers or Assistant English Teachers (ALTs and AETs, respectively) further reflect English being taught as an “inner-circle” language: “[i]n 2000, 98% of the 5,444 AETs came from the “inner-circle”” (Monbukagakusho, 2001 as cited in Matsuda, 2003, p. 720). These statistics further highlights the hegemonic language ideology around perceived standard varieties of English and shows how particular Englishes (“inner-circle”) are marked with high-value—I have personally experienced preferential treatment because my variety of English was more easily recognizable; I have also experienced critical treatment because my variety of English is not as “authentic”, “pure”, or “British” as some of my colleagues’. Clearly, approaching language in a hierarchical way happens even within the “inner-circle”. This observation is particularly important because it sheds light on the complexity within Kachru’s geographical and Sonntag’s sociopolitical typology as referenced earlier in chapter one.

Even more telling is MEXT’s new collaboration with The British Council: “[t]he British Council has engaged in an across-the-board collaboration with Japan’s Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) to create and provide content for a new edition of MEXT’s Team Teaching Handbook” (British Council & MEXT, 2013). Revealingly, the picture on the homepage depicts a white female English teacher wearing a beige suit teaching a young Japanese girl in school uniform. A superficial look at the ALT handbook guidelines displays many examples of English language education games along with techniques and approaches. The handbook encourages critical thinking skills in English through topics such as stereotypes and
culture—words that were never included in any training I received as an ALT. At first glance, this new ALT handbook appeared promising because it is clear that some strides were made to encourage ALTs to “[c]ompare stereotyped images with realistic images” and encouraged ALTs to engage in critical discussions around the notion of stereotype by asking such questions as “[w]hat is expected of men, women, older or younger people? Focus on roles in society” (British Council & MEXT, 2013, p.100). However, even though a critical perspective is encouraged, the handbook still idealizes the “native” English pronunciation from “inner-circle” countries and essentializes Japanese identity as being homogenous by encouraging ALTs to teach language and culture using an approach that highlights such differences as “correct” (“standard” English) pronunciation and “wrong” (Japanese English) pronunciation. An example of how Japanese English is taught as a subordinate (illegitimate) variety of English is highlighted in the following excerpt:

Abbreviations of words of English origins may make the originals unrecognisable to native speakers, and students need to be made aware of this. Below are a few common examples:

- “depato”=’department store’
- “pasokon” = ‘(personal) computer/PC’

(British Council & MEXT, 2013, p. 30)

Because “unrecognisable” Japanese English words are marked as mistakes since it is not part of the “target language”, these “mistakes” are perceived as denigrated forms of English even though Japanese English is a recognized standard form of English that is in use both inside and outside of the classroom by teachers and by students. The ALT handbook also advises that the students’ “own culture and experience” be contrasted with the “target culture”; this contrasting approach
to teaching students about culture through language fails to recognize that multiple linguistic and, therefore, cultural/racial identities exist within Japan (British Council & MEXT, 2013, p. 101). Therefore, even though it has been established that linguistic/racial diversity is present, scholars agree that American and British English are still very strongly perceived as “pure” or “authentic” forms of the English language and policies continue to reflect instrumentalist and hegemonic language ideologies toward English language learning (Matsuda, 2003):

> English has played a central role as the common international language in linking people who have different mother tongues. For children living in the 21st century, it is essential for them to acquire communication abilities in English as a common international language. In addition, English abilities are important in terms of linking our country with the rest of the world, obtaining the world’s understanding and trust, enhancing our international presence and further developing our nation (Toyama, MEXT, 2003).

The above excerpt highlights how English is perceived as a neutral tool of communication much like Blommaert’s (1999) instrumentalist ideology, but it is important to note that multiple language ideologies work simultaneously in many of the cases we have seen in chapter one and thus far. In this instance, the excerpt also makes clear that English is not just an instrumental tool to communicate with the global word as it also reinforces homo-genistic ideologies around the essentialized notion of a “pure” homogenous Japanese national identity. Overall, the examination of political discourse, Japanese education policy, and social attitudes within the context of English language education has shown that multiple language ideologies operate simultaneously and inform the policies and practices that shape the English language education landscape in Japan. As demonstrated, the sociopolitical context and attitudes toward English language education and national identity must be deeply examined in order to achieve a more thorough
understanding of the way language change takes place within institutional settings such as school and throughout society. In addition to highlighting the way in which multiple language ideologies work simultaneously, it is important to acknowledge the way in which e/raced “inner-circle” “native” speakers and marginalized racialized speakers of other languages than Japanese are in a constant state of struggle and resistance within the context of power and race. The way in which power is afforded to “native” English speakers, dominant Japanese-speakers, and by extension (un)racialized white bodies and unmarked Japanese bodies (as the mis/represented hegemonic, romanticized norm), Razack’s (2002) spatial theory becomes particularly relevant here because it demonstrates more than just simultaneous ideologies; it clarifies how multiple systems of domination can and do work together to create racial (and I add linguistic) hierarchies:

   It must be said at the outset that our focus on racial formations is automatically a focus on class and gender hierarchies as well. Racial hierarchies come into existence through patriarch and capitalism, each system of domination mutually constituting the other. The lure of a spatial approach is precisely the possibility of charting the simultaneous operation of multiple systems of domination (p. 6).

The passage above helps illuminate the intricate layers and overlapping dimensions of race, class, gender (and I add language). By recognizing the overlapping layers, Razack (2002) offers comparative education research and critical language theory a way to articulate race as part of an intricately connected social systems that have the ability to reveal power dynamics and show how power (tangible and tacit forms) operates. Razack (2002) discussion on spatial theory, especially her articulation of power as racial hierarchies embedded in intersections of gender and class, are particularly useful to begin talking about race.
Talking about Race: A Brief Anti-Racism Introduction

I’m so sorry. My son is used to white English teachers. He likes white female teachers.

When I was an English language teacher at a private English conversation school in Nagoya, I was surprised when one of my Japanese students ran away crying with tears and fear when he saw me. His mother, feeling slightly embarrassed, quickly apologized and said, “I’m so sorry. My son is used to white English teachers. He likes white female teachers” and laughed. While she coddled her son, convincing him it was ok to enter the classroom and give me a high five, I became very conscious of the disturbing effect my racialized body had on this child. This young boy, barely even five years old, did not want to high five me as he entered the classroom. He would run past me and pretty much avoid me for the entire one hour class. After the fourth or fifth week of “native” English lessons by me, her son no longer cried or avoided participation. Was race no longer a factor to be considered? Was “race” something to be overcome and be made invisible? Why wasn’t race ever acknowledged? Why did I, myself, fear naming “race”? Why do I continue to fear naming “race”?

These are the very questions that riddled me (and continue to riddle me). Although this child’s particular behaviour was unique to my English teaching experience, the attitude and perception he had about what it means to be recognized as a “native” English speaker is widely reflected in “inner-circle” hiring practices that permeate both public and private education contexts. The fact that 98% of ALTs are from the “inner-circle” is not just reflective of the bias toward perceived legitimacy of “native” English speakers but is also reflective of their “normalcy” and the perceived authority (superiority) of their “whiteness”. In Japan, “native” English speakers are associated with whiteness, whereas “non-native” English speakers are typically identified as racialized bodies, and this social perception is reinforced in images portrayed in the New
Horizon textbook (2006), where all characters are essentialized (mis)representations of monolithic national and linguistic identities: Ann Green is a white ALT from Toronto, Canada; Judy Brown is a Black American student from New York, United States of America; Mike Davis is a white student from Australia; Emi Ito is a Japanese student; and Shin Tanaka is a Japanese student; their Japanese teacher is Kazuko Sato. These essentialized characters accurately reflect the “inner-circle” hiring practices, where “inner-circle” “native” English speakers are associated with “whiteness” and the learners are perceived to be uniformly “Japanese”. Characters’ (mis)representations are further essentialized through pragmatic social exchanges that further reinforce monolithic national identity. Take the following example below, for instance:

Mike: What do you have for breakfast?
Judy: I have cereal.

How about you?
Mike: I have rice and miso soup.

(Tokyo Shoseki, 2006, Unit 4)

Although this dialogue might appear to be a successful attempt to teach a highly practical way to use English (i.e. wh-question words or how to use “have” in a non-possessive way), the character dynamics pertaining to their e/raced bodies and the content of their interaction are problematic because it reinforces (mis)representations of American/Japanese national identities. The above conversation identifies Judy as an essentialized Black American girl who has “cereal” for breakfast, which automatically puts her in a contrasting position to the notion of an essentialized Japanese character. Mike is “normalized” because he able to connect more closely to an essentialized Japanese character’s breakfast choice of “rice and miso soup”. Here’s another

---

13 All characters are not mentioned in this section, but the characters who are mentioned hereafter (Ann, Judy, Mike, Emi, Shin, and Ms. Sato) are based on my first-hand experience using text book material in a junior high classroom in both Nagoya and Tokyo.
instance where Mike’s character shows affiliation with “Japanese” in a way that situates Judy as a racialized American foreigner who is having a challenging time learning Japanese and reinforces Mike as a confident un/racialized white American who has an affiliation for the Japanese language:

Mike: What’s your favorite subject?
Judy: Math.
   It’s very interesting.
Mike: I like Japanese.
Judy: Me, too.
   It’s not easy, but I study hard.

(Tokyo Shoseki, 2006, Unit 4)

Again, we see that even though this particular exchange occurs between two “inner-circle” characters, Mike’s character is portrayed as more “Japanese” whereas Judy’s character is relevant only because it serves as a contrast, thus reinforcing the stereotype that Japanese is a difficult language for foreigners (apparently especially racialized foreigners). Therefore, in the context of the New Horizon textbook (Tokyo Shoseki, 2006), racialized bodies are portrayed as essentialized national identities (American, Japanese, Canadian) and are also perceived markers of linguistic (in)competency.

The next chapter takes a closer look at language, power, and race in such a way that was not made as explicit in the context provided earlier about Japan. Applying an anti-racism lens, this research does not treat “race” as something to be overcome or be made invisible as Warmington (2009) warns against. Race is made a central component to understanding how the dominant colonial process of English language education came to be; specific language ideologies and
teaching methodologies are critically examined to help illuminate how and why English became the official national language in a country that is (and was) multilingual much in same way Japan is. In Trinidad and Tobago, much like Japan’s minority and indigenous populations, English language education policies are deeply-rooted in blatantly oppressive, assimilative, and hegemonic language ideologies aimed at erasing linguistic culture and heritage through a strategic colonization processes. However, unlike Japan, English is currently the only language through which education is delivered.
Chapter Three: The Context of Trinidad and Tobago: An Anti-racism Approach to English Language Education

This chapter focuses on the connection between language, power, and race by firmly grounding the discussion in an anti-racism research methodology. Anti-racism as a conceptual, methodological, and analytical tool is particularly useful in highlighting power relations, resistance, and sites of transformation that allow for a deeper, more ideologically-rooted understanding of the relationships between language, power, and race. The first purpose of this chapter is to engage in a critical discussion around what it means to do anti-racism research by challenging the normalcy of traditional approaches to social science research methods. Second, since the practice of “talking” about race is often omitted from traditional social science research, this thesis aims to open up conversation around the realness of race by making reference to how race was historically constructed. Third, this chapter aims to highlight the theme of resistance within the context of English language education in Trinidad and Tobago by critically analysing the way language education policies and practices inform the way linguistic and national identities are negotiated.

Challenging Normalcy through Anti-racism Research Methodology

*Racism becomes your paranoia. Of course, it is a way of saying that racism doesn’t really exist in the way you say it does. As if we had to invent racism to explain our own feelings of exclusion, as if racism was a way of not being responsible for the places we cannot go. It is a form of racism to say that racism does not exist* (Ahmed, 2009, p. 47).

*Saying that you can’t do anything about it is how racism gets reproduced, I say. The belief that racism is inevitable is how racism becomes inevitable...* (Ahmed, 2009, p. 42).

During the first class of 3910S Advanced Seminar on Race and Anti-Racism Research Methodology in 2010, George Dei asked, “What makes it discomforting for people not to acknowledge race?” Many replied fear—fear of being accused of racism, fear of challenging the
status quo, fear of being paranoid. All responses seemed to say that naming race is a risky practice. Being race-conscious is a risky consciousness, but why? The act of naming race in anti-racism discourse, however, is, indeed, risky and troubling for many because

[a]nti-racism discourse moves away from discussions of tolerating diversity to the pointed notion of difference and power. It sees race and racism as central to how we claim, occupy, and defend spaces. The task of anti-racism is to identify, challenge, and change the values, structures, and behaviors that perpetuate systemic racism and other forms of societal oppression (Thomas, 1984; Lee, 1985; 1991; Walcott, 1990; Dei, 1996 as cited in Dei, 2005, p. 3).

This risky business of naming race, examining the implications of being race conscious, and challenging the normalcy of traditional social science research is precisely what needs to happen if the goal is to decolonize, empower, and transform policies and practices that perpetuate systemic beliefs that marginalize minority language speakers within dominant language contexts. In Dei (2005), questions probe at the complexity of what it means to do anti-racist research. Dei (2005) asserts that “[a]nti-racist research places the minoritized at the center of the analysis by focusing on their lived experiences and the “simultaneity of [their] oppressions” (Brewer, 1993, p. 16 as cited in Dei, 2005, p. 2), emphasizing how certain voices have been historically excluded and oppressed based on scientific research that positions people of color as biologically and socially inferior (see also Stitzlen, 2009 for a brief glimpse of invalid “scientific research” that deemed racialized bodies as socially and mentally subordinate). As such, anti-racism seeks to highlight persistent inequities and focuses on relations of domination and subordination in ways that do not simply reproduce subordination or reinforce dominance. For anti-racism
researchers, “recognition of the history and the context that underpin the research” is integral to decolonizing the research process (Dei, 2005, p. 12).

In addition, the subjects/local people must be viewed as bearers of knowledge, “not simply subjects of study” (Dei, 2005, p. 5). This approach not only troubles the normalcy of the expert superior, (white) researcher who is the knower and bearer of legitimate knowledge. Dei (2005) asks: “as researchers, do we begin our studies by claiming certain knowledge and therefore the right to set about “proving we are right?” Do we have a right to seek research information, no matter the cost, in the name of knowledge production?” (Dei, 2005, p. 7). These questions accurately illustrate how anti-racism research challenges normalcy by raising questions about the way traditional social science research has been done. The social sciences and humanities have admitted acknowledgment that, for example, “[n]ot many studies have dealt with the successes of the marginalized and particularly how people resist their marginality and domination” (Dei, 2005, p. 10). This shift from focusing on the marginalized as passive social actors who accept their oppressive state and domination to focusing on acts of resistance, autonomy, agency, and voice is a central aim of anti-racism research. This shift allows both the researcher and the local people an opportunity to be heard.

Moreover, unlike traditional social/cultural anthropology and ethnography, anti-racism research methodology views “the self” as a methodological feature and acknowledges gender, class, and racial biases. It does not assume to be neutral or unbiased and certainly does not claim to be objective: “[t]rue objectivity requires that politics is recognized where it exists, that bias is recognized where it exists, that oppression and exploitation are seen as such, and that victims and resisters are seen as such” (Okolie, 2005, p. 253). By shedding light on the complexities involved in performing research and illuminating the dynamics of the local people, anti-racism research
does not seek to negate sociopolitical contexts of oppression and exploitation and, in fact, challenges claims of “objectivity”.

In addition, Okolie (2005) notes that anti-racism research also challenges forms of positivism: “Positivism hardly recognizes the creative potentials of humans; they are simply objects responding to the constraints of social facts” (Okolie, 2005, p. 245). This positivistic view limits the agency of the social actors themselves and explains social interactions as a response to external factors. As Okolie (2005) points out, positivistic approaches do not recognize the “creative potential” of the subjects which does not grant social actors agency or view the social actors as legitimate sources of knowledge. Anti-racism reminds us that “[s]tatistics are not neutral. They both reflect and contribute to important dimensions of difference and power in society….This is very clear when we talk about statistics of race or of ethnicity” (Owen, 2001 as cited in Bulmer and Solomos, 2004, p. 49). Anti-racism researchers have argued that quantitative data such as statistical methods has tended to de-race (e/race) knowledge instead of engaging in critical discussions that question the rationale behind particular research methods and particular ways of knowing, especially when those ways of knowing are perceived to be value-neutral. With this in mind, Wahab (2005) points out the goal of anti-racist research is to critically engage structures and practices of racialized domination, to expose their hegemonies and transform political economies in a way in which minoritized and “Othered” bodies and discourses exert greater autonomy in self-determination and relational/representational politics. In so defining, it is also meant to subvert conventional research, which is ideologically driven and culturally specific, yet presented as universal, neutral, and objective” (Dei & Johal, 2005, p. 32).
The above stresses the way anti-racism research challenges the normalcy of traditional social science research. In particular, Okolie (2005) underscores that undermining quantitative and qualitative approaches is not the goal of anti-racist work; however, he notes that it is imperative that the authority of research methods be critically examined. With this in mind, Wahab (2005) questions the making of authority that validates and legitimizes particular knowledges over others. He argues that the making of authority is a racialized project that challenges essentialist views of the community as one homogeneous mass. We have seen this concept of the community in homo-genistic and hegemonic language ideologies that purport essentialized nationalist identities within the context of Japan, and, here within the context of Trinidad and Tobago, similar essentialist views will be exposed. “What may be represented as “uninclusive and anti-white” by those threatened by this openly racialized, embodied, strategic, and historical discourse is also emancipatory for us, bodies of color, who have historically occupied multiple sites of exclusion in colonial discourse” (Wahab, 2005, p. 49). This threat Wahab (2005) points out is reminiscent of the fear of naming race identified by my fellow classmates. However, this research maintains that this fear of naming race must be viewed as a site of possibility that allows us to stop talking about ourselves as “the Other” and start talking about ourselves as self(s) who are part of a larger project to decolonize research. In an attempt to unpack “racism”, Scheurich and Young’s (1997) typology of racism categories describes how race, as a conceptual tool, can be understood. Wahab (2005) and Dei and Johal (2005) highlight the saliency of epistemological racism (as defined by Scheurich and Young) and emphasize that racism does not occur only overtly or covertly at individual levels but also institutionally, socially, and epistemologically. In the same way, Lopez (2003) highlights criticisms of anti-racism and demonstrates how racism at the individual level hinders efforts to view anti-racism as a valid
research methodology, negating the sociopolitical contexts and racist epistemologies that underlie the very foundation of the research. Scheurich and Young (1997) offer an apt articulation of what is meant by *epistemological racism*:

> our current range of research epistemologies—positivism to postmodernism/poststructuralism—arise out of the social history and culture of the dominant race, that these epistemologies logically reflect and reinforce that social history and that racial group (while excluding the epistemologies of other races/cultures), and that this has negative results for people of color in general and scholars of color in particular (p. 8).

In ignoring epistemological racism, race is masked and made invisible: “individuals begin to think that it is merely a thing of the past and/or only connected to the specific act” (Lopez, 2003, p. 70). When this happens, racially neutral observations are presented as more palatable to *nice fields of research* (See Ladson-Billings, 1998). Therefore, while most criticisms of anti-racism discourse argue that race is peripheral or irrelevant to social science research, anti-racist researchers delve into the ideological substance of racism from an epistemological stance and “[consider] how and why race, despite its unscientific status, remains real: a real practice, with its own inner workings, enacted by real subjects with consequences that reach way beyond rates of GCSE achievement or school exclusions” (Warmington, 2009, p. 281).

**The Realness of Race: An Everyday Practice**

In light of Warmington’s observation above, anti-racism researchers view racism “not just as something that happened in the past and was now over, but as an ongoing practice playing itself out in everyday acts of racism and sexism within the system” (Max, 2005, p. 82). Attempts to depoliticize race and render it invisible are attributed to what scholars have called “post-racial color blindness” (Lentin, 2008; Warmington, 2009). These efforts to silence naming race or to
declare society “post-racial”, as Lentin (2008) and Warmington (2009) remind us, “[have] done nothing to address the fact that race and socio-economic disadvantage are almost completely synonymous for many in the US, and increasingly elsewhere, too” (Lentin, 2008, p. 325). The falsity of representing the marginalized racialized bodies “as unfortunate historical errors: illusions to be discarded, without delay, as humanity emerges into a more equal, more just future” (Warmington, 2009, p. 292) undermines anti-racist efforts to decolonize. For this reason, “[t]he effects of racial ideology are all too real: race may lack scientific integrity but it is a lived experience, a lived relationship” (Warmington, 2009, p. 283), and a real social practice that has historically been used justify why racialized bodies are innately inferior to white bodies.

**Historicizing Race**

Having established the present relevance of race and racism, it is nonetheless important to consider that the playing field of differently racialized peoples is not evenly level. Historical legacies of differential status ascribed to particular races are evident throughout. In the 1770s, Stitzlen (2009) notes, race was characterized through racial hierarchies. This hierarchal categorization process was perceived as a legitimate form of knowledge production in the name of science; Carl Linnaeus, for example, did not assign a particular rank but used highly value-laden terminology that connoted the superiority of the European race, which essentially denotes the superiority of Whiteness. In Darwin’s *The Origin of Species*, as Stitzlen (2009) observes, the study of canines influenced his studies of humans: “Darwin studied the physical traits, emotional displays, intelligence, communication skills and bodily tendencies of people of different races in much the same way that he studied those of dogs”, distinguishing “civilized” and “savage” races (Stitzlen, 2009, p. 407).
"Conceiving language loss as a Darwinian process implies that some languages are fitter than others, that the 'developed' will survive and the 'primitive' will go the way of the dinosaurs" (Crawford, 2000, p. 55). Similarly, within the context of “native” languages Speas (2009) points out that “[n]o language is “deteriorating.” In fact, we can see that people have been claiming that language is deteriorating for at least 2,000 years, but there is no existing case of a living language that has become less expressive owing to deterioration” (p. 4). The dangerous implication of conceiving language loss as something evolutionary is more poignantly illustrated if this same logic is applied to the racialized bodies— Fitter races will survive, while primitive races will vanish. Perhaps the reason this statement is so poignant is because when we think of language people tend to think of a tool of communication, but when we think of “race” we think of a body, a person. Perhaps that’s why this statement is so striking. However, what we must realize, however, is that language and race are inextricable, and therefore, when language education policies (overtly or covertly) devalue the legitimacy of a language and deem it “unfit”, that policy is not just devaluing a linguistic tool for communication; it is devaluing a person and all knowledges embedded in that linguistic/cultural/social “tool”. To further illustrate this importance of valuing multiple ways of knowing, Hornberger (1997a/b) points out that when local literacies are valued and perceived as legitimate forms of knowledge, children, teachers, and the communities become empowered. Because of the gaze of traditional social science and humanities research, indigenous knowledge has been undervalued for too long. These misguided perceptions, Stitzlen (2009) argues, are not only a social construction but a way of perceiving people. Her discussion also speaks to the connection between race and hegemonic language ideologies that privilege high-status language which this thesis focuses on: “the Greeks distinguished themselves from the barbarians in terms of speech (the Greeks believed the
barbarian could only utter “bar, bar, bar”), brutish behavior, and comportment” (Stitzlen, 2009, p. 403). Furthermore, “The English characterized the Irish by their habits of conduct and communication: their brutish social skills, immoral lawlessness, and uncivilized manner of speech”, deeming them “savage”, a term used to delineate all others who exhibited habits, values, and laws that differed from the English (Stitzlen, 2009, p. 403). These examples illustrate how (mis)representations of essentialized racial identities are contrasted with perceived superiority and civility of English Whiteness, and therefore, the English language. According to Stitzlen (2009), many historians have examined race in terms of biological differences; interestingly though, while many have studied race “in terms of how the body appears, few have studied race in terms of what the body does” (p. 402, original emphasis), and even fewer have studied how the body speaks. Stitzlen (2009) notes that theorists of social constructivism agree race is “a product of social practices, language systems, aesthetic values and divisive behaviors” (Stitzlen, 2009, p. 401, emphasis mine). It is here that Phillipson’s (1992) conception of linguicism becomes particularly relevant as it highlights how local dialects are stigmatized, thus resulting in an “unequal division of power and resources” (p. 55). Phillipson (1992) argues that “Like racism, linguicism may be conscious or unconscious on the part of the actors, and overt or covert. It may be of an abstract kind (regulations for the use of particular languages) or more concrete (resources allocation to one language but not others)” (p. 55); this notion of linguicism is useful to this research because it helps illuminate the intricate relationship between racialized speech and racialized bodies; this is a significant correlation because “race” is often overlooked. The emphasis on the connection between language, power, and race become more explicit as we delve deeper into how language and race operate in and through social actors and practices. Building on this connection, the next part of the discussion extends the anti-racism discourse
presented thus far by focusing on the link between language ideologies and race, highlighting issues of power and legitimacy.

**Where Language Meets Race: Yuh see my skin…Dats why I speak so.**

> You may have dark skin, we tell them, but you must not sound Black (Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 63, emphasis original).

Mufwene (1997), Lippi-Green (1997), and Amin (2005) acknowledge the political nature of language and recognize the inherent politics that underpin language ideology. Mufwene (1997) posits that Kachru’s (1996) World Englishes have been subject to the discourse of legitimate and illegitimate language and underscores the saliency of race within this discourse: The legitimate offspring are roughly those varieties spoken typically by descendants of Europeans around the world, whereas the illegitimate ones are those spoken primarily by populations that have not fully descended from Europeans” (Mufwene, 1997, p.182). Mufwene (1997) posits that all varieties of English are, in fact, legitimate as there is wide-agreement amongst linguists that no language is linguistically superior or inferior to another: “All new Englishes are natural developments and legitimate offspring, although some look more like their ancestors than others do” (p. 197). This argument is, however, problematic because it negates the sociopolitical context and downplays the significance of race in determining how these seemingly “natural developments” occurred. By emphasizing ecological factors, such as language contact, Mufwene (1997) eliminates race as a factor, resulting in language change being positioned as a natural, evolutionary process: “The processes that produced all of them [legitimate English] are of the same kind, although not the same changes apply in all cases” (p. 196). This reductionist approach to language spread completely negates the sociopolitical nature of language spread as discussed in chapter one and downplays power dynamics. Similarly, Loss (2000), Rubio-Marin
(2003), and Wright (2004) downplay the significance of recognizing the politics of English and its embedded power dynamics. What makes it comfortable for these theorists not to acknowledge race and simply overlook the unequal power dynamics at play? Perhaps, it is because the instrumental value of English is more practical rationale that fits easily into instrumentalist language ideologies that view English as merely a communicative tool. These authors highlight the instrumental value of English, its economic value, practicality, and logistical appeal. They present English as a viable lingua franca, thus negating its gatekeeper function, colonial history, and the ways in which particular kinds of knowledges are produced, reproduced, and constructed. Loss (2000), Rubio-Marín (2003), and Wright (2004) recognize that "[g]lobalisation is thus far an affair that touches elites far more than other groups, and having access to the technology divides the world in to the haves and have-nots" (Wright, 2004, pp. 158-159); however, they still maintain that "[English] is not only being learnt because it gives access to the power and prestige of a centre, but because it enables the flows networks and structures of an increasingly postnational system" (Wright, 2004, p. 177). The above approaches to language and policy not only mask race as factor in language change but also negate the politics of English. Lippi-Green (1997) attempts to bridge this gap as she problematizes the discourse of standard languages.

Lippi-Green (1997) defines how the concept of a standard language informs our understanding of language ideology and is strikingly reminiscent of the way minoritized bodies are positioned as “the Other”: “we speak of one standard and in opposition, non-standard, or substandard. This is the core of an ideology of standardization” (Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 59). To what extent an ideology of standardization makes room for non-standard speakers is telling: From the 1989 version of Oxford English Dictionary, as cited in Lippi-Green (1997), accent is [t]he mode of
utterance _peculiar_ to an individual, locality, or nation…This utterance consists mainly in a prevailing quality of tone, or in a _peculiar_ alteration of pitch, but may include _mispromunciation_ of vowels or consonants, _misplacing_ of stress, and _misinflection_ of a sentence. The locality of a speaker is generally clearly marked by this kind of accent” (Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 58, emphasis mine). In her book, _English with an Accent_, she illustrates how non-standard speakers are stigmatized. For example, James Kahakua, a native of Hawaii and a bilingual speaker of English and Hawaiian Creole English (HCE), was not promoted because of his Hawaiian accent. The speech pathologist who testified at his trial attested that it was possible to reduce his accent “if the individual is totally committed to improving” (Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 45). Mr. Kahakua sued his employer under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, on the basis of language traits linked to national origin, and lost. The judge believed that it was reasonable to expect radio announcers to speak “Standard English”. Lippi-Green (1997) argues, however, that “Mr. Kahakua can no more comply with the demand that he completely lose his native phonology—his accent—than he could comply with an order of the judge to grow four inches, or, and much more controversially, than it would be possible for him to change the color of his skin” (Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 45). Furthermore, Lippi-Green (1997) observes that “[w]e do not, cannot under our laws, ask people to change the color of their skin, their religion, their gender, but we regularly demand of people that they suppress or deny the most effective way they have of situating themselves socially in a world” (p. 63). Since overtly discriminating on the basis of race is prohibited by law, language (perhaps in the same way as religion, gender, class, or sexuality) becomes a euphemism for race that is a more palatable and socially accepted form of discrimination: thus, “[i]nstead of stigmatizing the physical characteristics of blacks—which is the essence of racism—one stigmatizes the characteristics of their speech” (Bonfiglio, 2002, p. 238). Lippi-Green (1997) lays
out a model of the language subordination process (see Figure 1). Her model demonstrates how the discourse of authority (Wahab, 2005) and the discourse of a standard language (Lippi-Green, 1997) are used to denigrate, devalue, and delegitimize non-dominant languages. Although the model itself does not speak to race specifically, we will see how anti-racism scholars have illuminated the correlation.

In the same way as the standardization discourse marginalizes non-dominant language, Amin (2005) points out that nativist discourse speaks to the same exclusion; however, where other scholars have highlighted power, Amin extends the discourse of language utilizing the discourse of anti-racism: “Nativist discourse positions non-white women and men living in First World societies as non-native to the nation” (Amin, 2000, as cited in Amin, 2005, p. 184), arguing that “ELT, then, is a site where discourses of colonialism, racism, and sexism intersect to produce and mark women and men from the Third World as permanent Others when they speak what was once the language of the colonizers—English” (Amin, 2005, p. 184). This marker of difference is in racial terms as the “native speaker of English” then, is code phrase for white speakers of English from the core English-speaking countries of the First World (Païkeday, 1985 as cited in Amin, 2005, p. 183). Amin (2005) recognizes the connection between language, power, and race, underscoring the need to address the way in which legitimacy, or rather perceptions of legitimacy inform how we perceive and make valued judgments about native English speakers and non-native English speakers:

Those girls who shone in the English class had a reputation of being intelligent and cultured; those who did well in Urdu were either ignored or identified as being from a lower class. However, within the walls of the convent schools it was made clear that native speakers were
the real and true speakers of English, and Pakistanis could never make such a claim. We understood that only white people were native speakers (Amin, 2005, p. 185).

Like Bourdieu’s (1991) notion of symbolic power and Phillipson’s (2008) notion of linguistic imperialism, Amin (2005) calls attention to the perceived superiority of “native” English speakers; however, as an anti-racist scholar, she centers her discussion on the saliency of race by recognizing that white un/racialized bodies were perceived to be the authentic “native” speakers. However, she does not emphasize resistance. Instead, the marginalized are positioned as helpless, passive receivers of dominance, undermining the goal of anti-racism research, which is, in part, to empower and create room for difference where difference already exists. Amin (2005) notes that indigenized varieties of English found in such places as India, Kenya, and Jamaica, (and, I add, Japan and Trinidad and Tobago) are linguistically legitimate varieties of English, even though they are stigmatized (Amin, 2005, p. 187).

The discourse of anti-racism exposes hegemony in language ideology by disrupting the notion that “[a]ny speech that is different from that constructed norm is called an accent” (Matsuda, 1991, p. 1361 as cited in Amin, 2005, p. 190). Lippi-Green’s (1997) case studies support Clark’s (1989) observation that the “dominant language groups feel perfectly empowered to reject their role, and to demand that a person with an accent carry the majority of responsibility in the communicative act” (p. 70). Because the dominant language group expects that the minority language speaker to know the dominant language, the minority language speaker is clearly put in a more vulnerable position because he or she is burdened with the responsibility to make the communicative act comprehensible so that the dominant language speaker understands. This demonstrates imbalance illustrates the subtle ways power and racism play out in every day communication experiences.
Another telling study in Lippi-Green (1997) explores 24 Disney films and examines how language variety is linked with each character’s race, national origins, or ethnicities. The findings suggest that “[c]haracters with strongly positive actions and motivations are overwhelmingly speakers of socially mainstream varieties of English” while the remaining characters often spoke non-mainstream “varieties of English linked to specific geographical regions and marginalized social groups” (Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 101). Although Lippi-Green is not an anti-racism scholar, the issue of race is riddled throughout her analysis without actually naming “race”. On the other hand, Amin (2005) identifies a clear connection between “foreign accents” and racialized bodies. She astutely observes that “it is not all foreign accents, but only accents linked to skin that isn’t white, or which signals a third-world homeland, that evokes such negative reactions” (Lippi-Green, 1997, pp. 238-239 as cited in Amin, 2005, p. 82). Poignantly, both Amin (2005) and Lippi-Green (1997) highlight the salience of race within the context of language, emphasizing issues of power, privilege, and racism that underpin every day communicative acts. Languages and perceived accents must be viewed as “ways of knowing, ways of socializing, and nonverbal communication” (Battiste, 2008, p. 504), but it is important that we can expand our understanding of language as not just a site of knowledge but as a tool of resistance. In the following section, language as site of possibility and tool of resistance is discussed within the context of Trinidad and Tobago. In order to facilitate this discussion, historical references are described to contextualize popular language ideologies that perpetuate the education and system during the British colonial period.
The Historical Context of English Language Education in Trinidad and Tobago.

Where yuh come from?

To begin, the historical context of English language education in Trinidad and Tobago must be considered. The Indian history in the Caribbean begins with the official abolition of slavery in 1838, as Mehta (2003) describes. Because the European sugarcane plantation owners could not legally require African slaves to work the fields, they had to come up with an incentive that would appeal to workers. Peoples from largely agricultural provinces in India, such as Bihar and Uttar Pradesh, answered to the seductive nature of colonialism, hoping for better financial security, prospects of new land, and a more prosperous future for their families (Mehta, 2003 and Cudjoe, 1985). Although there seems to be some discrepancy of the exact year the Indians voluntarily came to Trinidad as indentured labourers, the literature suggests that East Indians began arriving somewhere between 1843 and 1846, resulting in linguistic, cultural, social, and institutional changes (Mehta, 2003 and Cudjoe, 1985). Cudjoe (1985) points out that the linguistic transition was not easy or welcomed; The Reverend John Morton, founder of the Canadian Missions in Trinidad and Tobago notes: Between 1868 and 1915, “they [presumably East Indians and Africans] were “dumped down among strangers, without interpreters to smooth their way, or a friend to advise and lead them; or without the government to act as guardian” (Cudjoe, 1985, p. 11). Like many former British colonies, Cudjoe (2003) notes that during the 1860s, Trinidad was linguistically diverse: African language such as Ibo, Hausa, and Akan as well as East Indian languages such as Tamil and Hindi (Hindustani) were commonly spoken. Cudjoe (2003) also highlights that resistance to British colonialism was maintained through storytelling, religion, cultural beliefs, music, and ideas about family organization. In order to subvert attempts of resistance, the colonizers prohibited
religious practices, exacting tremendous penalties against violators; banned the playing of African drums; and outlawed the practice of Obeah, ordering practitioners to be jailed and flogged. They also delegitimized African forms of marriage and concubinage by promoting European monogamous forms of marriage and demeaned the importance of African [and Indian] language in the society (Cudjoe, 2003, p. 174, insertion mine).

Further attempts were made to devalue the culture, language, and traditions. Most notably two historians, Lord Macaulay and Lord Acton, failed to recognize the diverse cultural and linguistic knowledges of the Trinidadians by devaluing the knowledge and denigrating its cultural and linguistic value to the local people:

I have translations of the most celebrated Arabic and Sanskrit works….I have never found one among them who could deny that a single shelf of good European library was worth the whole narrative literature of India and Arabia (Macaulay, 1834 as cited in Mahabir, 1985, p. 37).

In light of the above sentiment, Mahabir (1985) vehemently argues that “the history of my forefathers has to be rewritten” and thus re-interpreted (p. 36). In doing so, Mahabir (1985) recognizes the great injustice and oversight of valuable knowledges and draws attention to unfair (mis/interpretations of the literary tradition of Trinidad and Tobago. However, more than just drawing attention the injustices Mahabir (1985) and Cudjoe (1985) (2003), more significantly, highlight local acts of resistance to British colonialism that have previously been silenced under the gaze of Eurocentric historical analysis that has historically oppressed and negated the legitimacy of the languages, literature, and knowledges of the local people of Trinidad and Tobago.
**Resistance and Empowerment**

This thesis suggests that viewing English as simultaneously a mechanism of oppression and mode of resistance is also useful in highlighting Spivak’s (1988) notion of the *subaltern*. In re-telling history and re-thinking how language is perceived, the subaltern can and will speak. According to Spivak (1988), however, dominant voices and traditional epistemologies do not allow the subaltern to speak. This must change. However, in order for there to be change, it is imperative that language ideology be critically interrogated: Tollefson (1991) explains that “[i]f linguistic minorities learn the dominant language, so the argument goes, then they will not suffer economic and social inequality. This assumption is an example of an *ideology*, which refers to normally unconscious assumptions that come to be seen as common sense” (p. 10). This common sense approach assumes that (a) minority languages must always assimilate to dominate languages; (b) minority languages are inherently not as valuable as dominant languages; and (c) only dominant languages are worthy of institutionalization. All assumptions marginalize and lead to stigmatization at the expense of local language, granting privilege to dominant language speakers. The logistical impractically of accommodating linguistic diversity is often at the base of every argument that aims to rationalize why minority languages are (or should be) excluded from social institutions. Interestingly, there seems to be an overwhelming acceptance amongst scholars who support linguistic assimilation that suggests minority language rights must come from the bottom-up. What does this suggest about the possible future for minority languages who do not have strong support from the community to preserve/revitalize/ or institutionalize that particular language?

Cudjoe notes that resistance in the form of civil disobedience such as in singing, dancing, or fleeing was integral to the negotiation of identity and place in the new society. Festivals such as
the French Carnival, La Davina Pastora (or the Siparia Fete), and Ramayana (a Hindu epic) were remade and imbued with “their own likeness by invigorating it with their own values, desires, and feelings” (Cudjoe, 2003, p. 176). (This “language refuguration” example is not unique to the Trinidad and Tobago context but can be seen in the work of Mary Louise Pratt (2002) which details how Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala in Cuzco in 1615 generated a 1200 page manuscript addressed to King Philip II of Spain. This work is particularly notable because the language used was the minority language Quechua and appropriated Spanish. This effort underscored the history Spanish exploitation and abuse in an attempt to expose the conquest of Inca for what it truly was—an abusive act of exploitation). This reinvention/refuguration was perceived, however, as a threat to the dominant colonial authority and resulted in their prohibition. Moreover, Cudjoe (2003) points out that the English language was not merely adopted because of hegemonic language ideologies but were challenged and resisted by parents. Parents kept children away from Ward Schools, that is, until “English authorities imposed the English language upon Trinidadians” (Cudjoe, 2003, p. 186).

According to Cudjoe (1985), despite the “tendency to look upon the speech of our East Indian forbears as “primitive” or “broken” or to depict it, and by definition the people, as ignorant of all civilized attitudes”, a conscious attempt was made to prove the legitimacy of Creole grammar (Cudjoe, 1985, p. 25). In 1887 J.J. Thomas sought to validate the Creole grammar: “pidgins and Creoles are not wrong versions of other languages but, rather new languages” (Cudjoe, 2003, p. 190). This sentiment reinforced what linguists such as Kachru (1996) emphasize in discussions surrounding World Englishes. By the 1880s, calypso was viewed as a common art form which also reinforces the theme of resistance: “[c]an’t beat we drum/In my own, own native land/ Can’t have we Carnival/ In my own, my native land” (Mahabir, 1985, p. 258). In light of this, both
calypso and the J. J. Thomas Creole grammar publication can be viewed as sites of resistance in which the people of Trinidad negotiated their linguistic identity and resisted hegemonic modes of institutional, cultural, social, and linguistic oppression. Interestingly, both music and grammar as sites of resistance supports Pennycook’s (1994) observation that English can be viewed simultaneously as oppressive and liberating. In line with this view, within the context of Sri Lanka, Canagarajah (2005a) calls attention to the need for scholars to recognize the agency of the subaltern: “[s]cholars should recognize the agency of subaltern communities to negotiate language politics in creative and critical ways that transcend the limited constructs formulated to either cynically sweep aside or unduly romanticize language rights” (Canagarajah, 2005a, p. 418). By making voices heard through the recognition of agency of the subaltern communities, resistance and transformation can take place. Pennycook (1994) draws on Achebe’s and Wa Thiong’o’s view on decolonization within the context of the role of English. He notes that for Achebe, English is seen as a tool to express the African experience, whereas for Wa Thiong’o’ to use English as form of cultural expression is akin to perpetuating colonialism. Pennycook (1994) observes that this dichotomy, Achebe’s English as a form of resistance and Wa Thiong’o’s English as mechanism of oppression, underscores that “Language is not merely a means to engage in struggle but it is also a principal site of struggle” (p. 265, original emphasis).

Colonialism imposed its control of the social production of wealth through military conquest and subsequent political dictatorship. But its most important area of domination was the mental universe of the colonized, the control through culture, of how people perceived themselves and their relationship to the world. Economics and political control can never be complete or effective without mental control. To control a people’s is to control its tools of self-definition in relationship to others. For colonialism this involved
two aspects of the same process: the destruction, or the deliberate undervaluing of a people’s culture, its art, dances, religions, history, geography, education, orature and literature; and the domination of a people’s language by that of the colonizing nation (Wa Thiong’o’, 1985, p. 118 as cited in Pennycook, 1994, pp. 61-62).

For Wa Thiong’o’ (1985), it seems that the use of English to express the local experience undermines the project of decolonization and overlooks the hegemonic language ideologies that underpin how and why English was taught in Trinidad: “[d]eliberate steps were taken simultaneously to stamp out European languages other than English, as well as the vestiges of local languages that had lingered on the scene” (London, 2003, p. 102). London (2003a) adeptly points out that the mission of schooling was to “sanitize” the unclean varieties of languages (and Englishes that developed) in favor of the “cleaner” British English. This had significant consequences that impact the way in which Trinidadian English is, even today, stigmatized for being “incorrect” or “broken”. These seemingly commonsensical assumptions “help to sustain existing power relationships (Barakett and Cleghorn, 2000), but as ideology builds these assumptions into the institutions of society, privilege gets frozen (Giddens, 1987), legitimacy is conferred, and ideology appears as a “natural condition” (as cited in London, 2003a, p. 99). Because “[a]s Canagarajah (2000) put it in the case of Sri Lanka, the English language has become “too deeply rooted” in local soil and in the consciousness of the local to be considered alien” (Canagarajah, 2000, as cited in London, 2003, pp. 97-98), and likewise, “Trinidad and Tobago is one of those nations where policy makers do not consider English language dominance problematic” (London, 2003, p. 97). In contrast to the view that English language dominance is not problematic, this thesis makes the argument that English as the dominant and as the only legitimate language in a previously non-dominant English speaking population is
highly problematic because it negates significant social and cultural heritages from the education curriculum and perpetuates institutional racism through the devaluation of the local people’s heritage language(s)\(^\text{14}\). A closer look at specific educational practices and policies further highlight the problematic, sociopolitical nature of English language education in Trinidad and Tobago.

**English Education in Trinidad and Tobago: *Yuh must learn to talk “proper” English***

London (2002/2003a/2003b) has done extensive work describing and analysing the way in which teaching and learning English in Trinidad occurred. Although London employs an ethno-historical/structural perspective informed by post-colonial thought, which highlights the ways in which dominant groups were able to exhibit and maintain power over subordinate groups, he is effective in highlighting how the project to “civilize” the indigenous peoples of Trinidad worked in favour of the colonizers.

**English Schooling.**

Teaching and learning English became institutionalized through Christian missionaries and was later reinforced after the emancipation of slavery in 1834. In successive years, the importance and teaching and learning English became more prominent: “Pride of place was accorded to the subject, so much so that some have argued that during this early period of colonization ‘school was English and English was school’” (London, 2003b, p. 287). With this in mind, London (2003b) closely scrutinizes the micropolitics that have helped reinforce the primacy allotted to English in Trinidad and draws on Pennycook to explain how English was used as a management tool:

\(^\text{14}\) In “The Heritage Languages of Trinidad and Tobago”, Ferreira (2013) underscores the revitalized interest in learning about heritage languages at the tertiary level.
Policies about providing or withholding an education in English were not simple questions to do with the medium of instruction . . . but rather were concerned with different views of how best to run a colony . . . A study of policies around English-language education, therefore, can give important insights into the more general operations of colonialism. Such an understanding has considerable significance for understanding current language policies (Pennycook, 1998, p. 20. as cited in London, 2003b, p. 290).

The above excerpt underscores the need to look more critically at how language policies are formed, especially since, in London (2002/2003a/2003b), there is overwhelming evidence that supports the argument that English language teaching favoured linguistic assimilation through the degradation and devaluing of local knowledges.

Through pedagogical management, regulatory methods, and evaluation reports, the English curriculum demonstrates “[a]n overarching imperative was that colonialism must civilize its “Others” and fix them into a state of perpetual otherness” (London, 2003b, p. 294). Tellingly, “[t]he intention was never to make “Englishmen” out of the boys and girls taught, but to produce a hybrid class who would appreciate, respect, and put the highest value on the English language and British culture, the indigenous counter parts having been devalued” (London, 2003b, p. 313; also see Bhabha, 1994 for hybridization). The following infamous statement by Lord Macaulay further supports the assimilative approach to nation-building: “[w]e must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect” (London, 2003b, p. 314). However, without the appropriate regulatory modalities as London (2003b) describes, becoming English was not an easy mission as it required systematic coercion:
The 1948 call for systematic drill in “basic speech” and the 1938 directive for more attention to the phonic plan outlined were not merely guidelines that may or may not have been followed. More appropriately they were pronouncements. They came with the understanding that penalty would be the result of noncompliance, and they constituted a coercive measure applied with some degree of finality (p. 311).

London (2003b) observes that deliberate attempts were taken to systematically “stamp out bad English” (Trinidad and Tobago Department of Education, 1942, p. 124 as cited in London, 2003b, p. 303). In order to maintain control and perpetuate the supremacy of English, London (2003a/2003b) demonstrates that the learners themselves as well as the teachers were subject to penalties, further legitimating and institutionalizing English. Textbooks, pedagogical strategies, and emphasis on grammar examined by London (2003a) further demonstrate how English knowledge was glorified at the expense of indigenous knowledge. For example, London (2003a) notes that British textbooks and pronunciation cards were used to stamp out bad English. Titles such as *English for the English* and *The Teaching of the Mother Tongue*, from London (2003a), are telling examples of what language counts, or more specifically what knowledge *counts*. In terms of pedagogy, patterned reading, repetition, and imitation were used to fix “bad English”. As one teacher during the colonial period notes, “[a] determined effort should be made to counteract the harmful influence of speech in the home and the street on the English of the school. Perhaps educational outings and contact with children who speak better would tend to minimize the evil” (Department of Education, 1939, p. 81 as cited in London, 2003a, p. 104).

More importantly, however, this vilification of languages in opposition to English illustrates how systematic steps were taken to ensure “proper” British English was not only valorised but
internalized as “correct”, “proper”, and, ultimately, “civilized” at the expense of local languages. It is here that Bourdieu’s (1991) notion of symbolic power and legitimate language becomes particularly helpful. Since immense concern was given to grammar to instill a sense of linguistic order (and perhaps social order?), teaching English was (and is) synonymous with devaluing the legitimacy of Trinidadian English and negating the existence (and pre-existence) of indigenous languages as culturally and linguistically valuable sources of legitimate knowledge. This knowledge was produced and reproduced demonstrating one way English was legitimated and maintained at institutional and individual levels: “legitimate language is a semi-artificial language which has to be sustained by a permanent effort of correction, a task which falls both to institutions specially designed for this purpose and to individual speakers” (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 60). Thus, the colonial imposition of English ensured that local languages and “bad Englishes” were viewed as “valueless, repugnant, and counterproductive” to the progress of civilisation (London, 2003b, p. 307). By the time Trinidad reached independence on August 31st, 1961, “the last nail in the coffin of linguistic heritage” was driven and “all the roots of indigenous languages ever spoken in Trinidad and Tobago were effectively dead. They could be found only in the folklore, calypso and Creole” (London, 2003b, p. 309). Language correction methods permeated the English language curriculum and the local people were not afforded the opportunity to have a say in curriculum content creation or pedagogical approaches:

The aspirations of the colonized were for the most part ignored. Colonial administrators, when they took interest in education at all, were concerned with training literate clerks who could staff the lower ranks of the civil service.... The thread that ran through all colonial education was the fact that it was offered by the colonizer
without the input or consent of the colonized (Kelly & Altbach, 1978, p. 20 as cited in London, 2002, p. 56).

This oppressive approach to language planning and policy in education is not simply a matter of a poor, misinformed pedagogical approach to education. It is an example of a deliberate, ethnocentrically racist attempt to intentionally erase and devalue the history of the people of Trinidad and Tobago:

Schooling was intended to inculcate into the colonized a world view of voluntary subservience to the ruling groups, and a willingness to continue to occupy positions on the lowest rungs of the occupational and social ladder. A number of effective strategies were used in the process, but the most significant among these were the instructional programmes and teaching methodologies used in colonial schools (London, 2002, p. 57).

Thus, the sociopolitical, colonial history cannot be simply ignored. London (2003a) argues that “resulting from the [English entrenchment] exercise was the notion that English, and English only, had a literary heritage, elaborate stylistic variations and cultural achievements worthy of respect, preservation and transmission” (p.109). Because of these deeply-rooted ideologies of English, London suggests that “English will in all probability maintain its position of dominance into the foreseeable future in Trinidad and Tobago” (London, 2003b, p. 287). However, if this is true, then, building on Cudjoe’s (1985) earlier suggestion that the (linguistic) history of Trinidad should be rewritten, this thesis suggests that by exploring the connection between language, power, and race, language planners and policymakers in education (in Trinidad and elsewhere) can create a more inclusive, linguistically diverse curriculum that recognizes and legitimizes its language diversity, teaches heritage languages, and values difference. London (2003a) acknowledges some changing attitudes toward learning heritage languages, but there is so much
more potential for language education policy to go beyond fulfilling its role (under language context) as outlined in the Trinidad and Tobago Ministry of Education Strategic Report 2010 “Vision for Our Children”\textsuperscript{15}. Instead, there must be a focused attempt to critically engage in conscious sociopolitical understandings of the history of English language education in Trinidad and Tobago. Critical engagement in language, power, and race issues will help better inform language education policies and practices in Trinidad and Tobago so that they do not continue to implement a curriculum which is based on racist, institutionalized practices of English language education coercion and oppression. Pousada (2011), as well as comparative education scholars and anti-racism researchers, agree that schools are sites where knowledge and practices are legitimized and can be transformed:

Schools may contribute greatly to the legitimization of a language plan by imbuing it with the prestige that a formal education conveys to its products. In this sense, the schools help to change language attitudes among the populace and create a space in which language change can be seen as desirable (Pousada, 2011, p. 3).

The above reinforces how schooling operationalizes the legitimating of knowledge, which is why it is imperative to consider the way in which language education policies have the strong potential to resist and transform racist, institutionalized practices of English language education coercion and oppression that marginalize minority language speakers, opening up possibility for (re)learning heritage languages that were “stamped out”. Interestingly, the Ministry of Education of Trinidad and Tobago Primary School Curriculum identifies the language context as “the co-existence of two linguistic systems, English Creole and Standard English” and maintains that this

\textsuperscript{15} Here are three specific objectives outlined by the Trinidad and Tobago Ministry of Education Strategic Report 2010: “Educate and develop the children of our nation” (p. 30); Be “Proficient in a second language” (p. 33); Be “Historically aware, including knowledge of our people” (p. 35). Tellingly, none of these objectives specify which languages or even identify heritage languages as a possibility for educational development.
existence “poses problems for learners of English”. This perspective, even though it claims that “[b]oth systems are valued”, is clearly not reflective of sociopolitical history of language(s) in Trinidad and Tobago. In fact, there is a widespread absence of an “explicit language policy with a clear statement on the role of other languages (international, minority, heritage and so on)” (Robertson, 2010, p. 16). This disconnect between what the primary school curriculum states is valued and what the curriculum truly values is part of the challenge language/education policymakers must critically engage in if true inclusiveness regarding the sociolinguistic realities is to be achieved:

Trinidad and Tobago, and indeed the entire Commonwealth Caribbean, has the advantage of already having English, a language of global significance, within its historic experience. This, however, should not lead to the unquestioned acceptance of English as the preferred language of education especially in the context of national and regional sociolinguistic realities (Robertson, 2010, p. 23).

Although the above quote identifies English for its instrumental value in connecting with the global world, Robertson (2010) recognizes the significance of sociolinguistic reality. It is imperative that policymakers, researchers, and practitioners do not take the role of English for granted, as Wren (2000) pointed out, and must work toward challenging “the negative image and the factors that have hampered the integration of P/Cs [Pidgins and Creoles] into the educational domain. Indeed, P/Cs continue to be stigmatized both by others and by their very speakers in educational systems and beyond” (Migge, Léglise, & Bartens, 2010, p. 3, insertion mine). By

---

16 I would like to thank and acknowledge Renée Figuera once again for providing me with the following valuable resource: See Migge, Léglise, and Bartens (2010), Creoles in Education: An Appraisal of Current Programs and Projects. This work is an excellent resource that demonstrates how language and pedagogy can be sites of transformation and resistance, not just in policy but in practice.
recognizing the stigma and by taking active steps to (re)construct P/Cs in a formal education setting is a profoundly laudable example of transformation and resistance.

Taking the sociopolitical/sociohistorical context of language education in Trinidad and Tobago one step further, this thesis now turns its attention to The Charter on Language Policy and Language Rights in the Creole-speaking Caribbean (2011) an example of a site of resistance that is imbued with possibilities that lead to more inclusive transformation in the context of language education.

**Resistance and Transformation through Policy: A Look Ahead**

The Charter on Language Policy and Language Rights in the Creole-speaking Caribbean was developed based on extensive scientific research done on Creole languages throughout the Caribbean for over five decades. Against this background, linguists and Creole language activists are now pressing for the recognition of the right of persons who speak Creole languages throughout the Caribbean through the implementation of the Charter by governments and other public bodies (International Centre for Caribbean Language Research, 2013).

The International Centre for Caribbean Language Research has been involved in promising research that is aimed at “ensur[ing] that the language rights of Caribbean citizens are protected throughout the region” (International Centre for Caribbean Language Research, 2013). The above is meant to illustrate how policy initiatives, through education, can resist the perceived superiority of English dominated policies and call for transformative approaches that entail more inclusivity. The Charter itself defines language rights as both “individual” and “collective” (The Charter on Language Policy and Language Rights in the Creole-speaking Caribbean, 2011). The Charter also recognizes the role of education in regard to language production and knowledge
but does not emphasize revitalization of heritage languages. Below is an excerpt from Article 24 that speaks to education in schools:

1. Education must help to foster the capacity for linguistic and cultural self-expression of the language communities of the territory where it is provided.

2. Education must help to maintain and develop the languages spoken by the language communities of the territory where it is provided.

3. Initial instruction in one’s first language is crucial as it enhances conceptual development, language acquisition and development, learning in general, and education of the child.

4. Education must always be at the service of linguistic and cultural diversity and of harmonious relations between different language communities throughout the world.

5. Within the context of the foregoing principles, everyone has the following rights:
   - to at least initial instruction and literacy in their first language;
   - to learn the territorial languages of the territory in which he/she resides;
   - to learn any other language.

6. Education in one’s first language should be continued for as long as is practical.

Thus, even though strides were made to recognize linguistic difference in the context of education, the Charter is still predicated on an instrumentalist language ideology that emphasizes (a) the practicality of language use (see number 3 and 6 above); (b) homo-genistic language ideology that alludes to a sense of nation-building (see number 2); and (c) hegemonic language ideology that emphasizes how language can be used to create conflict-free “harmonious” relationships between nations and people within nations (see number 4). Again, even though these three particular limiting language ideologies permeate the discourse of the Charter, especially in regard to education, this thesis still recognizes (and I somewhat applaud) the
concerted effort to resist “English-only” recognition (and legitimacy) initiatives in institutional domains. Specifically, in Part 2 of the Charter, references are made to public administration, official bodies, and socioeconomic spheres as shown here: “[a]ll language communities are entitled to the official use of their territorial languages and have the right to interact with and be served by public authorities in any territorial language” (International Centre for Caribbean Language Research, 2011, Article 12, 1). Therefore, although the issue of English language education has not traditionally been viewed as a problematic/challenging one in the context of Trinidad and Tobago, critical language theory and anti-racism theory offers language policymakers more socially and politically informed articulations that capture the deeply-rooted politics and problematic behind English language education and policy; the Charter is a great step forward to resistance and transformation because it recognizes sociohistorical context and that difference exists. Therefore, even though many linguists and sociolinguists such as Craig (1976) who point out that “Creole or Creole-influenced language has been treated in schools as if it did not exists, or as if it should be eradicated if it existed” (Craig, 1976, p. 98), it is refreshingly appreciative to see that strides are made to resist only-English dominance through acts of resistance at the policy level and through interests in revitalizing heritage languages. Language as heritage, language as resistance, and language as tool for resistance are very real conceptions and practices that have the ability to transform policy, practice, and pedagogy. I end with the below sentiment from Cudjoe (1985) who acknowledges and calls attention to the histories of colonial legacies of East Indian and African heritages there were systematically obliterated through racist language and education policies:

It is important to understand that the heritage of the East Indians is the heritage of all of the people of Trinidad and Tobago. At one level, it is the heritage of a specific group, but
because the East Indians are indeed Trinidadians and Tobagonians, their heritage must be seen as part of the larger national heritage, for it is the collectivity of the African and East Indian heritage (and that of all of the other ethnic groups) that constitutes Trinidad and Tobago's cultural heritage. It is important to grasp that heritage in its totality and to make it meaningful in our lives. The heritage of people is not something one puts up for display but something that one takes and integrates into one's present to create a meaningful future (Cudjoe, 1985, p. 10).

In the final section of this paper, I recap the major themes, synthesize key arguments, address some of the limitations/gaps in this research, and look forward to possible future avenues of research that are relevant to critical language theory, comparative education research, and anti-racism research.
Conclusion: Yuh nah done yet

To conclude, this thesis has focused primarily on two locations (Japan and Trinidad and Tobago) because these two countries are particularly useful in examining ideologies of language, power, and race in both dominant and non-dominant English contexts. With the help of the scholars in critical language theory, comparative education, and anti-racism research, I was able to explore the ideological underpinnings and theoretical gaps between these fields by offering some introductory insights into theorizing language, power, and race. Through case study and theoretical explanations, this thesis reifies that language, power, and race (as real social practices) are too often neglected from discussions around education policies. To review some of the major themes, I revisit the challenge of situating my linguistic identity and briefly recap the central theme of each chapter. Next, I offer suggestions on an “Ideological Readjustment” in opposition to Kachru’s (1982) “Attitudinal Readjustment”. I also identify limitations and make suggestions for future avenues that have the strong potential to enhance the scope of this research. By having used a multiple methodology and interdisciplinary approach to the sociopolitics of English, I hope that the limitations, biases, and shortcomings of this investigation will help serve as lesson to myself (and to other researchers and practitioners) so that more locally-relevant and comparatively contextualized research in the fields of critical language theory, comparative education, and anti-racism research can take place.

Revisiting the Challenge of Situating (my) Linguistic Identity

As a female, as a Trinidadian, as an English speaker, as member of the working class, as a person who embodies race in my skin color, in the food I eat, in the books I read, and in the music I listen to, and in the language(s) I speak—I have felt the gaze that doubts, trivializes, and laughs at my lived experience of race as unscientific research because it challenges the normalcy of
Whiteness, exposes critical intersections between language, power, and race, and resists the blind acceptance of instrumentalist, homo-genetic, hegemonic, and romanticized language ideologies that attempt to justify oppressive education and language policies and pedagogical practices. Anti-racism offers me, the researcher, a way to “stop talking about the other” (bell hooks, 1990 as cited in Wahab, 2005, p. 45) and focus on the self and experiences of the local people as sites of knowledge, possibilities, and transformation. By engaging in critical language theory, comparative education research, and anti-racism research, I was able to highlight the sociopolitics of English, the realness of race, and the legitimacy of multiple ways of knowing.

The research was also able to highlight in a comparative way the context of “global English” language education. This multidisciplinary approach offers critical language theory, comparative education research, and anti-racism research a space to engage in a conversation that highlights the sociopolitics of language education in dominant and non-dominant English speaking contexts that go far beyond vehemently contesting the neutrality of English and Eurocentricity; this research highlights the too often hidden ideologically-rooted assumptions and attitudes that drive the supremacy of English language education within the context of Japan and Trinidad and Tobago and further exacerbates inequalities and inequities.

In chapter one, this thesis challenged the perceived neutrality of English and provided a solid foundation of research that engages in issues of language politics exposing themes of power, inequality, language production, language commodification, racialized embodiments of language, and post-colonial histories of (re)making linguistic identities. In chapter two, this thesis challenged the discourse of native/standard ideology by further highlighting the inextricable relationship between language policy, cultural and national identity, education policy, and equality within the context of Japan. In chapter three, this thesis aimed to
draw attention to anti-racism research in order to challenge the normalcy of social science research by naming race and by bringing to light political, social, and institutional dimensions of English that have helped to perpetuate and sustain its power in Trinidad and Tobago at the expense of indigenous knowledges, languages, and cultures. In all, it is my hope that this thesis provided a relevant balance between theoretical and case study approaches in disseminating the sociopolitical role English language policies play in shaping cultural and national identit(ies), informing education policy, and influencing social perceptions about English language teaching, learning, and use. This investigation has provided just a glimpse of the possibilities for future research that could have a profound impact on the way ideology is operated and perceived, policy is created, and pedagogy is practiced. Scholars in critical language theory, comparative education, and anti-racism have unlimited potential to further tease out issues of power, resistance, and transformation within the context of language education by exploring the inextricable link between language, power, and race.

**Suggesting an Ideological Readjustment: Revising Kachru’s (1982)**

**“Attitudinal Readjustment”**

Based on the research analysis of this thesis, I end this section by revisiting Kachru’s (1982) “Attitudinal Readjustment” (see Appendix 2), and I propose the following “Ideological Readjustment” in opposition to Kachru’s (1982) suggestion:

1) English cannot be viewed as primarily a communicative tool. It is first and foremost embedded in colonial histories and rooted in politics. English is political, and therefore, not neutral.
2) Language is rooted in culture and is context specific. To remove culture from any language is to negate its historical, social, and cultural significance.

3) Language users should feel free to accept and/or critically interrogate the validity of what constitutes “literary tradition”.

4) The discourse of nativist language should be questioned and challenged as this can lead to stigmatization and marginalization.

5) In order for varieties of Englishes to be viewed as a “sufficient model”, the language in question must be legitimated. This is not merely a process of attitudinal readjustments as Kachru (1982) suggests but a process of negotiation between dominant and non-dominant speakers within and across nations.

**Limitations and Future Research Possibilities**

In addition to the above “Ideological Readjustment”, this thesis also calls for more concentration on exploring the relationship between language, power, and race that I alone, without local voices and without spending more time to theorize more deeply and considerably, could not offer here. Untangling the multiplicity of ways language can be understood is much needed in the fields critical language theory, comparative education, and anti-racism studies because, it should also be pointed out, that underlying this discussion on language, power, and race are questions that probe at the very nature of language itself, both in its philosophical underpinnings and its spoken, written, enacted (sign language, for example) expressions. As such, it imperative that all three fields acknowledge the multiple and simultaneous ways language can be perceived and conceived: Language as a marker gender/class/racial identity, language as an embodiment of culture of national identity, language as a source of knowledge(s) and a means to which
knowledge are exchanged and shared, language as a tool of resistance, and language as a
euphemism to mask race (and space). This range of role(s) of language within local contexts will
add even greater value to discussions around language policy and practice because it provides a
clearer understanding of how language operates in an unarguably linguistically plural and
racialized world, both in the classroom and in society. By recognizing the multiplicity of how
language operates, these conceptions challenge purely linguistic (sometimes misinformed)
efforts at revitalization. As Speas (2009) points out, “[l]inguists have a very specialized training
in the analysis of language and are generally fascinated by languages, [it] is not clear that their
skills are the skills that a community needs for revitalizing a language” (Speas, 2009, p. 23). By
acknowledging the inadequacy of linguistic research that negate social, political, cultural, and
ideological factors, Speas (2009) is accurate in calling into question the perceived authority of
linguistic efforts at revitalization and this caution is one that is worth considering before
language revitalization efforts are made. As such, there is much room for critical language
theory, comparative education, and anti-racism research methodology to speak to each other and
engage in a conversation that aims to understand how language operates in and through
structures of power. For in acknowledging the multiple ways language operates, there is also an
implicit affirmation of acknowledging linguistic pluralism, and acknowledging linguistic
pluralism is a step in affirming linguistic pluralism—this affirmation is significant because it
illustrates a step in the direction of affirming the legitimacy of knowledges associated with
languages of racialized bodies, and this realization has great potential to lead transformative
approaches within the context of language education policies and practices. In sum, I hope that
this exploratory investigation, as I see it, is able to fulfil some of its ambitious research aims: to
build (shareable, contestable, practical) research that is relevant. Relevant research has the ability
to disrupt dominant language policies and practices that aim to denigrate, marginalize, and oppress instead of resist, revitalize, and transform.

With the above in mind, it is my hope that this research and other research that aims to shine the light on language, power, and race, has meaningful implications for the classroom practitioner. Unlike policymakers, practitioners, in particular, are in a direct (and powerful) position to respond thoughtfully and considerately to the “ghettoization” argument, as Migge et al. (2010) critique: “[i]n many situations, educators and parents therefore believe that banning the P/C from educational practices and educational institutions is the best approach to improve children’s educational achievements” (Migge et al., 2010, p. 12). By circumventing dominant beliefs that implicitly and explicitly marginalize and (de)legitimatize the knowledge(s) and the expression of students, it is imperative that practitioners make a conscious and sustained effort to create a classroom that does not just tolerate difference but values difference. If language is understood as resistance, identity, and culture as critical language theory and anti-racism research methodology (to some extent) do, there is much opportunity for this research exploration to afford practitioners a set of theoretical tools that empower them to critically interrogate the essentialist textbook images and critique the merits of particular models of teaching that may not fit the local context they work in. More importantly, by providing practitioners with a theoretical framework and multiple methodological lenses into the context of language education, practitioners themselves will be able to see the real impact language, power, and race have within their classroom. The implications of being able to theoretically interrogate language education policies, I hope, will give practitioners the confidence to resist and transform the very same language education policies that mitigate against the development of their local (non-homogenous) communities.
One considerable omission in this paper is my lack of attention to the way gender and class intersect with language, power, and race. I specifically recognize that there has been a distinct gap in the diaspora women writers in the Caribbean and Mehta (2004) draws attention to this:

“[n]otable exceptions to this gap have been the pioneering work of Caribbean scholars such as Rhoda Reddock, Patricia Mohammed, Ramabai Espinet, Verne Shepherd and Bridget Brereton in the fields of social science and cultural studies” (Mehta, 2004, p. 3). With this in mind, I suggest that future research could explore sites of resistance and transformation, opposed to the themes of oppression and sadness that characterize Mehta’s (2004) account of Indo-Caribbean women crossing the Kaal-Pani. In this sense, anti-racism would be able to highlight intersections of gender; such engagement would create a larger space for women writers to engage in such dialogues as language as resistance and language as identity within the context of gender and race.

Another noteworthy possibility for future research that would greatly enhance the scope and depth of this research is Indigenous research methodology. Indigenous research methods critically engage local social actors in such a way that multiple voices are heard. By hearing first-hand experiences that reflect on how language and education policies are perceived and operated in society and by addressing the lived experiences of social actors, this Indigenous research methodology would be able to more critically and more authentically expose the way linguistic identities are negotiated within the context English language education. In Wilson’s (2001) apt articulation, he draws attention to the strong potential of Indigenous research methodology and paradigms:

One major difference between those dominant paradigms and an Indigenous paradigm is that those dominant paradigms build on the fundamental belief that knowledge is an

---

17 See Mehta (2004) for a collection of women writers who chronicle their journey over the Kaal-Pani river.
individual entity: the researcher is an individual in search of knowledge, knowledge is something that is gained, and therefore, knowledge may be owned by an individual. An Indigenous paradigm comes from the fundamental belief that knowledge is relational. Knowledge is shared with all creation. It is not just interpersonal relationships, or just with the research subjects I may be working with, but it is a relationship with all of creation. It is with the cosmos, it is with the animals, with the plants, with the earth that we share this knowledge. It goes beyond the idea of individual knowledge to the concept of relational knowledge (Wilson, 2001, p. 177 as cited in Steinhauer, 2002, p. 71).

The paradigm explained in the passage above is aligned with anti-racism research methodologies because they both aim to reveal relationships not just investigate subjects as objects. They also share other features that are quite similar: they both (1) analyse “the self” as a methodological feature; (2) acknowledge race; (3) expose multiple dimensions of power; (4) recognize difference (class, gender, race, language, histories, sociopolitics); (5) consider the historical, social, and political factors of the local context; (6) seek to engage in knowledge sharing and knowledge building; and (7) question the way knowledges come to be. For this reason, I see a great opportunity for Indigenous research to delve further into discussions that would help further refine the understanding of the relationships between language, power, and race.

**Research Relevance: A Global Perspective**

To end, I would like take a second glimpse at a global perspective and engage in a final effort to contextualize and situate the salient sociopolitics of English (and by extension the role of language, power, and race). In Australia, aboriginal children are made to feel inferior when their accents do not sound like Standard Australian English, reinforcing prejudice and racism (UNESCO, 2010, p. 215). In the United States, Latino, Blacks, and Native American are forced
to participate in a curriculum that neglects the contributions of their ancestors, stereotypes their identity, and glorifies American culture (UNESCO, 2010, p. 219). In Guatemala, Spanish speakers spend six times more years in schools than Qeqchi speakers (UNESCO, 2010, p. 23). Turkish-speakers are 30% more likely to score below the minimum in achievement tests than non-Turkish speakers (UNESCO, 2010, p. 23). There exists a plethora of examples that highlight how linguistic divides are linked to social inequality. The EFA (UNESCO, 2010) highlights that “language and ethnicity lead to marginalization in education through complex channels. Poverty is an important part of the equation”, which can’t be ignored (UNESCO, 2010, p. 24). The EFA (UNESCO, 2011) even identifies language as a key factor in violent conflicts: “over half the countries affected by armed conflict are highly diverse linguistically, making decisions over the language of instruction a potentially divisive political issue” (Pinnock, 2009 as cited in UNESCO, 2011, p. 168). Clearly, language policies raise challenging issues that represent complexity in trying to reconcile/negotiate racial, national, social, and linguistic diversity. Tollefson (1991), like many other scholars in this thesis, recognizes that examining the impact of language policy in order to expose competing interests and power is an illuminating lens worth thoughtful and critical consideration because “language policies often offer opportunity to some while denying it for many” (Tollefson, 1991, p. 204). With this in mind, it is imperative to seriously consider why countries adopt languages and discuss the social implications for unquestionably supporting such policies based on purely instrumentalist language ideologies. This research highlights that “English [should not be] a killer “language,” a “Tyrannosaurus Rex”—a language that “gobbles up others and eliminates local cultural practices” (insertion mine, Phillipson, 1992, p. 122 as cited in Tsui & Tollefson, 2007, p. 43). Instead, we need to examine the relationship between language and equality and its relationship to accessing (and, I
add, perceived access to) social and economic mobility for the most disadvantaged (see Farrell, 2007):

Failure to address inequalities, stigmatization and discrimination linked to wealth, gender, ethnicity, language, location and disability is holding back progress towards Education for All (UNESCO, 2010, p. 16).

Although I find the above quote accurate in accessing relevant issues related to language and language policies, the notion of progress warrants its own discussion, which I was not able to facilitate here. Instead, let it be said that the notion of progress from an evolutionary viewpoint, as Durkheim asserts, is dangerous when applied to societies because it is underpinned with philosophies that deem one society primitive and the other civilized (Fägerlind & Saha, 1989). With this in mind, we must clearly describe what progress is and critically evaluate its meaning. Within the context of progress for language education, we can ask, “Does literacy for all mean English for all?” If yes, and, I believe the answer is sadly a resounding yes, then it is imperative that we reconsider if “Education for All” is really an admirable goal when language policies, politics, international NGOs, and multilateral corporations mitigate against valuing difference in favor of homo-genistic language policies that marginalize minority language speakers in a way that puts them in a social (and at times economic) periphery. We must remember that any discussion of language—whether it be language policy, language education, language status, language rights, or language revitalization—is never really just about language on its own:

---

18 The notion of “progress” can be an oppressive and socially exclusive term if “progress” is measured without considering a model of inequality. For example, the Education for All Global Monitoring Report is underpinned with a (false) notion that equal progress can be achieved even though it acknowledges underlying social inequities that structurally and systematically prevent this from happening. Also, the notion of “progress” in the EFA (UNESCO, 2012) is founded on a discourse that sees education as a key to skills development and economic development and does not identify language as an issue as it did in 2010. While the EFA provides important insights in comparative education, it is imperative to critically examine underlying notions of progress and what it means within both a global and local context. At present, the EFA 2013-2014 (UNESCO, in preparation) is in the process of gathering feedback for their upcoming issue, and it would be particularly interesting to see how language, power, and race operate in future EFA narratives.
Embodied in a language is the history, the beliefs, the cultures, and the values of its speakers. Language and cultural identity are mutually constitutive. The recognition and promotion of the importance of English by non-English-speaking countries, often over and above their own languages, has profound implications for their national and cultural identities (Tsui & Tollefson, 2007, p. 2).

By considering the social and economic privileges that are awarded to particular languages (and not to others), it is no surprise that minority language speakers “choose” English. An illusion of choice, or a deliberate choice for the chance to be more economically and socially mobile? To facilitate this inquiry, local contexts must be considered and linguistic injustices must be acknowledged as racial and social injustices; this paradigm shift is mandatory. Scholars in critical language theory, comparative education, and anti-racism have the theoretical tools both to support this recognition and to empower policymakers and practitioners to transform policy and practices. As such, this thesis invites policymakers and practitioners to go beyond conceiving language as a mere tool of communication. They must recognize that language is connected to history, identity, knowledge, and race—they must recognize that the value we assign to language is the same value we assign to the people who speak the language. They must remember that people who do not speak the majority/dominant language are at an immediate social disadvantage primarily because institutionalized forms of discrimination have reinforced their subordinate status in society. If the goal is to transform oppressive language ideologies that inform policies and practices, then the first step is to boldly engage in the sociopolitics of (English) language education in research, in the classroom, and in society.
Figure 1: Lippi-Green’s (1997) Model of the Language Subordination Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language is mystified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You can never hope to comprehend the difficulties and complexities of your mother tongue without expert guidance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority is claimed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talk like me/us. We know what we are doing because we have studied language, because we write well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misinformation is generated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That usage you are so attached to is inaccurate. The variant I prefer is superior on historical, aesthetic, or logical grounds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-mainstream language is trivialized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look how cute, how homey, how funny.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conformers are held up as positive examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See what you can accomplish if you only try, how far you can get if you see the light.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explicit promises are made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers will take you seriously; doors will open.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threats are made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No one important will take you seriously; doors will close.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-conformers are vilified or marginalized.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See how willfully stupid, arrogant, unknowing, uninformed, and/or deviant and unrepresentative these speakers are.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 68)
Appendix 1: Kachru’s (1996) Concentric Circle Typology

Below is full list of examples taken from Kachru’s concentric circle typology that lists which countries belong to which circles:

The Expanding Circle: China, Egypt, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Korea, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Taiwan, USSR, and Zimbabwe

The Outer Circle: Bangladesh, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, and Zambia.

The Inner Circle: USA, UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand

(Kachru, 1996, p. 138)
Appendix 2: Kachru’s (1982) “Attitudinal Readjustment”

The following text is an abridged selection of Kachru’s (1982) “Attitudinal Readjustment”:

1) Non-native users must view English as a linguistic tool, thereby separating language from its colonial past.

2) English must be viewed as an inherent good which does not necessarily impose Western culture.

3) Non-native users "should accept the large body of English literature written by local creative writers as part of the native literary tradition”.

4) National and international uses must be differentiated as only national uses become non-native English.

5) "Non-native users ought to develop and identity with the local model of English without feelings that it is a "deficient model" as non-native Englishes are subject to their own rules and norms. (Kachru, 1982, p. 67-68).
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