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Abstract

Bilingualism and its impact on the identity of such speakers has been widely discussed in the academic field, yet there is little attention paid to the relationship between bilinguals’ self-perception and their identity as bilingual/non-native English teachers. In our multilingual world, ever greater numbers of bilingual teachers of English can be seen in the Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) profession. This dissertation describes a study of qualitative research based on a case study approach and narrative inquiry of interviewing six bilingual English teachers who were not born in English speaking countries and who are currently studying to obtain their Master’s degrees in TESOL in the U.K. The most unexpected finding that emerged was, despite being fluent in two languages, none of the participants, except one, perceived themselves as being bilingual. Their understanding of being bilingual was different from the way the term is categorised in the literature, based on how well they speak the language, how often it is used and at what age they learnt it. Being equally competent in two languages was most of the participants’ definition of being bilingual. Moreover, most of the participants did not believe that their core identity was changed through being bilingual. The analysis however revealed that all participants were aware of their behavioural changes such as being more open-minded to people from different cultures and more tolerant of differences through intercultural communication. Furthermore, as bilingual/non-native English teachers, the participants felt they were more empathetic towards the needs and problems of their students, having gone through a similar experience themselves and able to share this experience with their students. Finally, the implications of this study for the development of bilingual language teachers in the TESOL field are taken into consideration.
List of Abbreviations

**BE** (teachers): Bilingual (non-native) English (teachers)

**CLT**: Communicative Language Teaching

**ELT**: English Language Teaching

**FDH**: Fundamental Difference Hypothesis

**ICC**: Intercultural Communicative Competence

**L1**: First (native) Language

**L2**: Second (non-native) Language

**NES** (teachers): Native English Speakers/Speaking (teachers)

**NNES** (teachers): Non-Native English Speakers/Speaking (teachers)

**SLA**: Second Language Acquisition

**TESOL**: Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
# Table of Contents

**Chapter 1 Introduction** .......................................................................................................................... 1  
1.1 The Main Theme ................................................................................................................................. 1  
1.2 Rationale for Topic .............................................................................................................................. 2  
1.3 Aims and Scope ................................................................................................................................. 2  
1.4 Structure ........................................................................................................................................ 3  

**Chapter 2 Literature Review** .................................................................................................................. 4  
2.1 Introduction ....................................................................................................................................... 4  
2.2 The Debate of Bilingualism .............................................................................................................. 4  
2.3 The Bilingual Mind ........................................................................................................................... 6  
2.4 Code-Switching ............................................................................................................................... 8  
2.5 The Critical Period for SLA ............................................................................................................. 9  
2.6 Identity Theory ............................................................................................................................... 11  
2.7 Identity in Language Education ....................................................................................................... 13  
2.8 Intercultural Communication ......................................................................................................... 15  
2.9 The Native/Non-Native Debate and the Identity of BE Teachers ................................................. 18  
2.10 Unresolved Issues and Gaps in the Literature .............................................................................. 20  
2.11 Chapter Summary ......................................................................................................................... 20  

**Chapter 3 Research Methodology** .......................................................................................................... 22  
3.1 Introduction ....................................................................................................................................... 22  
3.2 Research Questions ........................................................................................................................... 22  
3.3 Participants ....................................................................................................................................... 23  
3.4 Research Approach ........................................................................................................................... 23  
3.5 Research Instrument ........................................................................................................................ 25  
3.6 Procedure ....................................................................................................................................... 26  
3.7 Data Analysis ................................................................................................................................... 27
Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 The Main Theme

This dissertation explores the area of bilingualism and its impact on the identity of bilingual English (BE) teachers. In the English Language Teaching (ELT) field today, 80% of English language teachers are bilingual/non-native users of English (Canagarajah, 2005), and the number of BE teachers and its research will continue to grow (Braine, 2010). Bilingualism could be simply defined as the ability and knowledge to use two languages where such individuals can be more specifically thought of as ‘balanced bilinguals’ (Butler and Hakuta, 2006; Chin and Wigglesworth, 2007; Baker, 2011; Pavlenko 2012). Defining bilingualism accurately, however, is problematic since individuals with different backgrounds such as age of language acquisition, language proficiency and language use, may all be categorised as being bilingual (Franson, 2009). The number of people who speak multiple languages can be recognised, and as such, various types and levels of bilinguals are evident. Bilingualism or being bilingual can therefore no longer be defined as one specific type. The various perceptions of bilingualism may affect bilinguals’ identity formation and their perceptions of themselves which might lead to BE teachers’ low self-confidence and unstable status in the ELT field (Braine, 1999). The studies of bilingualism and identity are therefore key components of this research.
1.2 Rationale for Topic

Through my personal experiences as a learner and teacher of English, and becoming bilingual, I became interested in the psychological effects that being bilingual can have, particularly with BE teachers.

While teaching in Japan, many of my Japanese students had similar experiences of feeling unsuccessful in communicating with native English speakers. They had problems expressing themselves in English since many aspects of their L1 and cultural background had influenced their learning such as the differences of politeness. Furthermore, I realised, through my own experiences, that the learner’s identity had an impact on learning and achievement. I therefore decided to connect my experiences and understanding to wider theories, and research the psychological impact of language learning on BE teachers’ identity, and its influences on the relationship between language learning and identity formation in the process of becoming bilingual.

1.3 Aims and Scope

This study aims to investigate the effects of bilingualism on the identity of a sample of BE teachers, to provide a better understanding of what impact being a BE teacher has on their own identity, and how the experience of being bilingual has affected their identity as BE teachers by examining their personal histories as learners of English and their professional experiences as teachers of English.

This research seeks answers to the following questions:

1. What effect does the learning of English have on the identity of BE teachers?
2. To what extent has the learning of English affected BE teachers’ ideas of themselves, other people, and the world they live in?

3. When BE teachers speak English, do they think and feel differently or the same as when they speak their first language?

4. Are BE teachers’ beliefs about teaching affected by being bilingual?

For the scope of this study, the term bilingualism will refer specifically to the study of sequential acquisition of bilingualism where a person ‘acquires a first language, and later becomes proficient in the second language’ (Baker, 2011: 116), and to those who are referred to as ‘late bilinguals’ (Butler and Hakuta, 2006; Chin and Wigglesworth, 2007; Pavlenko 2012). In this study, I will therefore use the terms bilinguals or BE teachers to refer to those who have learnt English as their second language (L2) after acquiring their first language (L1). This study excludes native English speakers (NES) who speak other languages.

1.4 Structure

The structure of this dissertation is divided into five chapters. This chapter introduces the main theme, the rationales, aims and scope of this study. Chapter Two will examine the literature relevant to the topic of this study. Chapter Three will provide an overview of the research methodology adopted to answer the research questions. Chapter Four will present an analysis and discussion of the main findings from the research questions. The final concluding chapter will consider the implications of this study and its findings for current professional practice in the field of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).
Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a review and discussion of the literature on the effects of bilingualism on the identity of BE teachers with an overview of bilingualism and identity theory relevant to this study. It starts with the debate of bilingualism followed by the bilingual mind, code-switching and the critical period for second language acquisition (SLA), then moves to the discussion of identity theory and its relation to language education, intercultural communication, and the native/non-native debate and the identity of BE teachers. Pavlenko’s (2003, 2005, 2007, 2011 and 2012) view of bilingualism and Norton’s (1997 and 2000) analysis of the relationship between identity and language learning were used as the main theoretical frameworks of this study because they both study closely bilinguals/L2 learners’ psychological struggles in relation to the social world.

2.2 The Debate of Bilingualism

The classic concept of bilingualism is defined by Bloomfield (1933: 55 cited in Chin and Wigglesworth, 2007: 5) as ‘native-like control of two languages’ whereas Mackey (1962: 52) defines it as ‘the ability to use more than one language’ and Weinreich (1963: 1) defines bilingualism as ‘the practice of alternately using two languages’. Moreover, several classifications of individual bilinguals are introduced in current academic books such as based on language proficiency; the term ‘balanced bilinguals’ refers to those who are equally competent in two languages.
from birth, and the term ‘dominant bilinguals’ refers to those who are more confident in one language than another (Butler and Hakuta, 2006; Chin and Wigglesworth, 2007; Baker, 2011; Pavlenko, 2012).

Many scholars, however, debate about the definition of bilingualism being ambiguous (Loveday, 1982; Bialystok, 2001; Pavlenko, 2007; Chin and Wigglesworth, 2007; Baker, 2011). Researchers raise the issue of defining ‘native-like’ degree of language competence and the existence of two monolinguals in one person concluding that there are no such clear-cut distinctions (Grosjean, 1989; Hamers and Blanc, 1989; Bialystok, 2001; Baker, 2011). Loveday (1982) argues that it is practically impossible to achieve or maintain an absolutely equal level of competence in two languages simultaneously, and says that almost all bilinguals feel that they can express themselves in certain situations and at certain periods better in one particular language than the other. More affirmatively picking up this point, Matsumoto and Juang (2003: 274) propose that:

Many bilinguals are more proficient or fluent in one language or the other. ... differences between languages may actually reflect differences in degree of proficiency rather than linguistic relativity.

Pavlenko (2011) unlocks the mysteries surrounding thinking and speaking in people who speak more than one language. She explores the bilingual mind in order to reverse the monolingualistic trend of the debates of language and thought into a more bilingualistic viewpoint. Pavlenko (2007: 5) also contests:

Bilingualism has been studied less extensively than monolingualism. Theoretical models of bilingual development, competence, performance, and processing have not been sufficiently elaborated, and conceptual notions and definitions show a great deal of variability.
2.3 The Bilingual Mind

When describing the process of becoming bilingual and how it affects identity formation, the concept of the bilingual mind and thought is an integral part of the study of bilingualism (Vygotsky, 1986; Pavlenko and Lantolf, 2000; Larsen et al., 2002; Bialystok, 2005; Pavlenko, 2005, 2011 and 2012; Athanasopoulos and Kasai, 2008 and 2011). Recent studies investigate English speakers of Japanese and conclude that L2 speakers do not demonstrate the same cognition as monolingual speakers (Cook et al., 2006; Athanasopoulos and Kasai, 2008). Bilingual minds are less likely to resemble those of monolinguals (Bialystok, 2005; Athanasopoulos and Kasai, 2008 and 2011) and the length of exposure of the target language country affect L2 users conceptual restructuring (Cook et al., 2006; Pavlenko, 2012).

Another theoretical perspective, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, also referred to as linguistic relativity, implies that language determines thought, ‘the interdependence of language and thought’ (Kramsch, 1998: 11). Bilinguals think and feel differently when using two languages even though ‘the languages per se may not cause the thinking differences’ (Matsumoto and Juang, 2003: 273). Nevertheless, it is ‘certainly possible that language may cause differences in thinking and behaviour, either directly or indirectly’ (ibid: 274). Having discussed and analysed linguistic relativity in the relevant literature, Pavlenko (2011: 252) offers a new perspective on the relationship between language and thought:

"The time has come, ..., to discard the narrow search for evidence for or against linguistic relativity and to engage in broad explorations of thinking and speaking in two or more languages."
She underlines the importance of the study of inner speech, which is one method of investigating the bilingual mind. Inner speech includes ‘talking to oneself out loud, inner mental conversation, writing a note to oneself, counting, praying, and dreaming’ (Larsen et al., 2002: 46).

Bilinguals choose language depending on their surroundings and needs, their inner speech, however, might suffer from less usage of their L1 or L2. The author of Lost in Translation, Eva Hoffman (1989: 107) provides a good example of an immigrant who experienced a loss of inner speech:

I wait for that spontaneous flow of inner language which used to be my night-time talk with myself ... Nothing comes.

Struggling with her mother tongue, Polish, and her L2, English, she noticed that L2 learning or becoming bilingual had affected her inner speech. Larsen et al. (2002: 53) examining a Polish-Danish cross-cultural study conclude that:

from the viewpoint of memory research we might ask: does thought covary with language? The answer, we suggest, is that it does.

They explain that adult immigrants, who migrated after acquiring L1, will potentially show more evidence of inner speech in L1 while young immigrants will potentially show more evidence of inner speech in L2 (ibid). Keysar, Hayakawa, and An (2012) indicate that using a foreign language may reduce a decision bias because a foreign language provides a greater emotional distance. Pavlenko (2012: 405) responds to their research:

The differences in L1 and L2 affective processing suggest that in some bilingual speakers, in particular late bilinguals and foreign language users, respective languages may be
differentially embodied, with the later learned language processed semantically but not affectively.

The loss of inner speech or identity crisis might come from this emotional distance when using a second or foreign language.

With regard to the bilingual mind, more extensive research needs to be undertaken on the impact of the identity issue of sequential bilingualism (Baker, 2011; Pavlenko, 2011). Pavlenko (2011) also asserts that the inquiry of the bilingual mind through studies of inner speech lacks sufficient data and is a promising area for future research.

2.4 Code-Switching

Another method of investigating the bilingual mind is through code-switching, which is one of the distinctive processes that bilingual speakers employ. The term ‘code-switching’ in studies of bilingualism and SLA is used to describe bilinguals’ or L2 speakers’ cognitive linguistic ability to switch between multiple languages (Romaine, 1989; Cenoz and Genesee, 2001; Fotos, 2001). The term, code, implies ‘a synonym for language variety’ (Nilep, 2006: 1). Code-switching shows ‘the intricate links between the two language systems in multicompetence: In the mind, the L1 is not insulated from the L2’ (Cook, 1999: 193). Grosjean (2001: 2) underscores the unequal activation of the two languages and explains that code-switches and borrowings, or what has been called loanwords, occur due to bilinguals’ dominant language activation:

in the bilingual mode, the bilingual speaker chooses a base language, activates the other language and calls on it from time to time in the form of code-switches and borrowings.
However, it is empirically and theoretically challenging to observe directly the psychological reasons for code-switching and how bilinguals choose codes or language variation (Nilep, 2006). Furthermore, bilinguals do code-switch between languages depending on the specific role they have to fulfil according to the situationally salient aspect of their identity (Riley, 2007: 89). Finally, Fotos (2001: 330) emphasises code-switching as a process of L2 learning and identity formation:

code-switching can serve a dual function: promoting SLA through negotiation of meaning and focus on form, and fostering students’ sense of their bilingual identity.

2.5 The Critical Period for SLA

The age factor is an influential aspect of bilingualism since adult immigrants or L2 speakers who have learnt English after acquiring L1 may experience a struggle and change of their identity (Norton, 2000). Many researchers consider the critical period of acquiring L2 as a key factor for L2 learners’ identity formation. Marinova-Todd, Marshall and Snow (2000: 9) defines the critical period for language acquisition as ‘a period of time when learning a language is relatively easy and typically meets with a high degree of success’. The implication is that the younger you learn a language, the better. Franson (2009), however, claims that the popular belief of younger learners having an advantage in learning L2 is not necessarily correct, and that older learners may have the advantage of using metalinguistic awareness to learn new languages more quickly and efficiently. Pavlenko (2005) also debates that even though the critical period has considered phonological and syntactic proficiency with regard to age, it does not explore adult L2 learners’ conceptual competence. Phillipson (1992: 185) calls this false belief of ‘the earlier English is taught, the better the results’, as ‘the early start fallacy’. Moreover, Singleton and Ryan (2004: 115)
conclude that it is impossible to judge whether younger L2 learners are globally more efficient and successful than older L2 learners, and vice versa. Marinova-Todd, Marshall and Snow (2000: 9) also highlight ‘a misemphasis on poor adult learners and an underemphasis on adults who master L2s to nativelike levels’. They argue that this myth about the critical period for SLA could have caused misunderstanding in L2 learning and teaching (ibid).

Assuming that there is a critical period for SLA, Bley-Vroman (1989) proposes the fundamental difference hypothesis (FDH), which explains that the same language acquisition system does not exist between children and adults. FDH provides another perspective explaining the differences between child and adult language development. FDH identifies the advantages that adult learners have:

previous knowledge of a language and general cognitive ability to deal with abstract formal systems … to compensate for the loss in adults of the child’s knowledge of Universal Grammar and of a Learning Procedure designed specifically to construct grammars (ibid: 54).

However, adult learners’ existing knowledge may also hinder their learning if the languages are significantly different in, for example, grammar and differences of politeness, which can be relative in a particular culture or language community. Hoffman (1989: 106), who emigrated to Canada at the age of thirteen, struggled to find her new identity through the process of becoming bilingual:

The words I learn now don’t stand for things in the same unquestioned way they did in my native tongue.

Her struggle may come from the fact that L2 learners use their existing knowledge of language to support their L2 learning.
The critical period for SLA therefore remains debatable. Successful adult L2 learners may reject the younger-is-better myth in SLA and support 'the early start fallacy' (Phillipson, 1992: 185). More extensive research on bilingualism with the age factor, therefore, needs to be undertaken. Finally, Chin and Wigglesworth (2007: 274) observe:

Being bilingual is more than the ability to speak two languages. For most bilinguals, the issue of bilingualism goes beyond language proficiency.

From the next section, the identity issues of bilinguals beyond language will be examined.

**2.6 Identity Theory**

Since many scholars claim that identity cannot be a fixed concept (Norton, 2000; Pennycook, 2001; Johnson, 2003; Riley, 2007; Miller, 2009; Pavlenko, 2011), the areas of negotiated, constructed and conflicted natures of identity are subject to increasing interest amongst L2 educators (Norton, 1997).


The definitions of identity are therefore extensive referring to the notion of it being negotiated and constructed in relation to the world which we move in, and that this is
an ongoing process. A leading scholar on the study of identity in language learning, Norton (2000: 5) defines identity as:

How a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how that person understands possibilities for the future.

The following scholars, Pennycook (2001), Fougère (2008) and Riley (2007) have similar perspectives to Norton (2000) that identity cannot be constructed solely in isolation but in relation to the outside social world. Identity may be seen as ‘a constant on-going negotiation of how we relate to the world’ and that engagement with particular languages and cultures include identity formation (Pennycook, 2001: 149). Fougère (2008) explains the notion of identities as opposed to a single identity, and that one person is capable of having multiple identities, ‘being continually constructed through interactions’ (ibid: 188).

With regard to this perspective of identity being created socially, Riley (2007: 86) explains ‘self’ and ‘person’ in relation to identity which changes from role to role as follows (ibid: 87-88):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Self:</strong> Numerical identity (which individual?)</th>
<th><strong>Person:</strong> Social identity (what sort of individual?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private, subjective</td>
<td>Public, social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports as ‘I’/ ‘me’</td>
<td>Addressed as ‘you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The agent of my actions</td>
<td>A set of roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential individual</td>
<td>Member of groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of memory: Diachronic locus</td>
<td>Participant in interactions: Synchronic focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Identity, self and person

Bilinguals may find themselves having multiple identities which might conflict with the public identity others perceive; for example, the perceptions of being bilingual because bilinguals' identity may vary depending on which communities they belong
to at a certain time, and this can happen over a period of years or even within a single day. Social groups consisting of individuals who come together to share a common activity are known as ‘communities of practice’ in sociolinguistics (Hall, 2002: 94). Bilinguals who belong to more than one community of practice need to adjust their identity ‘which takes place only when certain identities are contested’ (Pavlenko and Blackledge, 2004: 20).

Baker (2011: 398) alludes that the relationship between language and identity is complex, and indicates that language is a symbol of our identity conveying our preferred distinctiveness and allegiance, yet language does not define us. Language is a part of many factors which create identity.

2.7 Identity in Language Education

Norton (1997: 413-414) proposes that ‘the relationship between language and identity is not only abstract and theoretical, but also has important consequences for positive and productive language learning and teaching’. When interacting with various people using their L2, learners are engaged in identity construction and negotiation possibly constructing multiple identities and affecting their perceptions of themselves, other people and the world.

Miller (2009) discusses language teaching and teacher identity with insights from identity theory used in the TESOL field. He suggests that students in teacher education should understand identity as ‘a complex and multiple individual and social phenomenon, which has critical links to power and legitimacy’ (ibid: 178). Kelchtermans (2009: 261) avoids the idea of identity ‘because of its association with
a static essence, implicitly ignoring or denying its dynamic and biographical nature’. He uses the term ‘self-understanding’ as an alternative:

The term refers to both the understanding one has of one’s ‘self’ at a certain moment in time (product), as well as to the fact that this product results from an ongoing process of making sense of one’s experiences and their impact on the ‘self’ (ibid: 261).

His analysis of the concept of self-understanding shows teachers do not portray their ‘real’ self but a self as depicted through the act of ‘telling’ to their students (ibid: 261).

Comparable to Norton (1997 and 2000), Johnson (2003) understands that identity formation as a teacher is ‘relational, constructed and altered by how I see others and how they see me in our shared experiences and negotiated interactions’ (ibid: 788). As a native English speaking (NES) mentor teacher, who worked with a non-native English speaking (NNES) student teacher, she emphasises that our interactions with students go beyond the classroom and teachers’ personal selves often affect the relationship with students (ibid).

Moreover, BE teachers may have a different teaching viewpoint from monolingual teachers in terms of linguistic and cultural education. Duff and Uchida (1997) interviewed Japanese English teachers, Miki and Kimiko. Miki felt that the transmission of culture was best left to native speakers of English, and that she saw herself as a ‘linguistically oriented Japanese teacher’ (ibid: 456) whereas Kimiko believed that raising learners’ cross-cultural awareness was her teaching ethos, and this was based on her belief that ‘language and culture are inseparable’ (ibid: 466). Additionally, Pajares (1992: 327) argues that ‘teachers’ verbal expressions, predispositions to action, and teaching behaviour must all be included in assessments of beliefs’. Similarly, Williams and Burden (1997: 56) attest that:
Teachers are highly influenced by their beliefs, which in turn are closely linked to their values, to their views of the world and to their conceptions of their place within it.

BE teachers may share similar beliefs about learning and possibly teaching styles with their students, and they may more sensitively understand their students’ issues. Unfortunately, however, in the TESOL field, there has been little research to date on the BE teachers’ beliefs which might affect their identity formation processes as they move from being a learner to being a teacher.

2.8 Intercultural Communication

The study of intercultural communication or intercultural communicative competence (ICC) theory is widely known in the TESOL field (Wiseman, 1995; Byram, 1997; Alptekin, 2002). Bilinguals may encounter multicultural and intercultural societies affecting their identity formation of who they are. Holliday, Hyde and Kullman (2010) elucidate that learning a new language is a process involving issues of culture and identity. However, many scholars claim that culture is a very broad concept for which there is no clear definition (Kramsch, 1998; DeCapua and Wintergerst, 2004; Holliday, 2010; Scollon, Scollon and Jones, 2012). Against the ambiguity of the concept of culture, Holliday (2010) analyses that culture and prejudice create an ‘us’ and ‘them’ division. This involves ‘the highest degree of “strangerness” and the lowest degree of familiarity’ (Neuliep, 2012: 29). The culture in which people are born and raised is the essential concept of how to think, feel, act, interact, and communicate (Neuliep, 2012). Bilingual people who have lived in more than one country often encounter situations where their cultural identity plays a great role in their life affecting their identity formation.
Learning L2 not only requires learning linguistic features such as grammar and pronunciation, but also understanding and accepting the culture behind the language. Besides, ‘when bilinguals learn two languages, they often do so in the context of two different cultures’ (Matsumoto and Juang, 2003: 273). Language and culture, therefore, are inseparable concepts for L2 learners. Bilinguals encountering more than one culture may have their identities negotiated through intercultural communication. Additionally, self-concept confirmation, that is, the need to be seen as similar to and different than others, directly influences our communication (Gudykunst, 1995: 22). Intercultural communication occurs when two people from different cultural backgrounds communicate by exchanging verbal and nonverbal symbols (Neuliep, 2012). The verbal exchange is often though a ‘lingua franca’ which is ‘a contact language used among people who do not share a first language’ (Jenkins, 2007: 1). Neuliep (2012: 22) introduces a contextual model of intercultural communication as shown below:

![Diagram of intercultural communication context]

Figure 1: A contextual model of intercultural communication
According to Figure 1, when people from different cultures interact, they do so within a variety of contexts, including cultural, microcultural, environmental, sociorelational, and perceptual contexts (Neuliep, 2012). The largest circle, the cultural context permeates all aspects of the communicative exchange; the microcultural context implies the separate group of people within the culture based on the different ethnicity, language and so on; the environmental context represents specific rules which come from the geographical location of the interaction such as slurping noodles in Japan is customary whereas it would be considered rude in most western countries; and the sociorelational context applies to the relationship between the interactants, and verbal and nonverbal messages are defined by and filtered through their group memberships in the sociorelational context (ibid). Finally, perceptual contexts show individuals’ attitudes about people from different cultures and the perceptions of roles vary such as the perception of being a teacher is a highly respected and influential role in Japan whereas the perception of being a teacher in the U.S. is relatively less powerful (ibid). Attempting to understand others’ cultures and being aware of their cultural identity in the context of their interactions is an essential part of good intercultural communication (Holliiday, Hyde and Kullman, 2010: 21).

Interculturally competent communicators are ‘motivated’, ‘knowledgeable’, ‘skilled’ and ‘sensitive’ who can interact effectively by adapting verbal and nonverbal messages appropriately to the cultural context (Neuliep, 2012: 29). Aspects of intercultural communication are transmitted through teaching and learning of English (Scollon, Scollon and Jones, 2012), and given the increasing number of BE teachers who engage in intercultural communication and develop personal growth by becoming more open-minded and flexible through new identity formation, the
understanding of the relationship between bilinguals’ identity formation and intercultural communication will continue to grow within the TESOL field.

**2.9 The Native/Non-Native Debate and the Identity of BE Teachers**

According to Moussu and Llurda (2008), although the majority of English teachers in the world are non-native speakers, no research was conducted on these teachers until the 1990s when Phillipson (1992) and Medgyes (1994) finally pioneered this area of research to investigate the issues faced by BE teachers. The work of Braine (1999) has stimulated many scholars to research this issue, with topics ranging from teachers’ perceptions of their own identity to students’ views and aspects of teacher education.

Since the 1990’s, there has been a significant increase in research literature (Duff and Uchida, 1997; Braine, 1999; Maum, 2002; Pavlenko, 2003; Kamhi-Stein, 2004; Miller, 2009) focusing on BE teachers. The literature generally questions a simple dichotomy between native and non-native speakers. Rampton (1990) evaluates that the concepts of native speakers and L1 are unclear and proposes using the terms ‘language expertise’, ‘language inheritance’, and ‘language affiliation’. Cook (1999: 187) defines a native speaker as ‘a monolingual person who still speaks the language learnt in childhood’ whereas regarding a non-native speaker, he coined the term, ‘multi-competence’ to refer to the total knowledge of bilinguals, who can be called a multicompetent speaker.

The concept of ‘native-speakerism’ is a widely held belief within ELT that NES teachers represent a ‘Western culture’ portraying ‘the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology’ (Holliiday, 2005: 6). An
underlying theme here is “othering’ of students and colleagues from outside the English-speaking West’ (Holliday, 2006: 385). This biased belief might cause unprofessional favouritism and discriminatory practices in the ELT field (Maum, 2002). Holliday (2005 and 2006) argues that TESOL professionalism should not be influenced by native-speakerism.

Braine (1999: xvii) stresses that the variety of terms for ‘non-native educators within the TESOL organization’ as indicative of the struggle for self-definition. Many educated BE teachers are often called NNES teachers if they are not born in English speaking countries. Some academic research shows that NNES teachers have lower status and less influence than NES teachers, and it is hard for them to achieve legitimacy within the TESOL field (Duff and Uchida, 1997; Pennycook, 2001; Johnson, 2003; Varghese et al., 2005; Miller, 2009). Phillipson (1992: 185) calls the view that ‘the ideal teacher of English is a native speaker’ the ‘native speaker fallacy’. It is, however, hard to precisely identify native and non-native speakers, and this confusion causes some issues in the ELT/TESOL field.

Moreover, more scholars and educators are resisting ‘linguistic imperialism’ which analyses why English became a dominant language in the world (Canagarajah, 1999), including the ‘native speaker fallacy’ (Phillipson, 1992). BE teachers sharing L1 with their students may be good learner models having gone through the same process of learning English themselves (Medgyes, 1996; Maum, 2002; McKay, 2003). Many bilinguals or BE teachers might have suffered from the bias by monolingual speakers who see non-native speakers as ‘failed native speakers’ instead of recognising ‘their accomplishments in learning to use the L2’ (Cook, 1999: 195). This lack of an identity as BE teachers might lead to low self-confidence and unstable status in the ELT/TESOL profession (Braine, 1999).
2.10 Unresolved Issues and Gaps in the Literature

Having discussed the various definitions of bilingualism, the widely known concept of balanced bilingualism might have caused confusion and obscurity in the ELT/TESOL profession. Firstly, from the available literature, whether BE teachers see themselves as bilinguals or not remains unclear. Language competence of NNES is often measured against that of monolingual NES which is unfair since bilinguals use their two languages in different situations with different people (Baker, 2011: 9). Researchers therefore need to address the public misconception of bilinguals (Grosjean, 2001). Secondly, identity studies in language education do not fully explore the effects of the learning of English causing the identity issues of BE teachers in particular. Finally, little is known about BE teachers’ identity shift from a learner to a teacher in the TESOL field which might affect their teaching beliefs and behaviour in the classroom although much research explores the relationship between identity, language learning and teaching.

To summarise, some issues appear to require further exploration: BE teachers’ self-awareness of being bilingual and its relation to public misconception; the relationship between learning English and the psychological effects on the identity of BE teachers; and the relationship between BE teachers’ identity issues and their teaching beliefs.

2.11 Chapter Summary

This chapter provided a critical analysis of the literature around the effects of bilingualism on the identity of BE teachers with an overview of bilingualism and identity theory relevant to this study. It started with the debate of bilingualism
followed by the bilingual mind, code-switching and the critical period for SLA, and moved to the discussion of identity theory and its relation to language education, intercultural communication, and the native/non-native debate and the identity of BE teachers. This dissertation attempts to bridge some of the gaps in the literature noted in 2.10 by seeking to analyse BE teachers’ self-identification process in relation to the process of becoming bilinguals.
Chapter 3
Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out the aims and research questions which led this study. A description of the participants of the research is given, followed by the research approach and the instrument used for data collection. The research procedure and the instrument used for the data collection are analysed. Finally, the relevant ethical considerations and limitations of the study are discussed.

3.2 Research Questions

This research sought to investigate whether the English language learning experience has affected the identity of a sample of BE teachers.

The research questions are as follows:

1. What effect does the learning of English have on the identity of BE teachers?

2. To what extent has the learning of English affected BE teachers’ ideas of themselves, other people, and the world they live in?

3. When BE teachers speak English, do they think and feel differently or the same as when they speak their first language?

4. Are BE teachers’ beliefs about teaching affected by being bilingual?
3.3 Participants

The participants of this research were six BE teachers who enrolled on an MA TESOL in the U.K.: two Japanese, two Chinese, one Mexican and one Cypriot (see Appendix 1). None of the participants had learnt two languages simultaneously from birth, and participants’ L2 refers exclusively to English. Participants A, B and C lived in English speaking countries for over seven years whereas Participants D, E and F learnt English in their home countries, and have been living in the U.K. for about a year. The reason behind choosing these particular participants stemmed from the fact that they were all living in the U.K. as students, and as such, were readily available for research purposes. Moreover, they had previously been or are currently working as BE teachers, so more diverse outcomes from the perspectives of both students and teachers were possible.

3.4 Research Approach

Quantitative and qualitative research are the major approaches for doing research. Quantitative research aims to achieve ‘macro-perspective of the overarching trends in the world,’ whereas qualitative research presents ‘highly context-sensitive micro-perspective of the everyday realities of the world’ (Dörnyei, 2007: 29). Quantitative research would ‘emphasize the importance of measuring outcomes’ (Croker, 2009) and not give the rich depth required for this topic while qualitative research focuses on each participant in order to ‘delve deep into the subjective qualities that govern behaviour’ (Holliday, 2007: 7).

Moreover, Richards (2003: 10) summarises some implications of the nature of qualitative research, what he calls qualitative inquiry:
A qualitative case study approach has therefore been chosen because the main topic of this research on the identity of a specific group of bilingual teachers is unquantifiable, and this study focuses on ‘what is unique’ (Wallace, 1998: 161), which is a particular group of BE teachers. This case study approach generates more human interest than generalised statistical findings and is more valuable than other approaches (ibid: 163).

Moreover, in order to answer the research questions of this study, it was appropriate to collect data concerning the participants’ personal histories using ‘narrative inquiry’ (Murray, 2009: 46) which is:

conductive to documenting the changing conditions of lives and the impact these new conditions can have over time on all aspects of an individual’s life, including language learning.

This research therefore used aspects of a case study approach and also narrative inquiry because of the extended interviews in order to seek answers to the research questions.
3.5 Research Instrument

According to Lindlof and Taylor (2011: 175), interviews ‘enable researchers to gather information about things or processes that cannot be observed effectively by other means’. Interviews were chosen as the most efficacious research instrument of this study. The qualitative interviews aim at nuanced accounts of different aspects of the interviewee’s life which work with words, not numbers (Kvale, 2007: 11-12).

There are three one-to-one interviewing methods: structured; semi-structured; and unstructured (Dörnyei, 2007). The interviews of this study utilised a semi-structured style for the first two, then a structured style for the final followed by the interview guide (see Appendix 2). Burns (1999: 120) defines the semi-structured interview as ‘open-ended and thus provides much greater flexibility’. Although Gillham (2005: 79) acknowledges that it is ‘costly in time’, and questioning skill and practice are required, he advises that it gives the advantage of having a balance between structure and openness. Semi-structured interviews with some pilot questions which allowed more flexibility than structured interviews was therefore chosen for the first two interviews.

Structured interviews, used for the final interviews, literally carry the highest degree of structure where ‘the researcher follows a pre-prepared, elaborate ‘interview schedule/guide’, which contains a list of questions to be covered closely with every interviewee’ (ibid: 135). The advantage of structured interview is that ‘misunderstanding, or a lack of understanding, can be immediately sorted out during the exchange’ (Wallace, 1998: 146).

Nondirective questions were used for the first two interviews. Lindlof and Taylor (2011: 202) explain nondirective questions to be ‘a type of question that allows the subject freedom to define the scope and terms of his or her answer’. Two types of
nondirective questions, called grand tour and mini-tour, were used. The grand tour question is a common nondirective question which is often used to encourage telling the interviewer about activities, events and life in general which are situated in a time frame (ibid). The mini-tour question, is used to ask the participants about a 'standout' experience (ibid: 203) which may be key in understanding the participants’ identity shift.

Directive questions which are designed to ‘encourage people to think along certain lines or within certain parameters’ were used for the final interview (ibid: 207). One such question is known as a compare-contrast question, and this encourages the participant ‘to think comparatively (or contrastively) about a topic’ (ibid: 207). The more in depth, theoretical and psychological questions were used for the final interviews. By using different expressions or question types such as open-ended or closed, participants could think again and answer in depth.

3.6 Procedure

Before the first interviews, participants’ consent to cooperate in this study was obtained (see Appendix 4).

Three interviews were scheduled for each participant, and were conducted between 17th July and 20th August, 2012. This allowed time in between for data analysis and creation of follow-up questions to collect the data which did not become available during the previous interviews (see Appendix 3). This also allowed the possibility of obtaining the richest possible data from the participants to consider their life histories in depth. The purpose of doing three interviews was to obtain consistent answers from participants’, as Geertz (1973) coined the term, ‘thick description’ of their stories.
By obtaining richly detailed histories of the participants, the patterns of behaviour and thinking can be discovered (Croker, 2009: 9).

All interviews were conducted in a conference room to ensure consistency, to create a private atmosphere and to help focus on the interview questions. For the first interview, video and audio recordings were used to analyse the participants’ nonverbal expressions as well. Rubin and Rubin (1995) consider nonverbal cues as helping the interviewer analyse the participants’ noticeable moment from which follow-up questions can be created based on the facial expressions or emotional tones observed. Only audio recordings were used for the second and final interviews to have participants more relaxed so that they could answer questions without the added pressure of being filmed. Dörnyei (2007) recommends video data only being used when essential to analyse nonverbal communication. Therefore, audio recordings as the main medium worked well for this research. Although notes were also taken during the interviews, a relaxed atmosphere allowing the participants to talk more freely about themselves was maintained by keeping eye contact whenever possible.

3.7 Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis was used in this study. The main principle of this qualitative data analysis was a ‘language-based analysis’ (Dörnyei, 2007: 243) since all the data was transformed into textual forms. The analysis also applied to narrative analysis which is a ‘focus on stories told by participants’ (Grbich, 2007: 124). Moreover, qualitative data analysis is iterative, not linear:

using a nonlinear, ‘zigzag’ pattern: we move back and forth between data collection, data analysis and data interpretation depending on the emergent results (Dörnyei, 2007: 243).
Questions were presented to the participants, then the data was collected and analysed. Consequently, initial themes from the data were identified; for example, the participants’ English learning experiences, and then grouped into thematic categories, such as the English learning environment (see Appendix 5). These themes were identified as a result of listening and re-listening to the recorded interviews and analysing some nonverbal expressions to show the significance to their words.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

Consistent with the ethical principles behind informed consent and confidentiality, the participants were informed that all the data collected will be anonymous to maintain their privacy (Kvale, 2007). Informed consent requires informing participants of the overall purpose of the study and about the possible consequences from participation in the research (ibid). It was therefore explained that the research was focused on BE teachers’ life stories in relation to their experiences of learning and teaching. Participant confidentiality is essential and the transcribed texts are faithful to their oral statements (ibid). They were also informed of the possible risk that they might be easily identified due to the small number of participants and nationalities involved in the study. One participant, in fact, had concerns about being easily identified by the name of the university; therefore, the institution’s name was rendered unidentifiable. All participants however agreed to the disclosure of their nationalities as this is a crucial factor in the research since it focuses on bilingualism and its impact on identity where the English learning environment and L1 influence play major roles in analysing and understanding the data.
3.9 Limitations of the Research

After discussing the research methodology, it is also necessary to address identified limitations. The small number of participants and the short period of participant observation can be considered as limitations of this study. It may have been more informative to observe the participants’ changes of thought and behaviour from the beginning of the TESOL course until the end to see if this differs from their perceptions before taking the course. The data may have shown more salient outcomes; therefore, a longitudinal study may have been more beneficial.

Despite some flaws anticipated from the small sample size and the brevity in the study, when combined with my own experience as a BE teacher, as well as the relevant literature, I believe that this study has addressed the main issues providing insights of a sample of BE teachers’ identity formation processes from being learners to being teachers.

3.10 Chapter Summary

This chapter set out the research design for this study. Firstly, research questions and a description of the participants of the research were given, followed by the appropriateness of the qualitative research approach with aspects of a case study and narrative inquiry. Secondly, as the research instrument, interviews with different types of questions were addressed followed by the procedure. A description of the data analysis was also given: a language-based, narrative analysis. Finally, the ethical considerations and limitations of this study and how they could be overcome were discussed.
Chapter 4

Findings and Discussion

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the data obtained from the interviews, together with a discussion as to their significance for our understanding of the identity of a sample of BE teachers and its relation to bilingualism. Firstly, focus was directed towards the investigation of the effects of learning English on the identity of BE teachers. Secondly, attention was given to those factors which influenced BE teachers’ perceptions of themselves, other people and the world. Thirdly, the relationship between L1/L2 thought and behaviour among BE teachers was studied. Finally, BE teachers’ teaching beliefs were investigated.

The participants’ comments are faithful transcriptions of their oral statements excluding Participants E and F, whose oral statements were in Japanese and subsequently translated into English by myself. Furthermore, I grouped the participants because there seemed to be some differences between the responses from the participants who moved to English speaking countries to learn English at an earlier age (Group 1) and those who started to live abroad after becoming BE teachers (Group 2).

The main themes of the findings are: the English learning environment; L2 proficiency; perceptions of bilingualism; beliefs of the critical period for SLA; intercultural communicative competence; the relationship between thought and behaviour and identity formation; and teaching beliefs. The full transcribed comments from the interviews relating to each of the main themes can be found in
Appendix 5. The findings which emerged from the data are discussed and analysed under each research question.

4.2 Findings and Discussion - Research Question 1

What effect does the learning of English have on the identity of BE teachers?

Four themes have emerged from the data analysis with regard to the first research question: the English learning environment; L2 proficiency; perceptions of bilingualism and beliefs of the critical period for SLA which have possibly affected, either positively or negatively, the identity of BE teachers.

The English Learning Environment (Appendix 5.1)

Although all of the participants initially learnt English in their home countries, Participants A, B and C moved to English speaking countries to obtain higher education (Group 1) whereas Participants D, E and F stayed in their home countries until they came to the U.K. for the TESOL course (Group 2). This categorisation was important to compare how the length of residence in English speaking countries affected their learning outcomes and consequently their psychological effects (see 2.3).

a) Group 1

Participant A’s learning environment changed dramatically after she moved to the U.K. Previously, she was a receptive learner studying mainly grammar for reading skills in Macau, China, but after immigration, she said that:

‘I also became active learner by speaking with British people.’
Although not interested in foreign cultures before immigration, she decided to emigrate to the U.K. to become a bilingual speaker.

Participant B initially learnt English in Mexico, but she had no interest in learning at that time resulting in her having poor English skills. At her friend’s invitation, however, she decided to stay in the U.S. Her learning experience was therefore what most immigrants encounter, learning English by necessity:

‘I learnt spoken English first to communicate with local people…’

She acquired English naturally by interacting with local people and her English improved significantly.

Participant C started learning English in Cyprus, but she felt living in an English speaking country improved her English, and that L2 learning made her a different person to what she was in her home country. She also wanted to ensure a better career in the future through being bilingual. She commented that living in the U.K. was the best way to improve her English:

‘British people encouraged me to speak up, so I was not afraid of making mistakes.’

b) Group 2

Participant D started learning English in Hong Kong, but she did not like her English teachers at primary school, and consequently had poor English skills. However she attended a summer course in the U.S. for three weeks for the following reason:

‘I pushed myself to study hard to impress other people and not let them look down on me anymore.’

Her motivation was not from her interest in learning a language or culture, but to alter her ‘public’ identity (Riley, 2007) to gain respect from others. While she was
commenting on the above, she started crying, and asked me to stop the interview for a while until she had composed herself. She commented that this experience was very painful for her; however, it made her more determined to acquire English.

Although the former educational system in Japan only focused on reading and writing skills, Participant E seemed to have enjoyed learning about different cultures and languages by corresponding with NES people via letters:

'I started writing letters to some pen pals … I enjoyed communicating with native speakers of English.'

This experience encouraged her to become more interested in learning English, and she also gained an interest in her pen friends’ cultures. Subsequently, she became an English teacher, similar to the Japanese BE teacher, Kimiko (Norton, 2000), who believes that the teaching of language and culture are inseparable (see 2.7). This has affected her teaching belief which will be discussed in 4.5.

Participant F’s impression was different from Participant E’s although they both experienced a similar educational environment in Japan. His facial expression showed his negative impressions towards the native teacher at that time:

'When the teacher checked my pronunciation, I wasn’t happy or encouraged at all, but rather embarrassed.'

Having a native English teacher resulted in him having a negative impression towards English learning. He commented that this had the effect of limiting his spoken participation in class, which was surprising because during the interview in Japanese he was particularly talkative.
To summarise, Group 1 thought learning English in English speaking countries made them become fluent L2 English speakers with more positive learning outcomes. In Group 2, only Participant E had a positive attitude towards learning English whereas the others had a negative impression; however, they all had acquired an advanced level of English by their own means. The participants’ learning environments affected their learning, especially their confidence of L2 proficiency. The next section will show this evidence clearly.

**L2 Proficiency (Appendix 5.2)**

Exploring participants’ L2 proficiency was necessary to see how they perceived themselves as bilinguals since bilingualism is commonly defined based on bilinguals’ L2 proficiency which remains debatable as discussed in 2.2.

All participants were asked to rate their L2 proficiency at that moment as a subjective self-assessment. To reduce any potential embarrassments, they were allowed to answer in the way they wanted using a percentage scoring method or ordering each of the four language skills according to their confidence with them.

The results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L2 Learning Environment</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Language Skills (percentage score) (Good → Bad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Listening (100) Speaking (100) Reading (80) Writing (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Listening (90) Reading (80) Speaking (70) Writing (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Speaking (80) Listening (70) Reading (60) Writing (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Reading Writing Speaking Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Reading Writing Listening Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Reading Listening Writing Speaking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1: Learning English in English speaking countries  
Group 2: Learning English in non-English speaking countries  

Table 2: Participants’ self-assessment of their L2 proficiency

According to Table 2, Group 1 used the percentage score and thought they had the lowest proficiency in writing whereas Group 2 noticeably hesitated to use the percentage score with no confidence in rating their English skills, but they all judged
their reading skills the highest. This finding showed correlations with regard to language skills and learning environments where people who were more exposed to English speaking environments (Group 1) gained more confidence in speaking and listening, whereas people who have learnt English as a school subject (Group 2) developed more confidence in reading and writing. Moreover, Participants D, E and F were all teaching English in their L1 whereas the others used English in class. Medgyes (1994) reports that non-native teachers are relatively satisfied with their reading and writing skills, and also reveals that the more proficient the non-native speakers of English are, the less grammar-centred they are. This is one viewpoint from Medgyes’s (ibid) experience as a non-native teacher which may support the above finding.

To summarise, the data exemplified that the English learning environment has impacted on the participants’ L2 proficiency. Learning English in English speaking countries (Group 1) encouraged participants to be more communicatively competent; Group 1 therefore obtained the advanced English level self-confidently in listening and speaking. Group 2, who had little interaction with NES, thought that since English was one of the school subjects, reading and writing were more compulsory to learn at school; they therefore gained more self-confidence in writing.

Perceptions of Bilingualism (Appendix 5.3)

The participants were asked what bilingualism and being bilingual meant to them. They were also asked if they saw themselves as being bilingual or not, and what the definition of bilingualism was. The participants, except Participant A, answered ‘no’ to the question of ‘Are you bilingual?’ Although using two languages in their
everyday lives and teaching English, they did not perceive themselves as being bilingual. This was a very intriguing finding during the research.

All participants said that bilingual people should have the same level of language proficiency in L1 and L2 although their definitions of the same level varied as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The same level of language proficiency of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Speaking or understanding (Participant A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Speaking (Participant B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Speaking and using (Participant C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicating (Participant D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Using the four language skills (Participant E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Speaking, equal to native speaker level (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 2: Participants’ definition of bilingualism

This variety of definitions of ‘same level of language proficiency’ could highlight the debate of the ambiguity of bilingualism as discussed in 2.2.

To summarise, only one participant considered herself bilingual. This is an illuminating finding regarding the contradiction between the theoretical definition of bilingualism and people’s perceptions. According to the data, balanced bilingualism implying equal competence in two languages seems to be readily accepted among the participants even though they could be called dominant bilinguals who are more fluent in one language (see also 2.2). The participants were all proficient in L2, yet they were hesitant to admit they were bilinguals.

**The Beliefs of the Critical Period for SLA (Appendix 5.4)**

The following data is concerned with what the participants considered to be the critical period for SLA.
As already found in 2.5 regarding the critical period for SLA being uncertain and debatable, according to Table 3, Participants A, B and D said that L2 should be acquired around the age of five or six; Participant C said it should be from birth as equal to L1; Participant E hoped the critical period was until around thirteen or fourteen years old when they started learning English at secondary schools in Japan. Participant F denied the critical period for SLA believing anyone can acquire L2 at any age. Despite the ambiguity of the age factor on L2 acquisition, most participants said L2 should be acquired before the age of six. The exceptions were the Japanese participants (E and F) who started learning English at the age of thirteen.

Most of the participants’ understanding of the critical period for SLA was probably based on their belief that learning L2 before six years old was a prerequisite of being bilingual. However, two participants (E and F) who were against the critical period for SLA being before six years old, still perceived themselves as non-bilinguals. Only Participant A, who believed that the critical period for SLA was before six years old and migrated to the U.K. at the age of fifteen (but initially started learning at the age of three), considered herself a bilingual. The participants’ perceptions of bilingualism and self-awareness in relation to the critical period for SLA showed an interesting correlation and contradiction.

The fact that they had not learnt two languages simultaneously from birth, yet still became professional English teachers could support the ‘early start fallacy’
(Phillipson, 1992), and could corroborate Franson’s (2009) account of adult L2 learners usage of metalinguistic awareness and Bley-Vroman’s (1989) hypothesis (see also 2.5). The participants’ opinions about the critical period for SLA however varied greatly which probably affected their beliefs about being bilingual.

To summarise, four themes have emerged from the data analysis of the first research question: the English learning environment; L2 proficiency; perceptions of bilingualism; and the beliefs of the critical period for SLA. These themes played significant roles in understanding the identity of BE teachers in relation to their learning experiences because the learning environment determined their L2 proficiency, and the perceptions of bilingualism might have interrelated with the participants’ beliefs about the critical period for SLA. All of these themes have affected the identity of BE teachers; the perceptions of themselves as bilingual speakers and teachers of English.

**4.3 Findings and Discussion - Research Question 2**

*To what extent has the learning of English affected BE teachers’ ideas of themselves, other people, and the world they live in?*

In relation to the process or results of learning English, the role played by participants’ competence in intercultural communication was crucial in forming their identities as bilinguals and shaping their perceptions of the world. This was the most significant theme that emerged from the data.

**Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) (Appendix 5.5)**

The participants’ intercultural experience was remarkable as all participants had experienced communicating with people using English as a ‘lingua franca’ (Firth,
In the process of or as a result of the learning of English, the participants obtained ICC either by choice or by necessity. Participants A, B and C (Group 1) had lived in English speaking countries for over seven years whereas Participants D, E and F (Group 2) had approximately one year of living experience abroad.

Participant A called herself a free will bilingual as opposed to a forced bilingual; she said she would learn and accept anything she wanted and would not learn what she was not interested in. Fortunately after immigration, her interest in British culture and its language facilitated her L2 fluency and she became interculturally competent as well. She commented that initially when she came to the U.K.:

‘I always wondered why people are polite, why they say that.’

After she became familiar with British traditions, she said:

‘I see myself more British. I understand British culture more, so I shifted more British.’

In Participant B’s case, her working experience as a babysitter and close interaction with local people had given her a better appreciation when interacting with various people:

‘My way of thinking also changed. I am more open-minded, more easily accept different culture, accents, and also think everyone is the same no matter what religion.’

Participant C felt that she became more open-minded in contacting various individuals with whom she would not have communicated previously:

‘My attitude changed after living in the U.K., I became more flexible.’
Participant D’s perception of British people was very similar to the other Participants A, B and C with regard to becoming more polite or non-judgemental of people’s nationality. She said that:

‘… now I have adjusted to being polite … I don’t look people as different nationalities, but rather personality. … Living abroad experience changed my point of view.’

During her TESOL studies in the U.K., Participant E explained some experiences of misunderstanding with a university lecturer and her host family. The lecturer did not understand what she wanted to say:

‘I wish I had more communication strategy as both a teacher and a student.’

Her host family might have expected her to feel at home, but she did not understand regarding the use of the kitchen:

‘I thought it would be rude to use their kitchen while they were not there, which I thought was very Japanese way of thinking.’

Through these bitter experiences, she learnt not to be too passive and polite as she would be when speaking in Japanese.

Participant F believed that having interactions with people from different cultures enabled L2 learners to obtain ICC. He learnt to leave his mistakes or not to ask interlocutors for meanings if they were not so meaningful, as he wanted to keep the conversation flowing in order to build a comfortable atmosphere, rather than stopping the conversation every time he needed to think and understand what was being said:

‘There are lots of miscommunication, but I don’t correct my mistakes for some unimportant conversations and just let it go.’
Participant F’s comments illustrate the ‘let-it-pass principle’ (Firth, 1996), in which the listener ‘lets the unknown or unclear action, word or utterance ‘pass’ on the (common-sense) assumption that it will either become clear or redundant as talk progresses’ (ibid: 243). This situation also applies to what Scollon, Scollon and Jones (2012) consider the ambiguity of language and the need to develop strategies to make intercultural communication smoother.

All participants believed that they had gained various components of intercultural communication by living abroad and interacting with various people such as ‘open-mindedness, … empathy, tolerance for ambiguity, flexibility in thinking and behaviour, self-awareness, knowledge of one’s own and other cultures, …, and communication or message skills’ (Spencer-Oatey and Franklin, 2009: 57). Group 1 had gained ICC in the process of learning English having lived in English speaking countries. Group 2 obtained or noticed the importance of ICC as the result of learning English, becoming BE teachers, and have subsequently been living in the U.K. for their postgraduate study. This showed how their ideas of themselves, other people, and the world were affected by the learning of English.

Furthermore, consciously or unconsciously, the participants seemed to understand the complexity and ambiguity of language by obtaining ICC. The degree of politeness and its perception appeared to vary depending on the nationality: Japanese participants thought they should not be too polite whereas the others thought they should be more polite, especially in the U.K. When people from different cultures communicate, they establish a relationship (Neuliep, 2012). However, as discussed in 2.8 regarding perceptual differences between two cultures, what is regarded as typical in one culture could be considered strange or rude in another.
Their views of themselves, other people and the world they live in had therefore broadened and become more complex as a result of becoming bilinguals, and their identity was negotiated through intercultural communication. Consequently, they had a greater affinity with people of different cultures and appreciated the differences more which reflected the benefits of intercultural communication as discussed in 2.8.

It was particularly fascinating to study the participants’ identity in intercultural contexts since ‘it is exactly in such contexts that people often reflect more about them’ (Fougère, 2008: 188).

4.4 Findings and Discussion - Research Question 3

When BE teachers speak English, do they think and feel differently or the same as when they speak their first language?

The themes of the relationship between L1/L2 thought and behaviour (Appendix 5.6) and identity formation (Appendix 5.7) emerged during the data analysis.

The Relationship between L1/L2 Thought and Behaviour and Identity Formation

Questions were asked regarding the participants’ identity formation as bilinguals by comparing their past and present identities.

Participant A very quickly answered yes to the question whereas others had to think a little before answering:

‘Yes, I think and act differently. When speaking English, I act more modestly, more politely’ (Appendix 5.6).

‘I was with a British boyfriend for 2 years, so I understood U.K. culture. This affects my way of thinking’ (Appendix 5.7).
She was aware of the differences in her behaviour, attitude, and way of thinking when speaking in L1 and L2.

Participant B said she did not change her thinking regardless of the language she spoke, but she commented that her family noticed changes:

‘... my mother said when I speak English, I changed the voice, tone, and gesture. I never realised that I changed. I behave differently because I am in the different culture’ (Appendix 5.6).

‘My core identity never changes. I belong to where I am from’ (Appendix 5.7).

She tried acting differently, not interrupting the conversation contrary to how she would behave in her home country. She seemed happy to adjust her behaviour according to the culture.

Participant C’s comments were similar to those of Participant A in terms of the awareness of identity changes:

‘I do code-switching. I am also more aware of acting differently. ... My parents see the difference in my behaviour. ..., but I don’t feel so deep when saying sorry in English’ (Appendix 5.6).

‘I struggled to find a way to use English phrases people use like ‘cheers’, but that’s not me, so I stopped using some phrases’ (Appendix 5.7).

Her possible use of code-switching might come from her realisation of emotional distance of L2 words as discussed in 2.3. Her comments regarding the understanding of L2 and the above struggle also showed similarity to observations made by Hoffman (1989) (see also 2.5). She formed and accepted her new identity although she struggled to change her behaviour and to find the appropriate words and phrases for her expressions in English.
Participant D said that she did not think or feel differently, but that she consciously changed her behaviour when speaking in English:

‘In English, I always use polite expressions such as would like, please, can I, and I always try to be as polite as possible’ (Appendix 5.6).

‘… my core identity remains the same’ (Appendix 5.7).

Participant E commented on her L1 and cultural influences and also her unchanged identity:

‘L1 transfer is a great impact on me. My way of thinking is always Japanese. … Even when I speak in English, I feel I am Japanese’ (Appendix 5.6).

‘My core personality hasn’t changed. … I look at myself as complete Japanese’ (Appendix 5.7).

Participant F also believed that his identity never changed and L1 played a great role when speaking English:

‘My identity hasn’t changed, but the way I express myself changes when I speak English’ (Appendix 5.6).

‘My core personality never changed. … My core identity, the Japanese comes from the experience I got through life in Japan’ (Appendix 5.7).

His way of thinking was based on a Japanese way of thinking such as being indirect and respecting group harmony, but he was more flexible when speaking English.

To summarise, Participants A and C said that their identity or personality had changed whereas all the others said that they might be adjusting how they behaved, but that they believed their core identity or personality, which came from where they lived originally, never changed. With regard to the relationship between thought and language, the participants made some interesting observations. For example, they
described the changes of their thought or behaviour as being influenced by the language they spoke, the culture they shared, and the identities they constructed and reconstructed.

The findings here regarding participants’ perceptions of identity could also relate to the influence of their perceptions of bilingualism. Moreover, the participants’ comments relating to their inner speech showed evidence of a dominant L1 influence supporting the observation of adult immigrants by Larsen et al. (2002) and linguistic relativity discussed in 2.3.

Participants A and C who were more exposed to English speaking environments at an earlier age appeared to acknowledge their new identity whereas those who had later exposure to such environments did not. This was a noticeable finding that most of the participants did not think their core identity changed, but rather it was their behaviour that changed. All the participants did change their attitudes and became more accommodating towards people from different nationalities. This seems to support the ‘accommodation theory’ developed by Howard Giles where a speaker’s speech style shifts to become more like that of the addressee (Bell, 1984). Further research on how far speakers can and do accommodate might be an interesting study for my future research.

4.5 Findings and Discussion - Research Question 4

Are BE teachers’ beliefs about teaching affected by being bilingual?

The investigation of BE teachers’ teaching beliefs was of particular interest to compare with my own experiences.
Teaching Beliefs (Appendix 5.8)

Participant A:

‘My learning experience can definitely help my students become fluent L2 speakers.’

Participant B:

‘I also reflect my learning experience to my students because I can understand their problems, and that’s very similar to what I have been through.’

Participant C:

‘I want to treat naturally, and equally to my students. My first English language teacher was like that, and I liked it.’

Participant D:

‘My teachers kept encouraging me not to give up. I am so proud of being an English teacher now because I can help my students using my learning experience in my home country.’

Participant E:

‘I love teaching English and my teaching advice is based on my own learning experience.’

Participant F:

‘It was so hard to improve my communicative competence, ..., so I understand my students’ learning issues better than native speakers.’

To summarise, Participants C and D commented that their language teachers were influential for their own teaching beliefs whereas the others said that their learning experiences affected their teaching beliefs. As a result, all participants could be more sensitive to students’ learning issues.

In addition, they also expressed their own teaching beliefs extended from their L2 learning experience.
Participant A commented that:

‘It is more of teaching behaviour than teaching the language. … I give students more responsibility.’

Participant B stated that:

‘I believe the ways they teach are more important than either native or non-native.’

‘… teaching language is also helping developing personality, be a better person. … Teaching is more than language.’

Participants A and B believed that teaching English is not just about teaching the language, but also about educating students on how to further develop themselves prudently.

Participant C, however, believed that the status of teachers and students should be equal without any priority as mentioned earlier regarding her first English teacher, but she was also always aware of being a BE teacher:

‘As a teacher, I work hard since English is not L1 …’

With more than five years of teaching experience, Participants D, E and F stated the importance of being patient with students and encouraging them without any expectation of their learning achievement.

Participant D’s belief was rooted from her negative English learning experience:

‘My motto is not to give up on students, no matter how poor their English skills are.’

Participant E said strongly with a smile that:

‘I want them to know how fun and interesting it is to learn English. … talking about cultural differences without using grammar textbooks is important and fun …’
She also believed individual care was more decisive:

‘Individual advice is important. … I don’t force them to study at school.’

As mentioned in 4.2, she reflected on her own experience of communicating with English speakers and travelling around the world hoping her students would realise the advantages of being able to use English.

Participant F demonstrated a respect for his students and an understanding of their learning issues:

‘I try not to demotivate my students even if they can’t answer since I understand their learning issues.’

These additional beliefs might stem from the participants’ cultural backgrounds and their teacher identity which came from what they value in language education as discussed in 2.7.

In conclusion, the teaching beliefs of the participants varied, but all participants believed that being BE teachers provided their students with more encouragement since they were more aware and sensitive to the learning issues faced by students of their own nationality. Although most of the participants had no self-acknowledgement as bilinguals, they tended to have a strong teaching belief in their classroom. Furthermore, all of the participants commented that their identity as BE teachers had a positive influence on their students, not necessarily by being bilingual, but by achieving an advanced level of English. Finally, Participants A, B and C are currently teaching English in the U.K., and this might demonstrate that ‘native speakerism’ has less impact on BE teachers and better status in the TESOL profession (see 2.9) although this small sample cannot generalise the reality in the ELT/TESOL field.
4.6 Conclusions to Research Findings

The findings generated by this study’s research questions were based on a sample of BE teachers’ English learning experience. The following summarises the answers for each of the four research questions which correspond with the numbers:

1. The participants made different comments regarding the effect of learning English. The length of residency in English speaking countries affected their confidence of L2 proficiency, and all of the participants had positive learning outcomes achieving advanced levels of English. Participants D and F however had negative impressions of their learning experiences, yet they have made the best use of the learning of English. The participants’ identity as BE teachers or bilinguals consequently were affected, either positively or negatively, by their learning experiences, which reflected the English learning environment, L2 proficiency, perceptions of bilingualism, and the beliefs of the critical period for SLA.

2. Participants A and C, who started living abroad at an earlier age than the other participants, mentioned that they have new perceptions of themselves whereas the others claimed that their perceptions of themselves did not change, but their behaviour changed to be more flexible to various people through intercultural communication. Their experience of learning English has shown them the differences between their L1 and L2 cultures such as politeness. Finally, all of the participants claimed that their perceptions of other people and the world they live in changed after gaining ICC either in the process of or as a result of the learning of English, having more appreciation towards people from different cultures.
3. Participants A and C said they did think and feel differently and were aware of their new identity whereas the others said their identity or core personality never changed even when speaking in L2. How they thought and felt were found through their identity shift or behavioural changes in accordance with changing social relations with people. Since they had achieved a competent level of English, they were more adaptable at switching behaviour between the two languages, but in most participants’ cases, their thought remained unchanged.

4. The participants all showed their teaching beliefs reflected their learning experiences or their language teachers, and also their values in language education although they did not portray their beliefs as being bilingual. They also showed their teaching beliefs confidently through their verbal and nonverbal messages; for instance, they spent more time talking about their teaching beliefs with smiles than any other questions during the interviews. The investigation of BE teachers and their teaching beliefs therefore concluded that having experience of learning English affected their teaching beliefs positively with regard to their own students.

An unexpected but noticeable observation was that Participants E and F during the interviews, which were conducted in Japanese, demonstrated code-switching using English words and phrases such as ‘communication strategy’ (Appendix 5.5.5) and ‘let it go’ (Appendix 5.5.6). Despite deciding to use Japanese for the interviews, they chose more English words to explain things that happened in the U.K. This might come from bilinguals’ dominant language activation (Grosjean, 2001) discussed in 2.4. Similarly, the other participants also demonstrated dominant influence of L1 or
L2 with different people or in different situations which could imply that, as late bilinguals, they can be called dominant bilinguals as discussed in 2.2.

4.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the data obtained from the interviews, together with a discussion as to their significance for our understanding of the identity of a sample of BE teachers and its relation to bilingualism. Finally, the conclusions of the findings of the four research questions were summarised.
Chapter 5

Implications and Conclusion

5.1 Introduction

This chapter considers the implications of the findings and discussions of this study for the TESOL profession. However, it is first reminded that this study was conducted with a very small number of participants. The findings of this study nonetheless may contribute to providing a clearer understanding of bilingualism and its impact on the identity of BE teachers; identity issues as learners and teachers of English; and teacher development.

5.2 Implications for Bilingualism and Its Impact on the Identity of BE Teachers

The findings which revealed the ambiguity of the concept of bilingualism and the participants’ definitions of being bilingual were similar to the widely held belief of balanced bilingualism which shows an idealised concept of being equally competent in two languages. The participants, nevertheless, seemed confident in their teaching or enjoyed teaching as BE teachers. Most of them, however, did not perceive themselves as being bilingual and showed the contradiction of the beliefs of the critical period for SLA. This perception of bilingualism apparently affects a teacher’s identity as a BE teacher because it could, positively or negatively, affect their self-esteem or confidence. All participants exhibited that ‘sequential acquisition of bilingualism’ (Baker, 2011) could achieve an advanced level of English although their hesitance of the acknowledgement of being bilingual might interrelate the concept of balanced bilingualism. The existence of dominant bilinguals, those who speak one
language more dominantly than another, based on the starting age, place of L2 learning, interlocutors and language environments, should be more acknowledged and accepted in L2 language education enabling BE teachers’ identity or self-perceptions to change more positively.

5.3 Implications for Identity Issues as Learners and Teachers of English

The participants have had both positive and negative experiences in learning English. By going through the process of becoming bilinguals and consequently BE teachers, the participants were all aware of their changes in behaviour, but also illustrated significant L1 influence when speaking in English; most of the participants did not believe that their core identity changed. The participants had developed and forged their identity as BE teachers and may considerably help their students’ identity issues in L2 learning. This is because they presumably know the students’ learning issues having shared the same experiences learning English, and they would use the same or similar learning strategies. The findings showed that L2 speakers may discover and develop a new personality or identity through self-expression in another language (Savignon, 2002: 14). The learning environment and L2 proficiency were ostensibly key factors affecting the participants’ recognition of their bilingual identity and bilingualism, and ultimately influenced their teaching beliefs. It is also recommended to understand how people create and negotiate their cultural identity in the process of intercultural communication (Holli day, Hyde and Kullman, 2010). BE teachers can advise their students to be aware of identity issues through intercultural communication based on their experience. Kullman (2013, in press) informs that ‘the role of the teacher is to help individual learners to find their own new
voices in the new language, and to mediate between these new voices and the learners’ first language voices’. As lifelong L2 learners, BE teachers may be better equipped to guide L2 students in finding a new voice which could be their new identities.

5.4 Implications for Teacher Development

Teacher development might imply a challenge for BE teachers to overcome the insecurity and lack of self-confidence that characterises English proficiency of many BE teachers, especially in speaking. Language proficiency is an unquestioned requirement for language teachers, yet the participants who studied L2 in their home countries believed they had lower competence in both speaking and listening. Countries such as Japan and China, according to the relevant participants, still teach English using L1 for verbal and written instructions and not English, and the teachers’ speaking fluency is not always a priority in state schools. However, BE teachers should consider the most popular current teaching method, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) where communicative competence is the primary concern. Here, teachers are expected to predominantly use the target language although ‘judicious use of the students’ native language is permitted in CLT’ (Larsen-Freeman and Anderson, 2011: 125). Cullen (1994) describes a teacher training programme which incorporates a language improvement component. Cullen (2002: 221) also prompts another approach to language improvement for teachers by helping teachers develop ‘a command of classroom language’ by using lesson transcripts. Exploring the content of teacher training programmes could demonstrate the need for more opportunities to incorporate specific guidance concerning BE teachers.
5.5 Further Research

Although this research attempted to fill some gaps in the existing literature on the impact of bilingualism on the identity of BE teachers, there remains a considerable need for further research in this field to produce more convincing evidence of the perceptions of BE teachers, especially those who speak both English and their students’ L1. Moreover, it is recommended that the research should involve BE teachers who have had equal lengths of exposure to English environments and how they accommodate towards various people in intercultural communication. Finally, as a recommendation for prospective researchers, a longer period of observation and a greater number of participants would deepen this study and its interrelation in the TESOL field.

5.6 Conclusion

The widely held belief of balanced bilingualism has affected the participants’ self-perceptions of being bilingual or not. This has also reflected the experience of learning English. BE teachers however can possibly help their students more effectively than monolingual NES teachers. To encourage improvement of their students’ communicative competence, BE teachers should regard themselves as examples of bilinguals who are also successful L2 learners.

All participants evaluated my interviews as enlightening which gave them the opportunity to think about their identity seriously. Through this research, I have found the similarities between the participants’ and my own experiences as a learner and a teacher, especially with regard to teaching beliefs based on L2 learning experiences. I have also discovered the significant role ICC plays and the gap in the
literature and among BE teachers regarding the perceptions of bilingualism. These findings have allowed me to gain valuable insights for my role as a BE teacher. As a Japanese bilingual speaker of English who obtained a Bachelor's degree in a university in the U.S. and have taught English in Japan, I am now more confident of perceiving myself as a bilingual who found my new identity as a BE teacher. I hope more BE teachers perceive themselves as bilinguals and act more confidently as successful models for their students. Although this study cannot generalise the findings to all BE teachers, I believe this was a worthwhile investigation into bilingual teachers of English which has the potential to enable such teachers to help their students in the process of identity formation as bilingual speakers of English.
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Appendices

Appendix 1

Participants’ Background History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Studying Experience Abroad</th>
<th>Use of L1 in Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mid-20's</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Macau, China/U.K.</td>
<td>Yes (11 years)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Early 30's</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Mexico/U.S.</td>
<td>Yes (10 years)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cypriot</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Early 20's</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Cyprus/U.K.</td>
<td>Yes (7 years)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mid-30's</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>H.K., China/U.S.</td>
<td>Yes (3 weeks), MA TESOL (1 year)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mid-40's</td>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>No. MA TESOL (1 year)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Mid-30's</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>No. MA TESOL (1 year)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |              |        |      |                  |                      |                            |                   |

Table 4: Participants’ background history

Participant A:

Participant A is a mid-twenty year old female from Macau, China. She immigrated to the U.K. when she was 14 years old with her family, but it was her choice to come to the U.K. She has taught Cantonese to British Born Chinese (BBC); however, she has never taught English prior to taking an MA TESOL course. She is currently studying on the TESOL course and is also teaching English to various nationalities in the U.K. She has been living in the U.K. for 11 years.

Participant B:

Participant B is an early thirty year old female from Mexico. She had studied English in her home country since she was 7 years old. She moved to the U.S. when she was 19 years old to improve her English skills, and graduated from an American college. She has taught English for 4 years in Mexico, and is studying on an MA
TESOL course and has started teaching English in the U.K. She has lived abroad for 10 years in total.

Participant C:
Participant C is an early twenty year old female from Cyprus. She came to the U.K. when she was 17 years old, graduated from a British university, and is now studying on an MA TESOL course in the U.K. She has experience of being a supply teacher at primary schools in the U.K.; however she had no experience of teaching English at this time. She has just started teaching English in the U.K. She has been living in the U.K. for 7 years.

Participant D:
Participant D is a mid-thirty year old female from Hong Kong, China. She has learnt English in Hong Kong, but also stayed in the U.S. for 3 weeks taking an intensive English course. Before coming to the U.K. to take an MA TESOL course, she has taught English for 10 years at secondary schools in Hong Kong, China. She has been living in the U.K. for a year.

Participant E:
Participant E is a mid-forty year old female from Japan. She has only learnt English in Japan. She has taught English at high schools in Japan for about 20 years. She will continue her career as an English teacher in Japan. She came to the U.K. to study on an MA TESOL course and experience life in an English speaking country for the first time. She has been living in the U.K. for a year.

Participant F:
Participant F is the only male participant. He is in his mid-thirties, and is from Japan. He has only learnt English in Japan. He has lived in Zambia, Africa to teach math and science using the English language for a year. He came to the U.K. to study on an MA TESOL course, and will go back to Japan to obtain a career as an English teacher. He has been living in the U.K. for a year.
Appendix 2

Interview Guide

2.1 First interview (One question for the narrative interview style)

1. Warm welcome and greeting with tea and snacks.
2. Ask permission to record interviews.
3. Collect certificate of informed consent.
4. Outline the aim of this study.
5. Ask questions.

Pilot question for the first interviews: Can you tell me about your English learning experience from the beginning?

2.2 Second interview (semi-structured interview, some follow-up questions from the first interviews, and general pilot questions)

1. Warm welcome and greeting with tea and snacks.
2. Ask permission to record interviews.
3. Ask questions.

The second interview follow-up questions for each participant:

Participant A:

- Can you explain what the similarities and differences are between Macau and British people and culture?
- Why did you move to the U.K.? Was this your choice or your family’s?

Participant B:

- Would you want to go to the U.S. even if your friend was not there?
- What makes you want to go back to the same city where you used to live in the U.S. and stay?
- Did having a Latino community help your stay in the U.S.? Why was this?
- Can you explain what the similarities and differences are between Mexican and American/British people and culture?

Participant C:

- What was your motivation to learn English?
- What are the similarities and differences between Cypriots and British people and culture?
Participant D:
- Can you tell me about your time during school (age 15-21)?

Participant E:
- Can you tell me more about your teaching experience since you have taught English for over 20 years?

Participant F:
- Why did you not like English?
- Why did you start thinking of living abroad?

4. General pilot questions for all participants:
- Could you rate your own English language proficiency (listening, speaking, writing and reading)?
- What made you think you became fluent in English?
- Has your personality or way of thinking changed since living abroad?
- Tell me about your interesting or memorable experiences of communicating with native English speakers.
- What is your best and worst experience of speaking English?

2.3 Final interview (structured interview)

1. Warm welcome and greeting with tea and snacks.
2. Ask permission to record interviews.
3. Ask questions.

Pilot questions for the final interviews:
- Please explain what bilingual or bilingualism mean.
- Are you bilingual?
- How do you see yourself now in terms of your cultural identity and self-perception? Do you feel isolated or accepted?
- Do you think and act differently or the same when you speak English or your mother tongue?
- Why did you become an English teacher?
- What is your teaching belief as a bilingual teacher?

4. Ask for participants’ impression of my overall interview and suggestions for further improvement.
Appendix 3

Schedule of the Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>First interview</th>
<th>Second interview</th>
<th>Third interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>28th of July</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>3rd of August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>28th of July</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>1st of August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>17th of July</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>1st of August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>26th of July</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>3rd of August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10th of August</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>17th of August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>28th of July</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>1st of August</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Schedule of the interviews
Appendix 4

Certification of Informed Consent

Name: _____________________________________________
Date: ____________________________________________

I would like you to participate in my research for the dissertation of MA TESOL at Canterbury Christ Church University. The main aim of my study is to collect your English learning and teaching history as a sample of bilingual/non-native English teachers.

If you agree to participate in this research, the interviews will take place three times, and each interview will take approximately one hour. For the first interview, I will record and videotape the interviews using an audio and a video recorder. For the second and final interviews, I will only use an audio recorder.

The recordings will be kept private and for the purpose of my research only. I will transcribe the interviews and your identity will remain anonymous and all information will be treated with strict confidentiality.

Your participation in the research is voluntary. You can withdraw your consent from the study at any time by emailing me at: a.asada655@canterbury.ac.uk.

You can ask me any questions relating to the research at any time. I will provide you with a copy of my results to ensure you are satisfied with the data.

Please sign below to show that you have understood and been informed of the purpose of my study and that you consent to each part of the study. Please return a copy of this form to me and keep one copy for your records.

I agree to take part in this research.

Signature                                                                                      Date
___________________________________________________________________
Appendix 5

Excerpts of Relevant Transcription Data from Interviews

All the comments cited or paraphrased in text or used to populate Box 2, Table 2 and Table 3 are highlighted in bold.

5.1 Comments on: The English Learning Environment

5.1.1 Participant A:

‘I started learning English at the age of 3 or 4, but I was ‘receptive’ learner till I moved to U.K. because I was only studying grammar and writing. I have no contact with native speakers in Macau. I was studying English as a compulsory subject, no interest of western culture during primary school days. I took English lessons every day, it consists of three parts: general English, reading, and grammar. I think my English fluency level was pre-intermediate at the age of 15 when moving to the U.K., but my grammar knowledge was solid. After coming to the U.K., I was taking EFL support, and study intensively to take FCE, which is called first certificate English, test-4skills for 2 years. At the age of 16, I have achieved the score of IELTS 6.5, and I also became active learner by speaking with British people.’

5.1.2 Participant B:

‘I started learning English at the age of 7 at school for 2 hours per week, and Mexican teacher was using Spanish to teach English and just forced students to memorise the vocabulary. I didn’t like English at all, no interest in foreign culture, but my best friend went to Boston and she invited me to come over when I had no English skills at that time. I stayed in Boston for a year and a half. I studied English by necessity. At the age of 19, my English is 15% and very limited. I was working as a babysitter, and parents and children helped me improve my English. I started liking American culture and the language. I went back to Mexico for 6 months, took intensive English program studied 2 hours every day, and got a certificate of teaching English. I went back to Boston; apply for the course to become a pre-school teacher. I learnt spoken English first to communicate with local people, then written English at this time.’

5.1.3 Participant C:

‘I started learning at the age of 7 in Cyprus before learning at the state school because most parents want their children to learn English in private schools. Teachers always talk in English, so it was good for me. At the age of 16, I finished taking English lessons, and came to U.K. at the age of 17. After
coming to the U.K., I always kept vocabulary books as my own dictionary, write down words which are not in the course books. British people encouraged me to speak up, so I was not afraid of making mistakes.’

5.1.4 Participant D:

‘My English teachers at primary school were not good and I did not like them, so my English test results were always poor. However, at the age of 14, I attended a summer course which had 10 intensive lessons in the U.S. and improved English skills a lot. I pushed myself to study hard to impress other people and not let them look down on me anymore.’

5.1.5 Participant E:

‘I started learning at the age of 13 when I was in the first year of secondary school, but I knew how to write in Roman letters when I was 11 or 12, and liked to write my name in English. I became a fan of Duran Duran, an English band, and started listening to their songs. I translated the lyrics into Japanese and analysed the English grammar. I became more interested in the U.K. country and its culture. I started writing letters to some pen pals in the U.K. initially, then Australia, and for some difficult words, asked my high school teacher. I enjoyed communicating with native speakers of English.’

5.1.6 Participant F:

‘I started learning English at the age of 13 at my secondary school in Japan as a compulsory subject. There was a native English teacher at school, but I was scared and intimidated by the teacher. When the teacher checked my pronunciation, I wasn’t happy or encouraged at all, but rather embarrassed. Besides, I had no interest in western culture at that time. English tests were always average. I was listening to western music and watching western movies, but they did not encourage me to learn English.’

5.2 Comments on: L2 Proficiency

5.2.1 Participant A:

‘Well, my listening and speaking skills are perfect, so I score 100. Reading is 80%, and writing is 70% because I still struggle with my assignments.’

5.2.2 Participant B:

‘I think my listening is quite good, so maybe 90%, and reading is around 80%, speaking is 70%, and I don’t have any confidence in writing, so I would say, 40%.’
5.2.3 Participant C:

‘My speaking skills are the best, but not perfect, so I say 80%. Then, listening is 70%, reading is 60%, and writing is maybe 50%.’

5.2.4 Participant D:

‘My reading and writing skills are much better than speaking and listening. I would say, reading first, writing second, speaking third, then listening. I sometimes don’t understand what English people say, it sounds so fast.’

5.2.5 Participant E:

‘I love reading, so my reading skills are the best, and writing next, then listening, but I have no confidence in speaking.’

5.2.6 Participant F:

‘My reading skills would be the top, then listening. I am not confident in writing and speaking. Maybe my speaking skills are the worst.’

5.3 Comments on: Perceptions of Bilingualism

5.3.1 Participant A:

‘I think bilinguals should be able to speak or understand two or more languages nearly equally. They should be both receptive which means listening and reading, and active which means speaking and writing, to be bilinguals, no clear domination on languages. People who are able to code-switch quickly without dictionaries can be defined as bilinguals. So, yes, I am bilingual.’

5.3.2 Participant B:

‘Bilingualism or being bilingual means to speak two or more languages at the same level. Age matters, you need to learn languages before 5 years old. I don’t think I am bilingual.’

5.3.3 Participant C:

‘Bilingualism means being able to speak and use two languages at the same level from birth. I didn’t learn English from birth, so I am not bilingual.’
5.3.4 Participant D:

‘Being able to communicate two languages at the same level is what I call bilingual. Age factor is also important. I am not bilingual since I can’t communicate well in English, my English is not at the same level as Cantonese.’

5.3.5 Participant E:

‘Bilingualism means to have two languages at the same level, ideally four language skills. Speaking is the most important skill to judge the fluency. 40/60 is okay. You can say you are bilingual. Age is important, too. I am definitely not bilingual.’

5.3.6 Participant F:

‘Being bilingual means being able to speak more than two languages. Being bilingual means speaking fluently, which is equal to native speakers’ level. I can’t speak English fluently, so, I am not bilingual.’

5.4 Comments on: The belief of the Critical Age Period for SLA

5.4.1 Participant A:

‘The critical period should be before 6 years old.’

5.4.2 Participant B:

‘I know some adult learners are successful L2 speakers, but according to my belief of the critical period, it’s before 5 years old. It’s so hard to get rid of L1 accent after that age.’

5.4.3 Participant C:

‘You need to learn both L1 and L2 from birth.’

5.4.4 Participant D:

‘I think you need to learn L2 around 5 or 6 years old.’

5.4.5 Participant E:

‘I hope the critical period was until around thirteen or fourteen years old when they started learning English at secondary schools in Japan.’
5.4.6 Participant F:

'I don’t believe that the critical period for SLA exists. Anyone can acquire L2 at any age.'

5.5 Comments on: Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC)

5.5.1 Participant A:

'I call myself free will bilingual as opposed to a forced bilingual because I would learn and accept anything I wanted and would not learn what I was not interested in. My family is Catholic, and I went to Catholic school in Macau. I pray in Cantonese. When I moved to U.K., I started attending Church of England. I was willing to participate in Christian service like singing in the U.K. I always wondered why people are polite, why they say that; for example, bless you, excuse me, and so on, and pronunciation like ‘crisps’, I couldn’t pronounce /s/ /p/ /s/ together. After I learnt British tradition such as Christmas tradition such as presents and food, I see myself more British. I understand British culture more, so I shifted more British.'

5.5.2 Participant B:

'The memorable experience is when I was in Boston working as a babysitter; I always said ‘put the belt on’ for 2-3 months. Then my babysitting children finally told me that was not belt that was seatbelt. Since then, I never forget that word. My way of thinking also changed. I am more open-minded, more easily accept different culture, accents, and also think everyone is the same no matter what religion.'

5.5.3 Participant C:

'Living abroad experience was survival for me because I had no friends at all at first. Now, I have many friends in the U.K., but I miss more Cyprus people, so I visit my country three times a year. Now, I try to talk to people even though I don’t like. Before coming to the U.K., I never talked to people I didn’t like. My attitude changed after living in the U.K., I became more flexible.'

5.5.4 Participant D:

'It bothered me to be polite at the beginning, but now I have adjusted to being polite otherwise people would consider me and other H.K. people as rude. I accept western culture such as hug, kiss, casual clothes, never in H.K. I make friends with European friends, and so I accepted the differences. I got used to some habit like hugging and goodbye kiss after a few times. I don’t look people as different nationalities, but rather personality. My way of thinking has changed a bit; for example, accepting the differences, more open-minded. Living abroad experience changed my point of view.'
5.5.5 Participant E:

'I wish I had more communication strategy as both a teacher and a student when I discuss things with the professor during the lecture in the TESOL course, but the professor didn't fully understand what I was trying to say. I wanted to tell her about cultural difference, lecture preparation, large area of study, and so on, but the professor only thought it was just lack of my language proficiency. When my host mother called me, she said that she and her husband would be back late, which meant to eat dinner by myself, but I thought I would be better to wait until they came back because they usually cook. I thought it would be rude to use their kitchen while they were not there, which I thought was very Japanese way of thinking. Another embarrassing story is I took my washing inside, but not my host family's. I thought they would like to leave it a bit longer since it was a bit wet. I was trying to be polite, but they expected me to do it for everyone. I saw the mother's face looked unpleasant so I made an excuse, but I felt guilty.'

5.5.6 Participant F:

'I believe that having interactions with people from different cultures enabled L2 learners to obtain ICC. I learnt to leave my mistakes or not to ask interlocutors for meanings if they were not so meaningful, as I wanted to keep the conversation flowing in order to build a comfortable atmosphere, rather than stopping the conversation every time I needed to think and understand what was being said. I answer using a useful, easier expression first even though that expression doesn't really fit what I mean. There are lots of miscommunication, but I don't correct my mistakes for some unimportant conversations and just let it go. I changed the way I express and communicate. I learnt from my own experiences.'

5.6 Comments on: The Relationship between L1/L2 Thought and Behaviour

5.6.1 Participant A:

'Yes, I think and act differently. When speaking English, I act more modestly, more politely. I also try to use phrases like thank you, sorry, excuse me more than speaking in Cantonese. When speaking my mother tongue, I am more direct and more confident to make jokes with more historical knowledge. I always try to speak clearly in both languages.'

5.6.2 Participant B:

'No, I don't think so, but my mother said when I speak English, I changed the voice, tone, and gesture. I never realised that I changed. I behave differently because I am in the different culture. In Mexico, they scream a
lot, and they interrupt conversation all the time. They are all talking. On the other hand, English people don’t interrupt so much, so I try not to interrupt much. I am aware of the difference. Although I try to adopt, sometimes, I cannot change. I respect others by acting differently or changing the behaviour, but not having two faces.’

5.6.3 Participant C:

‘I sometimes forget about Greek grammar and spelling, and sometimes, I do code-switching. I am also more aware of acting differently. I am discovering myself and am proud of myself, my home county, my L1 language. My parents see the difference in my behaviour. For example, sharing food, saying thank you and sorry more often than in Cyprus, but I don’t feel so deep when saying sorry in English.’

5.6.4 Participant D:

‘In Cantonese, I speak more directly, and I don’t say ‘sorry’ and ‘excuse me’. In English, I always use polite expressions such as would like, please, can I, and I always try to be as polite as possible. I use some expressions similar to these but not as strong as sorry.’

5.6.5 Participant E:

‘I think the same based on my Japanese way of thinking. L1 transfer is a great impact on me. My way of thinking is always Japanese. Sometimes, Japanese word-order affects my English, and I have to adjust; for example, using passive voice, I am consciously thinking in Japanese. I sometimes feel unclear in a certain context such as watching films, but I also think, even in Japanese, I don’t have a complete knowledge of everything, so it might be the same. I need to use a dictionary to check the words to find the words in Japanese. Even when I speak in English, I feel I am Japanese.’

5.6.6 Participant F:

‘My identity hasn’t changed, but the way I express myself changes when I speak English. When speaking L1, I never really think before I speak. When speaking English, I have to think first, especially when talking about Japanese culture, I have to change the channel such as where I should start. I think a lot.’
5.7 Comments on: Identity Formation

5.7.1 Participant A:
‘I wanted to go into a good university, and I knew if I stay in Macau, I could not go to a good university because Macau is small place. I always had a boyfriend whose L1 is English, so I have constantly spoken English, and they have corrected my mistakes. I was with a British boyfriend for 2 years, so I understood U.K. culture. This affects my way of thinking. I sometimes isolate myself on purpose. In Macau, people at my age, they haven’t been abroad much, so I think I am better than them, and my eyes are more broaden. I know more than you, sort of thing. I didn’t want to be friends with these people. People might think of me as different.’

5.7.2 Participant B:
‘My identity of who I am came from being a Latino woman, and some other influence. My core identity never changes. I belong to where I am from. I respect others by acting differently or changing the behaviour for them, but I am not having two faces. I became more flexible, open-minded now.’

5.7.3 Participant C:
‘I think I understand myself more. I was shy, not social in my home country, but now I am more confident, active, and open-minded. I think language influences confidence. At the beginning, I tried to fit in to U.K. community, so I felt unpleasant when someone asked me where I was from, but now, I am confident, and don’t try to fit in. I struggled to find a way to use English phrases people use like ‘cheers’, but that’s not me, so I stopped using some phrases.’

5.7.4 Participant D:
‘After acquiring English, I am more confidence in myself, but I think I am not westernised. My personality has not changed. I changed a bit, more patients, and try to be more polite to people from different cultures. I am more open-minded when speaking in English. My way of thinking has changed a bit such as accepting the differences, more open-minded. Living abroad experience changed my point of view although my core identity remains the same.’

5.7.5 Participant E:
‘My core personality hasn’t changed. People think I am selfish because I do what I want to do, but reliable, a natural leader and not slow-paced. My way of thinking has not been affected by the English language. I look at myself as complete Japanese. Japanese language influences my way of thinking. I am only translating Japanese into English. I don’t feel other cultural influence on my identity. I think I am not that fluent. I am Japanese,
using English as L2, but it does not have a great impact on my identity. I don’t think my thought will change when going back to Japan as far as my age is concerned.’

5.7.6 Participant F:

‘My core personality never changed. I appreciate having a Japanese cultural background, but I do not expect the same belief or value from other people. I try to be as natural as possible to other people. My core identity, the Japanese comes from the experience I got through life in Japan. Although I am in the U.K., I try not to be western, try not to adjust, and try to be who I am as I am in Japan. But in conversation, I will adjust based on the interlocutor’s cultural background; for example, try to speak clearly.’

5.8 Comments on: Teacher’s Belief

5.8.1 Participant A:

‘Everyone can develop fluency. I believe if I can do it, anyone can do it. My learning experience can definitely help my students become fluent L2 speakers. I encourage students by being more enthusiastic in class. Make the topic/lesson interesting. It is more of teaching behaviour than teaching the language. For instance it’s teaching how to interact with people from different cultures. I give students more responsibility.’

5.8.2 Participant B:

‘I believe the ways they teach are more important than either native or non-native. Some people think teaching English is giving language, but I believe that teaching language is also helping developing personality, be a better person. If you help the students, the class is better. Teaching is more than language. It gives more general education, nurturing children. I also reflect my learning experience to my students because I can understand their problems, and that’s very similar to what I have been through.’

5.8.3 Participant C:

‘The teachers should stay the same level, no priority as a teacher. I want to treat naturally, and equally to my students. My first English language teacher was like that, and I liked it. As a teacher, I work hard since English is not L1 and write teacher’s diary.’
5.8.4 Participant D:

'I encourage students to read, write, and practise more. Bilingual teachers use their experience of learning L2. My motto is not to give up on students, no matter how poor their English skills are. This is what I have experienced when I first studied English. My teachers kept encouraging me not to give up. I am so proud of being an English teacher now because I can help my students using my learning experience in my home country.'

5.8.5 Participant E:

'I always encourage students to study English, helping them realise it can be fun and interesting to learn things about a different culture through English. I want them to know how fun and interesting it is to learn English. I don’t care what levels they are at, but I want to help them as a teacher. I believe that talking about cultural differences without using grammar textbooks is important and fun as the students enjoy listening to my interesting stories. I also encourage them to go abroad. I believe that through talking on a one to one basis I can find their interests and similarities. Individual advice is important. I think, students will someday start learning English seriously when needed, and that is ok. I don't force them to study at school. I also think reading is important to help develop critical thinking. I love teaching English and my teaching advice is based on my own learning experience.'

5.8.6 Participant F:

'My motto, according to my university professor, is do it, tell the students to do it, and if it doesn’t work, do it all again. I believe that the goals set by the teachers could be different from the students'. I try not to demotivate my students even if they can’t answer since I understand their learning issues. Even if they didn’t do homework, they might have struggled to solve the questions. It was so hard to improve my communicative competence, especially pronunciation when I was studying English, so I understand my students' learning issues better than native speakers.'