비교문화연구 제56집 (2019.9) pp.445~480

The NS–NNS Dichotomy and Subalternity: Political And Psychoanalytic Approaches To Social Change In Applied Linguistics*

Rod Pederson
(Incheon National University, Associate Professor)

Abstract

The ongoing debate regarding the Native Speaker, Non–Native Speaker (NS–NNS) dichotomy over the past 30 years in applied linguistics literature have generally focused on issues of identity (Norton, 2006), linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992), and the relations of power between the centre and periphery (Kachru, 1996). It is well known that many of these theories have been informed by critical pedagogy and poststructuralism (Morgan & Ramanathan, 2005). Recently, postcolonial theories of historicization, decolonialization, and subalternity, developed from Gramsci's (2000) theory of hegemony, have been appropriated in applied linguistics literature and synthesized with critical approaches to ELT practices (Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Shin, 2006). While these approaches are designed to foment social change within applied linguistic practices, it is clear that their effect has been limited (Graddol, 2006). Many scholars in education cite neoliberalism as the mechanism that withers critical approaches to education (Giroux, 2010). The purpose of this paper is to review the relevant literature in order to discern why it has failed to be truly transformative. Drawing on political (Mouffe, 2005) and psychoanalytic theory (Stavrakakis, 2007), the author attempts to describe how post–democratic societies have displaced emotion, or passion with reason, thus reducing the political will to fully implement counter–hegemonic movements within applied

* This work was supported by the Incheon National University (International Cooperative) Research Grant in 2019.

linguistics. The review of this literature suggests that emotion and passion are necessary for social change.

Key Words : Postcolonialism; decolonialization, subalternity, critical pedagogy, native speakerism, social agency

Ⅰ. Introduction

In recent years much has been written about the nature of native speakerism and its relationship to subalternity in applied linguistic literature. Literature focusing on native speakerism, or the native speaker-nonnative speaker (NS-NNS) dichotomy, encompasses a wide range of issues including the NS as a myth (Crowley, 2003; Lippi-Green, 1997; McWhorter, 2001), the construction of NS identity in terms of both teacher and student (Aneja, 2016; Motha & Lin, 2013), globalized identities (Heller, 2003; Shin, 2006), and the issues of power that are inherent to the dichotomy (Lin & Luke, 2011; Rubdy, 2015). These issues of power and discrimination were first theorized by Kachru (1982) in his seminal work *The Other Tongue* and were later supported by Phillipson's (1992) and Canagarajah's (1999) work on the theory of linguistic imperialism that delineated the hegemonic domination of English language teaching (ELT) by the West. In addition, Pennycook's (1998) documentation of the colonial genesis of applied linguistics and its continuing influence in the theories and pedagogies in applied linguistics added to the legitimacy of these theories in applied linguistics. Moreover, literature on the NS-NNS dichotomy has also documented how unequal relations of power in ELT are academically maintained through the publishing of textbooks, academic journals, teacher training, and standardized testing (Morgan & Ramanathan, 2005; Shin, 2010). Thus, the NS-NSS dichotomy functions as a process of 'othering' ELT learners, teachers, and scholars in terms of the lessening access and use

of knowledge within the field of study as well as the ability to voice their concerns and opinions. Lin and Luke (2011) easily penetrate the diverse theorizing in applied linguistics of the othering and subalternity inherent within the NS-NNS dichotomy simply by pointing out that the naming of teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) directly, and officially, places the NNS in a subaltern position.

This focus on the unequal relations of power, often referred to as the center vs. the periphery (Green & Ives, 2009; Kachru, 1996; Kumaravadivelu, 2016), has led scholars in applied linguistics to critical pedagogy and postcolonial literature for its theories of power and resistance. The majority of these theories are initially derived from Gramsci's (1970) theory of hegemony that defines the dominated classes in a society as 'subaltern'. This theoretical term was taken up and further theorized by post-colonial scholars such as Spivak (1988) and Bhabha (1994) to address to the problems of unequal relations of power faced by the people of postcolonial nations in terms of the bureaucratic, ideological, linguistic, and academic structures that remained after the colonial powers left. The primary issue addressed by the postcolonial scholars was not so much the realia of the remaining social structures and how to dismantle them, but the continuing effect of the colonial experience on the identities and subjectivities of the postcolonial subjects. As Bourdieu (1991) theorized, the colonization of the mind was the central issue. For these reasons, Spivak (1988) raised the question: 'Can the Subaltern Speak?' and concluded that the answer was negative as the subaltern did not have an equal power to signify as did the dominant within the hegemonic system. Thus, post-colonial scholarship not only included the task of the re-historicization of postcolonial peoples (Said, 1978, Bhabha, 1994): but also investigated and problematized the construction of postcolonial identities and Bhabha's 'third space' that theorized the means for postcolonial subjects to construct identities that transcended the subaltern relationship with language, culture, and power.

Such post-colonial literature and the nature of subalternity was eventually appropriated into applied linguistics literature through the research on the

NS-NNS dichotomy (Heller, 2003; Motha & Lin, 2013), linguistic imperialism (Canagarajah, 1999; Phillipson, 1992), critical approaches to applied linguistics (Pennycook, 2001), and World Englishes (WE) (Kachru, 1996; Seargeant, 2008). These seemingly disparate approaches to the unequal relations of power in applied linguistics appropriated the postcolonial theories of subalternity within hegemony and its effects on identity which necessitated the individual and political counter-hegemonic actions of re-historicization to regain the truth of their people and the decolonialization of the mind and social structures of their societies (Kumaravadivelu, 2016). However, the majority of this necessary work remained theoretical in nature, and as such, has given little guidance as to how the applied linguistics practitioner may support such initiatives. Moreover, it is clear that while the appropriation of critical pedagogy and postcolonial theory into applied linguistics has increased over the past twenty years, its impact on applied linguistics practices and the subalternity of the hegemony of the center has had little actual effect (Graddol, 2006; Green & Ives, 2009; Kumaravadivelu, 2016). The intent of this paper is to examine the literature that is relevant to these issues and suggest that the appropriation of the political/psychoanalytic theories of the 'Lacanian Left' has the possibility of infusing critical and postcolonial theories with the necessary emotion, or passion, to transform the 'pedagogical into the political' (Giroux; 2002; Motta, 2014). This focus may facilitate the necessary political 'antagonism' that is mostly dormant in a post-democratic world where business and consumerism hold political sway (Mouffe, 2005; Stavrakakis, 2007). In doing so, this paper hopes to further the counter-hegemonic theorizing in applied linguistics designed to foster the social agency and justice of the subaltern in applied linguistics (Kumaravadivelu, 2016).

II. The NS-NNS dichotomy and subalternity in applied linguistics

In order to understand the nature of subalternity and its relation to the NS-NNS dichotomy in ELT it is necessary to situate Gramsci's (2000) concept of the subaltern within his larger theory of hegemony. In its most basic form, Gramsci's theory of hegemony entailed a non-coercive form of domination through the ideology of social structures and state bureaucracies with the tacit support of the dominated, or subaltern (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985; Stavrakakis, 2007). This tacit support, or manufactured consent, of the subaltern in their own domination enabled the dominant discourses of the state to control the populace with limited resort to violence and inculcate the masses with the dominant ideology through the bureaucratic control of all aspects of society such as education, business and the media (Stavrakakis, 2007). Necessarily, this also included the control of language as a means of both social sublimation and mobility within society in terms of the mastery of favored discourses. While the nature and implications of Gramsci's (2000) theory of hegemony will be more thoroughly discussed later in this paper, for the argument at hand it is only necessary to outline the nature of hegemony and the complicity inherent to the manufactured consent of the subaltern and its relations to language and discourse.

Kachru's (1982) seminal work *The Other Tongue* was the first rupture in traditional applied linguistic theory to question the relations of power in terms of language, culture, and power. His theory of the 'Three Circles of English' maps the expansion of English through the colonial power of the 'inner circle' nations, where English is the primary language (Western and white nations), the 'expanding circle' nations (those under or formerly under colonial rule where English was the language of social agency and mobility), and the 'expanding circle' of nations who were not subject to colonial rule but are learning English as a foreign Language (EFL) for the purposes of

developing modern economies and cultures. In doing so, Kachru's theory directly revealed the unequal relations of power within the NS-NNS dichotomy and how it affected non-inner circle nations. Philipson (1992) furthered Kachru's (1982) work by theorizing how the dominance of English language and culture began through colonial relations of power and are maintained through the auspices of the English Council, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank (WB). Moreover, Pennycook's (1998) work on the history of the discourses of colonialism in Hong Kong support much of Phillipson's (1992) assertions. In addition, Phillipson also outlines the practices of ELT by naming the fallacies claiming that native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) are represented as the ideal teachers of English as well as the ideological arguments for the spread of English as a *lingua franca,* such as the necessary control of English from the center and other forms of linguicism, as well as English being promoted as being a gateway to economic development and modernism.

Many scholars in applied linguistics have theorized about the nature of unequal power relations in the NS-NNS dichotomy, which Holliday (1999) termed 'native speakerism'. Holliday theorized the growth of English as an International Language (EIL) as a natural effect of Western colonialism, imperialism, and globalization, while Phillipson (1992) argued that it was a matter of the coercive economic, cultural, and ideological effects of Western hegemony that actively promotes and attempts to control EIL. Whereas there are legitimate points to both sides of this theoretical argument, it occludes the purely linguistic argument that the NS-NNS dichotomy is both a myth and a fallacy (Crowley, 2003). Lippi-Green (1997) and McWhorter, (2001) deconstruct this issue in their analyses of so-called standard English (SE). Simply put, their analyses argue that given the wide diversity of English dialects in America and the United Kingdom, and the fluid nature of language, that SE does not, and cannot, exist in reality. Thus, the very foundation of the NS-NNS dichotomy is demonstrated to be a myth; for if no linguistic standard for English may be shown to be valid, the only possible definition

for an NS would be a person who grew up with English as a 'cradle' language. Given that the numbers of English speakers designated as NNSs now outnumber the NS from inner circle nations, the NS-NNS dichotomy may only be described as a fallacy (Davies, 1996; Moussu & Lurda 2008). However, some scholars maintain that a form of SE exists in terms of academic writing and testing (Harris, 2001; Lippi-Green, 1997; Raimes, 1990).

Although the myth of the NS-NNS dichotomy has been widely recognized in applied linguistics literature, its power may be clearly seen within the international practices of applied linguistics. The discriminatory hiring practices of non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) and their lack of equal treatment and pay compared to native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) has been widely noted in applied linguistics literature and demonstrates subaltern beliefs about the NS-NNS dichotomy (Green & Ives, 2009; Heller, 2003). This claim is supported by the 33,162 NEST teachers teaching in Korean Public schools in 2009 (Korean Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 2009), which does not factor in the additional numbers of NNESTs teaching in private English academies that a majority of Korean students attend (Shin, 2010). Moreover, it is striking that Korean's spent 15 billion dollars on private English education and foreign study in 2006 (Park, 2010) in addition to 650 million dollars on the standardized testing of the West; primarily those of the Educational Testing Service (ETS), such as the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) tests in 2005 (Shin, 2010). Increasingly, such testing becomes high stakes testing (HST) that has a great impact on the future success of students (Graddol, 2006; Shin, 2010). A similar progression of these practices in applied linguistics have also been noted to be rapidly occurring in China (Green & Ives, 2009; Hau, 2014). Thus, while SE and the NS-NNS dichotomy may be shown to be myths, they nevertheless materially exist in terms of economics, testing, and publishing in applied linguistics practice and are driven by the beliefs of the NNS subaltern of the validity and power of the NS-NNS dichotomy. Some scholars theorize that the subaltern acceptance of

this dichotomy exists through theories of representation that demonstrate not only that a multiplicity of meanings exists for every signification, but that some accepted representational beliefs are acts of false consciousness (Kubota, 2016; Kumaravadivelu, 2016). As such, much of the actual practices in applied linguistics support the claims of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992; Canagarajah, 1999) as well as Gramsci's (2000) theory of hegemony in that the subaltern are complicit in their own domination through their tacit support of the dominant power.

Much of the literature in applied linguistics and WE that helps explicate the nature of the power of the NS-NNS dichotomy focuses on the relationship between the 'center' and the 'periphery'. In general, these theoretical discussions revolve around the issues of linguicism, or who controls SE (Lysandrou & Lysandrou, 2003; Quirk, 1985), proper methodologies or pedagogies (Holliday, 2015), the major publishing houses that supply the learning materials for applied linguistics (Green & Ives, 2009; Kumaravadivelu, 2006), and the access of NNS scholars to publish their work in international academic journals (Flowerdew, 2012; Selvi, 2011). Phillipson's (1992) charge of linguicism within ELT focuses on how entities such as The British Council, ETS, and the major publishing houses actively proselytize and systematically disseminate language ideologies that favor a specific SE, whether it be British or an American dialect, for the purposes of controlling EIL. While it is clear that there are some benefits to EIL as the vast majority of business and scientific information is in English (Brutt-Griffler, 2005; Spolsky, 2004), it is unclear whether the control of English from the center is either desirable or possible. Sociolinguistic perspectives deny the possibility of control as language is in a constant state of flux (Solano-Flores, 2006; Traugott, 2012). Pennycook (2004) more precisely explicates this perspective by claiming that language does not really exist in reality, but is only 'real' in a state of 'performativity' as it is uttered. Regardless of the claims of linguicism and the neutrality of English (Lysandrou & Lysandrou, 2003), or the dangers of 'deficit linguistics', increasing numbers of scholars recognize that the growth of EIL and the use

of the term SE is more of a 'code' for whiteness and serves as an instrument to maintain existing inequalities in EFL nations (Graddol, 2006; Motha, 2014; Mahboob, 2009). The growth of the WE movement is a clear denial of linguicism and the control of English by the center (Kachru, 1996; Seargeant, 2008).

WE also is in the forefront of movements against the power of the international publishing houses in disseminating the preferred methodologies, or approaches, to applied linguistics such as communicative language teaching (CLT) (Kachru, 1996; Mahboob, 2009). In addition, various 'critical' approaches to applied linguistics also theorize how center dominated language ideologies and pedagogies develop and maintain unequal power relations between the center and periphery (Kachru, 1996; Pennycook, 2001). As access to Western universities is much desired in many EFL nations, the center guided ETS serves as a gateway to Western academic degrees and what Bourdieu (1991) refers to as 'profits of distinction' (Graddol, 2006; Motha, 2014). The issue of NNS scholars' ability to publish in international academic journals is also a key way in which the center attempts to control ELT practices (Kachru, 1996; Seargeant, 2008). While it is clear that an increasing amount of NNS scholars are publishing in international academic journals, it also remains clear that it is considerably more difficult for them to do so in comparison to NS scholars (Flowerdew, 2012; Selvi, 2011). Although some journals, such as the *Asian EFL Journal* (2018), state their willingness to help NNS scholars to publish in their journal, it is clear that these well-intentioned efforts are rare and would, nonetheless, lead such authors towards the generally perceived representation of SE (https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/guidelines/).

Ⅲ. Postcolonialism and applied linguistics

1. Origins of postcolonialism

The origins of postcolonialism are generally attributed to the works of Said (1978), Spivak (1988), and Bhabha (1994), although some scholar's attribute to Gandhi's works in freeing India from British colonialism (Trivedi, 2011). Regardless of the genesis of post-colonialism, the influence of post-colonial theory has become a distinct field of study and has been widely appropriated into many fields of study within the social sciences such as sociology (Burawoy, 2008), cultural studies (Hall, 2006), critical literacy/ pedagogy (Keyl, 2017), political science (Mouffe, 2005; Stavrakakis, 2007), and applied linguistics (Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Shin, 2006). In addition, it must be noted that a key aspect of postcolonial theory is derived from Gramsci's (2000) theory of hegemony as the terms subaltern and counter-hegemony are commonly used theoretical terms. While Gramsci's theory may be the most commonly used theory of hegemony within the social sciences, other theories have developed from Gramsci's theory including international relations theories that focus mainly on the exercise of cultural and economic power (Cox, 1993; Gill & Mittleman, 2001; Joseph, 2000), and Laclau and Mouffe's (1985) theory that views hegemony as a necessary and ongoing process that may lead to a more radical democratic society, while never being able to totally reach its goal. Three relevant aspects of postcolonial theory will be discussed in this section will be the problematic nature of the construction of postcolonial identities, complicity within subaltern communities, and theories of counter-hegemony.

2. Postcolonialism and identity

A review of recent literature in applied linguistics regarding the

construction of second language (L2) identity, whether those of students, teachers, or scholars, reveals that poststructuralism is the most generally applied approach to understanding L2 identities (Block, 2007; Norton & Toohey, 2004). The key factor in the majority of this literature is the 'othering' that is embedded within the very naming of TESOL that requires inquiry not only into the theories and practices of the field of study, but also into the nature into the discursive processes of signification that are a fundamental aspect of identity formation (Lin & Luke, 2011; Hall, 2006). Much of the theory used in these studies is derived from European sociology, particularly that of Bourdieu (1991), who theorizes that authority resides outside of language and that 'profits of distinction' may be acquired through the acquisition of symbolic, cultural, and economic 'capitals (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). As such, poststructural approaches to the construction of identity tend to view identity as a 'site of struggle' that is fluid in terms of its hybridity (Bhabha, 1994, Hall, 2006). Recently, these discursive views of identity have included globalization into their theorizations as the varying discourses of globalization, that mirror Bourdieu's (1991) forms of capitals, not only clearly state the economic costs of acquiring 'profits of distinction' that commodify English language acquisition but also the multiple possibilities of hybridity made available through globalized cultures (Heller, 2003; Shin, 2006). Nevertheless, while some scholars theorize possibilities for the increased social agency of NNSs (Norton & Toohey, 2004), the marginality of their social positions, or subalternity, remains unquestioned. As much of the theorizing in post-structuralism includes postcolonialism (Bourdieu, 1991; Hall, 1997), it is not surprising that an increasing number of theorists in applied linguistics have appropriated postcolonial theory into their analyses of the construction of NNS identities (Bolton, 2006; Kachru & Smith, 2008; Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Lin & Luke, 2011; Morgan & Ramanathan, 2005; Shin, 2006).

Although much postcolonial literature does not mention theories of hegemony, they nonetheless are partially employing the theory by focusing on the

plight of the dominated in a society, or the subaltern (Hall, 1997). Postcolonial scholars most often theorize about the construction of identities of subjects on former colonial nations who remain subaltern in the current neo-liberal or globalized world (Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 2006; Kachru, 1996; Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Spivak, 1988). While the origins of post-colonial thought and action are often attributed to Gandhi (Trivedi, 2011), the seminal work of Said's (1978) *Orientalism* likely had a greater influence on the post-colonial scholarship that was to follow. Said's work demonstrated how colonial scholarship, journalism, and fiction created or influenced fields of study that depicted the 'other' through the lens of colonial ideology and culture in ways that not only denigrated and essentialized the peoples they were 'researching', but over the decades of colonial rule became compounded into inaccurate and subaltern views that became the dominant academic view of subordinated peoples. It is also worth noting that such colonial researchers did not bother to check their findings with the peoples they work researching, but also often described their cultures in shockingly defamatory ways (Pennycook, 2001).

This focus on the subaltern construction of identity is most noted in Spivak's (1988) seminal work *Can the Subaltern Speak?* that focuses on the issue of identity through the appropriation of Foucault's (1984) theory of power that explicates how 'epistemic violence' is perpetrated through the re-writing of history to precisely define the dominant 'self' and subaltern 'other'. This epistemic violence in turn serves to define the possibilities of scholarship in academia and reduces the history of the subaltern to insignificance in all forms of textuality and representation. Spivak (1988) points out that such epistemology greatly influences both the dominant and the dominated alike, thus foretelling Bourdieu's (1991) assertion that there is a 'remorseless reciprocity' between the self and the other. Thus, Spivak (1988) theorizes that the subaltern cannot speak as she is subject to a revisionist history of her people and the neo-colonial social structures that continue to dominate state bureaucratic and educational systems. Moreover,

this lack of the 'right to signify' (Hall, 2006) also affects the intelligentsia of the dominant in that their understandings of the subaltern are misinformed by the biased scholarship of their predecessors (Said, 1978; Spivak, 1988). Bhabha (1994) extended theorizations of postcolonial identity through his concept of the "Third Space" that theorizes how the subjectivity of the subaltern is defined through socio-cultural contexts including social practices, economics, and politics. Thus, the third space becomes a dialectical space of negotiation and struggle that creates hybrid identities that challenge existing hegemonic representations of the subaltern and make possible enhanced social agency for the subaltern. It is worth noting that the third space and hybridity are being increasingly incorporated into applied linguistics literature on identity and practice (Kramsch & Uryu, 2012; Kubota, 2016).

3. Subalternity and complicity

The structure of any hegemonic system, whether as a state or between states, consists of both the dominant groups in a society and the tacit support of the subaltern (Gramsci, 2000: Laclau & Mouffe, 1985). The tension between these two aspects of hegemony is crucial to understand as the dominant do not rule through coercive power but through the bureaucracies, economics, social practices, and signifying practices of the state (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985), which in turn is tacitly supported by the subaltern. The tension that exists in this relationship lies in the how and why the subaltern consent to their own domination. Indeed, Gramsci (2000) states that while the tacit support of the subaltern is necessary to the foundation and maintenance of hegemony, resistance and counter-hegemonic social movements are always present. Thus, the subaltern are always complicitous in their own domination (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985; Pederson, 2018). Kumaravadivelu (2016) supports this notion of complicity within subalternity and applied linguistics by recognizing that the subaltern are socialized into believing or accepting ideologies that are not in their own benefit through education and social and

signifying practices. This dialectic between domination and complicity also demonstrates that true hegemonic control may never be fully realized and is always open to counter-hegemonic resistance (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985).

In the discourses of WE, these relations of power have come to be referred to as 'the center vs. the periphery' (Green & Ives, 2009; Kachru & Smith, 2008; Kumaravadivelu, 2016). However, a key aspect of complicity within hegemonic power relations that is often overlooked in applied linguistics literature is Spivak's (1988) concept of the 'elite subaltern'. Thus, the nature of complicity becomes more complex in terms of the consumption of "center" teaching materials (Kachru, 1996), hiring of foreign faculty (Shin, 2010), proliferation of private language academies (Park, 2008), and ETS testing services (Spolsky, 2004), that demonstrate how many of the elite subaltern within Kachru's (1982) outer and expanding circles of English directly benefit from the hegemony of the center within applied linguistics. This dialectic within the relationship between applied linguistics and subalternity, as practiced by individual English learning nations, may be seen as a hegemony within hegemony. As such, it is not surprising that the economics of the elite subaltern affect the language policies and social and educational practices of English learning nations (Shin, 2010). It is also clear that much of the manufactured consent implicit in hegemony is contrary to the interests of the subaltern (Canagarajah, 1999; Kumaravadivelu, 2016).

4. Counter-hegemony

As the post-colonial focus on the construction of subaltern identity is an issue of subjectivity and relations of hegemonic power, it necessarily also theorizes strategies to counter the unequal power relations within hegemony. Gramsci's (2000) theory of hegemony also includes his theory of counter-hegemony which focuses on the development of 'organic intellectuals' to educate, radicalize, and lead the subaltern in counter-hegemonic actions. Postcolonial theory generally approaches counter-hegemony through the historicization, or re-historicization

of the subaltern in postcolonial societies (Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 2006; Spivak, 1988). Reflecting the *Orientalism* of Said (1978), that theorizes how current conceptions of both Western history and academics were constructed through the racial and cultural biases of colonialism, post-colonial scholars theorize that re-historicization of local subalternity must be accomplished before meaningful counter-hegemonic actions may occur (Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 2006; Spivak, 1988). Informed by post-structural thought, the purpose of re-historicization is to reverse the 'colonization of the mind' (Bourdieu, 1991). In other words, subaltern subjects need to re-learn, or discover, the true nature of their past as opposed to accepting the dominant Western views of history and the remnants of colonial ideologies in post-colonial states (Kachru & Smith, 2008). Thus, it is theorized that through the process of re-historicization that the negotiation of identity and the opening of a "third space" occurs in ways that also make enhanced forms of social agency possible (Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 2006; Spivak, 1988).

The genealogy of post-colonial theories in applied linguistics comes through European poststructuralism, such as Foucault's (1984) theory of power and Bourdieu's (1991) theories of symbolic signification, the critical literacy/pedagogy of Freire (1972), and the WE movement (Kachru, 1996). Critical pedagogy was appropriated into applied linguistic literature through scholars such as Canagarajah (1999), Kumaravadivelu, (2016), and Pennycook (2001). It is crucial to understand that Foucault's (1984) discursive theory of power as being coercive, fluid (not residing in one place), and productive is fundamental to both critical pedagogy and post-colonial thought as it allows the possibility for social change. This appropriation of critical discourses into applied linguistics allowed the interrogation of relations of power in ELT between the center and periphery and theorized the need for situated, critical pedagogies for the development of Freire & Macedo's (1987) 'critical consciousness' in order to disrupt the hegemonic relations inherent in ELT and increase the possibilities for social justice and agency (Bolton, 2006; Canagarajah, 1999; Leonardi, 2010). Early approaches to counter-hegemony

in applied linguistics focused on the use of critical pedagogy in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, such as Canagarajah's (1999) application of critical pedagogy to Sri Lankan English education. Critical approaches to ELT have also been applied to theorizations of identity (Aneja, 2016; Norton, 2006) and the NS-NNS dichotomy (Heller, 2003; Moussu & Lurda 2008; Pederson, 2012).

This 'critical turn' in applied linguistic literature in time also appropriated postcolonial theories (Kramsch, & Uryu, 2012; Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Ramanathan, 2005; Rubdy, 2015). While the majority of such approaches to the issue of subalternity and counter-hegemony in applied linguistics theorized the use of critical pedagogies in counter-hegemony, they have also applied the postcolonial strategy of re-historicization, or decolonialization as Kumaravadivelu (2016) terms it. However, there are three problematic issues with these approaches to subalternity and hegemony that question their ability to foment meaningful social change. The first is that no hegemonic structure, be it a nation-state or a globalized socio-economic structure, willingly gives up any of its power (Gramsci, 2000). As such, counter-hegemonic actions need to radicalize the political will of the subaltern in order for social change to occur (Mouffe, 2000; Stavrakakis, 2007). Second, true decolonialization in ELT would also have to politically undermine the subaltern elites who profit from Western hegemony in applied linguistics (Pederson, 2018; Spivak, 1988). Third, the politico-economic complicity of the elite subaltern must first be overcome in order to decolonialize the subaltern (Stavrakakis, 2007). Thus, it is difficult to see how organic intellectuals (Gramsci, 2000; Kumaravadivelu, 2016), who are often educated by Western educational institutions, could succeed in such a great and complex task. A good example of this is Kumaravadivelu's (2016) analysis of China's failed counter-hegemonic attempt to subvert the power of Western publishing houses by creating their own English education textbooks. Essentially, Kumaravadivelu claims that the complicity of the subaltern (teachers, students, and parents), in terms of the NS-NNS dichotomy and center pedagogies, as represented by the

power of Western publishing houses, could not be overcome. In addition, a re-theorization of counter-hegemony into a political synthesis of strategic (decolonialization) and tactical (China's attempt to create their own textbooks) forms may facilitate the progress of counter-hegemonic movements (Pederson, 2018). Although this theoretical move may have some promise, it is also unlikely to effectively radicalize the subaltern into successful counter-hegemonic movements. What is needed, then, is a radical politics of the pedagogical that has the potential to critically educate/decolonialize a subaltern populace in ways that arouse their political passions.

Ⅳ. The pedagogical and the political

Gramsci's (2000) theory of hegemony has been appropriated and developed in various fields including political science (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985) and psychoanalysis (Stavrakakis, 2007). While each theoretical approach may focus on different theoretical loci like social structures and practices (Bludgeon, 2013; Giddens, 2000), possibilities for radical democracy (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985), and emotion (Stavrakakis, 2007) of the establishment and maintenance of the hegemonic state, they all recognize that the primary function of a hegemonic system is the systematic application of power to society. It is equally understood that power and politics are equivalent in meaning in theories of hegemony (Giroux, 2010; Laclau & Mouffe, 1985; Stavrakakis, 2007). These views of the establishment and maintenance of the state have also been appropriated into the fields of education, through critical pedagogy (Aronowitz, & Giroux, 1991; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Giroux, 2010;), and ultimately into applied linguistics (Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Morgan & Ramanathan 2005, Pennycook, 2001). As the purpose of theories of hegemony are to both demystify the nature of hegemonic control over society and to theorize the possibilities for social change for the purposes

of a more socially just society (Laclau, 2000; Stavrakakis, 2007), theories of counter-hegemony naturally focus on the agency of organic intellectuals to educate the subaltern of a society through the practices of historicization and/or decolonialization (Bhabha, 1994; Gramsci, 2000). In addition, as it is the social structures of the state and its signifying practices that socializes the subaltern and gains their 'manufactured consent' for the ideology necessary for state domination, every social practice or act of signification is pedagogical in nature (Giroux, 2010; Mouffe, 2005; Stavrakakis, 2007). Thus, not only is the pedagogical the political, everything is pedagogical (Giroux, 2002; Freire & Macedo, 1987; Motta, 2014).

The approach to education that most reflects how and why relations of power affects society and theorizes pedagogies designed to further the purposes of social justice is critical pedagogy (Freire & Macedo, 1987, Giroux, 1997; Kincheloe, 2008). The genealogy of critical pedagogy runs through Marxian views of ideology (Luke & Dooley, 2011), the critical theory of the Frankfurt School (Horkheimer & Adorno 1969; Marcuse, 1964), post-structuralism (Bourdieu, 1991; Foucault, 1984), Freire's (1972) critical literacy, to applied linguistics (Canagarajah, 1999; Crooks, 2010; Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Norton & Toohey, 2004; Pennycook, 2001, Ramanathan, 2005). While there are currently many approaches to critical pedagogy, they all share the basic pedagogical concepts of historicization, situated learning, dialogism, and publishing (Freire & Macedo, 1987; Kincheloe, 2008). The first three aspects of this pedagogical schemata create a space for inquiry in the classroom, while publishing (writing editorials, blogging, etc.) represents the political action of signifying the forms of knowledge and culture that were transformed in the process of inquiry (Beach & Myers, 2001; Giroux, 1997). Thus, critical pedagogy is supposed to be a transformative form of education designed to increase the social agency of students as well as to foster social change for a more socially just and democratic society (Giroux, 1997; Kincheloe, 2008; Motta, 2014; Norton & Toohey, 2004). Perhaps the clearest description of critical pedagogy and its application to ELT practice is Canagarajah's (1999) six-point schema stating

that critical pedagogy views knowledge as ideological and subject to negotiation, and that learning is personal, situated, cultural, and political. As such, critical approaches to applied linguistics share much with post-colonial theory.

Generally, approaches to counter-hegemony in applied linguistics incorporate a synthesis of postcolonial theory and critical pedagogy (Bolton, 2006; Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Lin & Luke, 2011). This is not surprising given the genealogy of critical pedagogy and the affinity to social justice and the demystification of relations of power that it shares with postcolonial theory. The similarities between critical pedagogy and post-colonial theories of counter hegemony, through the practices of historicization/decolonialization, are clearly represented in Luke & Dooley's (2011) analysis of Freire's (1972) seminal work:

> Freire's work draws from Marx a classical view of ideology: that ruling class ideology dominates what counts as school knowledge and ideology. By this view, approaches to literacy are expressions of dominant ideology, and succeed in creating a literacy that is principally receptive, involved in the passive transmission, decoding and reproduction of dominant and distorted views of the world. The alternative is to begin from learners' key problems, world views and 'namings' of the phenomenal world, in effect turning them into teachers and inventors of the curriculum. This entails an agentive 'renaming' of the world, a decoding and recoding of meaning. The focus is on ideology critique: exposing, second guessing and reconstructing dominant versions of the world provided in literature, textbooks and everyday texts and utterance. (p. 861)

Here, Luke and Dooley (2011) show how Freire (1972) approaches literacy from the perspective of the signifying practices of a society in the 'naming' of the social world, in all its representational forms, which allows learners to situate and rename, or in effect re-historicize, the society in which they live and their place within it. Moreover, both postcolonial and

critical pedagogical approaches within applied linguistics contain Freire's conception of 'conscientization', or the creation of a 'critical consciousness' (Bolton, 2006; Canagarajah, 1999; Leonardi, 2010). Thus, the main difference between these approaches to subalternity and social agency is that postcolonial approaches focus more on the process of decolonialization while critical pedagogy more clearly promotes political activism for the purposes of positive social change (Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Ramanathan, 2005).

As the amount of literature in applied linguistics that advocates critical and postcolonial approaches to ELT increases, it is necessary to address the issue of the minimal actual change in ELT practices internationally. Although some postcolonial nations, the more economically advanced one's such as Singapore and Hong Kong, have included aspects of critical pedagogy into their curricula (Crookes, 2010), the hegemony of English from the center and the concomitant representational power of SE and the NS remain dominant in most EFL nations (Graddol, 2006; Heller, 2003). In addition, the implementation of high-stakes/SE testing increases as it has become a commodity that increases the socio-economic power of the elite subaltern within a society that have the means to better educate their children (Graddol, 2006; Shin, 2010). Thus, as the increasing educational drive for positive social change within critical approaches and the counter hegemonic practices of decolonialization in postcolonial approaches to applied linguistics, which seem to hold a promise for greater social justice and agency for English learning nations, one must ask the question of why so little change is actually occurring? It would seem that the only possible answers to this question are that either the theoretical foundations of these approaches are faulty or that they are missing a crucial aspect that would enable the power for significant social change.

Despite the increasing amount of scholarship and pedagogical application of critical pedagogy in both education and applied linguistics, it is clear that the promise of positive social change central to critical pedagogy has had limited success. Over the past 30 years, critical scholars have detailed and

defined how the workings of neoliberal political ideologies not only have affected the social structures and practices of nations and international relations through globalization, but also how neoliberalism has negatively affected education on an international scale (Bousquet, 2008; Flores, 2013; Giroux, 2010; Kline, 2007). While many definitions of neoliberalism exist in the relevant literature, it may be summarized as the ideological dominance of the economism of a market driven economy, or simply as corporate governance. In terms of neoliberalism's effects on education, many scholars claim the primary problem is the rise of standardized curricula (which are designed to benefit the corporate elite) and the subsequent increasing application of HST that greatly influences the future social agency and mobility of student populations (Giroux, 2010; Graddol, 2006; Shin, 2010). According to Giroux (2010), the effects of neoliberal policies in education wither the promises that are the foundations of critical pedagogy. Giroux clearly describes how the withering of critical forms of pedagogy occur within a neoliberal educational system by stating that:

> It places an emphasis on winning at all costs, a ruthless competitiveness, hedonism, the cult of individualism, and a subject largely constructed within a market-driven rationality that abstracts economics and markets from ethical considerations. Within this pedagogy, compassion is a weakness, and moral responsibility is scorned because it places human needs over market considerations. (p. 185)

Thus, as in many nations, many Korean students and families both subscribe to, and abhor, the neoliberal 'hakbeol' ideology that dominates Korean education as they believe that there is no other choice for their future (Shin, 2010). As such, the neoliberal expedient of consumerism also becomes the driving force behind student's learning as well as how they are viewed by educational institutions (Graves, 2002; Lipman, 2004).

Scholars of HST, such as Graves (2002) and Lipman (2004), generally

agree that neoliberal policies in education, and their concomitant commitment to HST not only primarily supports the existing elites within a society, but also reduces education to the reproduction of existing social classes, which therefore, denies the educational promise of social mobility (Giroux, 2010; Kincheloe, 2008). This process of the commercialization of the subject within neoliberal education is perhaps best described by Flores (2013) who states that:

> Neoliberalism, then, is the merging of macro-level policy shifts and the individual-level production of subjects to fit these political and economic changes. Neoliberalism is not simply about the corporatization of society but also the corporatization of the individual subject. (p. 504)

Thus, the expanding reality of neoliberalism as an international ideology helps to explicate the weakness of critical pedagogy in education as well as delineating the increasing lack of democratic political interest in advanced economic nations (Graves, 2002; Lipman, 2004). Ironically, the dominance of neoliberalism also subscribes to Giroux's (1997) assertion that the pedagogical is the political.

Ⅴ. The Lacanian left

Critical pedagogy theorists have long appropriated concepts from psychology and psychoanalytic theory (Janks, 2002; Kincheloe, 2008; Sardar, 2016). Among other movements, this appropriation has given rise to the psychoanalytical/ political theories of what has come to be known as 'The Lacanian Left', which has developed Lacan's (1964) theories in ways that could prove useful to critical/postcolonial approaches to applied linguistics. Based on a psychoanalytic understanding of the mechanisms of neoliberalism, Stavrakakis' (2007) approach to Lacanian theory elucidates a 'post-democratic' world where the basic and necessary antagonisms (debates) of democracy are sublimated

by the manufactured desires of consumer culture, in essence, silencing the political drive of the populace for the temporary joy of consumption. As such, the Lacanian Left define the effects of neoliberalism as the creation of a post-democratic world. Stavrakakis' basic tool for understanding the phenomena of a post-democratic world is Lacan's (1964) theory of *jouissance* which theorizes that the innate joy of being human, in an animal sense, is lost when the infant enters the symbolic world of modern humanity. In other words, people not only think symbolically, but are forced to signify or represent all meanings and emotions within the symbolic world. As such, people attain a 'lack' of *jouissance* that may never be truly satisfied, but is always an object of desire that is sublimated into consumerism which drives a lack of passion for the garnering and assertion of political will (Stavrakakis, 2007). Thus, a post-democratic world displaces political ideologies with a need to explore identities through consumerism to achieve the lost *jouissance* of being (Daunton & Hilton, 2001), which in turn becomes a form of power which commands the individual to seek enjoyment, or the hegemonic economy of enjoyment (Stavrakakis, 2007). According to Stavrakakis (2007) and Ranciere, (1995), this command to enjoyment, in the attempt to fulfill the lost *jouissance*, causes the loss of the antagonistic connotations within identity which then become identified with governmental administration. As such, elected governments and the socio-economic elites control a neoliberal approach to government in which the processes of democracy become more of a controlled spectacle designed for a passive electorate (Marquand, 2004). This redirection of the *jouissance* of engaging in politics into consumerism has led to a rational, dispassionate, and passive citizenship in terms of its political involvement (Stavrakakis, 2007).

Similarly, this lack of *jouissance* may explain both the representational power of the NS-NNS dichotomy and the commodification of English (Graddol, 2000) as well as why critical and postcolonial approaches to pedagogy have been hindered in achieving the promise of transformative changes in educational or ELT practices worldwide that its theories claim

to enable (Kincheloe, 2008; Kumaravadivelu, 2016). As a critical pedagogue, it is not my intent to belittle the theories or practices of critical pedagogy or postcolonialism, whether in education generally or in ELT. Rather, the theoretical discussions presented in this paper are an attempt to understand why transformative change has only occurred on an individual or local scale through my entire career as a scholar. Thus, Lacanian (1964) theory shows how an enjoyable democratic ethics of the political may be gained by fostering a relationship between the necessary negativity required for democratic discussion and enjoyment (Bennett, 2001; Stavrakakis, 2007). Mouffe (2000) points out that political liberalism stifles the emotions of antagonism that leads to a 'rationalism' which tends to create a dispassionate form of politics. Thus, she advocates a return to the foundations of antagonism, equality, and popular sovereignty that underly democracy. In addition, Berezin (2001) notes that it was historical struggles of equality that aroused the political passions for democratic citizenry. Thus, it may be theorized that in order to decolonialize the subaltern within ELT it is first necessary to sublimate the rationalism of neoliberal post-democracy with the *jouissance* of the negativity of the commodification of the NS-NNS dichotomy embedded ELT practices, thus arousing the political ethics of passion and antagonism for positive social change. Finally, it is also important to note that democracy is an ideal that may never be truly achieved, and is hence always in a state of becoming (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985; Mouffe, 2005). Nonetheless, the possibilities for positive social change remain possible within this critical dialectic of education for the purposes of social justice and democracy (Mouffe, 2005; Stavrakakis, 2007).

Ⅵ. Conclusion

The theoretical arguments presented in this paper have shown that the control of ELT practices from the center is a form of hegemony that

necessarily marks the consumers of the commodity of English as subaltern in terms of the NS-NNS dichotomy embedded within ELT scholarship and practice (Lin & Luke; 2011). Informed by Gramsci's (2000) theory of hegemony and poststructuralism, critical pedagogy and postcolonialism have similarities in their antecedent theories and goals of social transformation for the purposes of social justice, it is not surprising that applied linguistic scholars have applied both approaches to the issues of subalternity (Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Lin & Luke; 2011; Shin, 2006). Applying Spivak's question of 'can the subaltern speak?' and Bhabha's (1994) theory of a 'third space', applied linguists have developed their theorizations of the construction of NNS identities in ways that have the potential to enhance their social agency (Kumaravadivelu, 2016). In addition, by focusing on the nature of hegemony and subalternity in postcolonial theory, such scholars have also focused on the necessity of decolonialization as the primary focus of counterhegemonic socio-political movements. While all of these theoretical moves have the promise promoting of positive social transformation, they nonetheless overlook the problem of the complicity of the subaltern and the elite subaltern which must be overcome for counterhegemonic actions to substantively transform the relations of power within a hegemonic system (Mouffe, 2005; Pederson, 2018; Stavrakakis, 2007). Thus, the application of critical and postcolonial approaches to ELT have mainly garnered local social changes internationally (Kumaravadivelu, 2016).

According to the political/psychoanalytic theories of the 'Lacanian Left', the attempts at decolonialization and significant social change within post-democratic hegemonic systems are due to a lack of emotion, or passion, in and for political action that leaves citizens passive in a politics that is dominated by business and consumerism (Mouffe, 2005; Stavrakakis, 2007). According to Stavrakakis (2007), the lack of *jouissance*, or real animal joy and emotion, that accompanies human entrance into the symbolic world of significations sublimates human desire and emotion into the command to consumerism in post-democratic societies. This point is germane to the

argument at hand as the commodification of English from the center and its relation to the garnering of an elite status (Heller, 2003; Shin, 2010), mirrors the sublimation of *jouissance* into consumerism and is concomitant political passivity. Thus, theories of the Lacanian Left may inform applied linguistic theory in that 'rational' approaches to decolonialization and counterhegemonic actions that lack the 'antagonism', or the emotional expression of political difference are unlikely to succeed at a significant level. As such, scholars such as Bennett (2001), Mouffe (2000), and Stavrakakis (2007) maintain that in order to foster socio-political change in the post-democratic world it is necessary to redirect the *jouissance* sublimated into consumerism into an emotional passion for the democratic foundations of antagonism, popular sovereignty, and equality. Arguably, such a 'pedagogy of the political' is necessary also to empower the subaltern movements within applied linguistics.

References

Aneja, G., (Non)native speakered: Rethinking (non) nativeness and teacher identity in TESOL teacher education, *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(3), 572-596, 2016

Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H., *Postmodern education: Politics, culture, and social criticism,* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1991

Asian EFL Journal, https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/guidelines/, 2018

Beach, R., & Myers, J., *Inquiry-based English instruction: Engaging students in life and literature,* New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2001

Bennett, J., *The enchantment of modern life: Attachments, crossings and ethics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001

Berezin, M., Emotions and political identity: Mobilizing affection for the polity, In J. Goodwin, J. Jasper, & F. Polletta (Eds.), *Passionate politics: Emotions and social movements* (pp. 83-98). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001

Bhabha, H., *The location of culture,* New York, NY: Routledge, 1994

Block, D., *Second language identities,* London, UK: Continuum, 2007

Bludgeon, S., The dynamics of gender hegemony: Femininities, masculinities and social change, *Sociology, 48*(2), 317-334, 2013

Bolton, K., World Englishes today In B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, & C. Nelson (Eds.), *The handbook of world Englishes*, (pp. 240-269), Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 2006

Bourdieu, P., *Language and symbolic power,* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L., *An invitation to reflexive sociology.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1992

Bousquet, M., *How the university works: Higher education and the low-wage nation*. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2008

Brutt-Griffler, J., "Globalization" and applied linguistics: Post-imperial questions

of identity and the construction of applied linguistics discourse." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*(1): 25-49, 2005

Burawoy, M., Rejoinder: For a subaltern global sociology? *Current Sociology, 56*(3): 435-444, 2008

Canagarajah, S., *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching,* London, UK: Oxford University Press, 1999

Cox, R., Gramsci, hegemony and international relations: An essay in method. In S. Gill (Ed.), *Gramsci, historical materialism and international relations* (pp. 49-66). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1993

Crookes, G., Plenary speeches: The practicality and relevance of second language critical pedagogy, *Language Teaching,* 43(3), 333−348, 2010

Crowley, T., *Standard English and the politics of language*. London, UK: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003

Daunton, M., & Hilton, M., *The politics of consumption,* Oxford, UK. Berg, 2001

Davies, A., Proficiency or the native speaker: What are we trying to achieve in ELT? In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 145-157), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996

Flores, N., The unexamined relationship between neoliberalism and plurilingualism: A cautionary tale. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(3), 500-520, 2013

Flowerdew, J., Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(1), 121-150, 2012

Foucault, M., *The Foucault reader*. New York, NY: Random House, 1984

Freire, P., *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1970

Freire, P., & Macedo, D., *The politics of education*. South Hadley, UK: Bergin and Garvey, 1987

Giddens, A., *Runaway world: How globalization is reshaping our lives*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2000

Gill, S., & Mittelman, J. (Eds)., *Innovation and transformation in international studies* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001

Giroux, H., *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling*. Boulder, CO: Westview press, 1997

Giroux, H., Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere, *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(4), 425-464, 2002

Giroux, H., Bare pedagogy and the scourge of neoliberalism: Rethinking higher education as a democratic public sphere, *The Educational Forum, 74*(3), 184-196., 2010

Graddol, D. *The future of English: A guide to forecasting the popularity of the English language in the 21st century,* New York, NY: The British Council, 2000

Graddol, D., *English Next*. London, UK. British Council, 2006

Gramsci, A., *The Antonio Gramsci reader: Selected writings 1916-1935,* New York, NY: NYU Press, 2000

Graves, D., *Testing is not teaching*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann., 2002

Green, M., & Ives, P., Subalternity and language: Overcoming the fragmentation of common sense. *Historical materialism, 17*(1), 3-30, 2009

Hall, S., *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997

Hall, S., Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Braziel, and A. Mannur, *Theorizing diaspora* (pp. 233-246), Malden, UK: Blackwell, 2006

Harris, R., *The language myth in western culture*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2001

Hau, C. *The Chinese question: Ethnicity, nation, and region in and beyond the Philippines*. Singapore: National University of Singapore Press, 2014

Heller, M., Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity, *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 7*(4), 473-492, 2003

Holliday, A., Small cultures. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(2), 237-264, 1999

Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T., *Dialectic of enlightenment,* New York, NY: Continuum, 1969

Janks, H., Critical literacy: Beyond reason, *The Australian Educational Researcher, 29*(1), 7-26, 2002

Joseph, J., A realist theory of hegemony, *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, *30*(2), 179-202, 2000

Kachru, B., *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Urbana, IL, University of Illinois Press, 1982

Kachru, B., The paradigms of marginality, *World Englishes, 15*(3), 241-55, 1996

Kachru, Y., & Smith, L., *Culture, contexts, and world Englishes,* London, UK: Routledge, 2008

Keyl, S., Subaltern pedagogy: A critical theorizing of pedagogical practices for marginalized border-crossers, *International Journal of Critical pedagogy, 8*(1), 173-194, 2017

Kincheloe, J., *Critical pedagogy primer.* 2nd ed. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishers, 2008

Klein, N., *The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism,* New York, NY: Picador, 2007

Korean Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, *Improvement on native English teacher and support,* Seoul, ROK: Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, 2009

Kramsch, C., & Uryu, M., Intercultural contact, hybridity, and third space. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 211-227). New York, NY: Routledge, 2012

Kubota, R, The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory, and neoliberal multiculturalism: complicities and implications for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics, 37*(4), 474-494, 2016

Kumaravadivelu, B., Dangerous liaison: Globalization, empire and TESOL.

In J. Edge (Ed.), *(Re)Locating TESOL in an Age of Empire* (pp. 1-26). London, UK: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006

Kumaravadivelu, B., "The decolonial option in English teaching: Can the subaltern act?" *TESOL Quarterly,* 50(1): 66-85, 2016

Lacan, J., *The four fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis*. ed. Jacques-Alain. Miller, trans. Alan Sheridan, London, UK: Penguin, 1964

Laclau, E., Identity and hegemony: The role of universality in the constitution of political logics. In J. Butler, E. Laclau, &, S. Zizek, (Eds.). *Contingency, hegemony, universality* (44-89). London, UK: Verso, 2000

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C., *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics,* London, UK: Verso, 1985

Leonardi, V., Forming identity and avoiding hegemony in the era of globalization, *Journal of Language & Translation, 11*(1), 91-113, 2010

Lin, A., & Luke, A., Coloniality, postcoloniality, and TESOL. . . Can a spider weave its way out of the web that it is being woven into just as it weaves? *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 3*(2), 65-73, 2011

Lipman, P., *High-stakes education: Inequality, globalization, and urban school reform,* New York, NY: Routledge: Falmer, 2004

Lippi-Green, R., *English with an accent,* New York, NY: Routledge, 1997

Luke, A., & Dooley, K., Critical literacy and second language learning, In E. Hinkel (ed), *Handbook of research on second language teaching and learning*, Vol. 2. (pp. 856-868). New York, NY: Routledge, 2011

Lysandrou, P., & Lysandrou, Y., Global English and progression: Understanding English language spread in the contemporary era, *Economy and Society, 32*(2), 207-233, 2003

Mahboob, A., English as an Islamic language: A case study of Pakistani English, *World Englishes, 28*(2), 175-189, 2009

Marcuse, H., *One dimensional man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society,* Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1964

Marquand, D., *Decline of the public*. Cambridge, MA: Polity, 2004

McWhorter, J., *Word on the street: Debunking the myth of "pure" standard*

English, New York: Basic Books, 2001

Morgan, B., & Ramanathan, C., Critical literacies and language education: Global and local perspectives, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 25*, 151-169, 2005

Motha, S., *Race and empire in English language teaching,* New York, NY, Teachers College Press, 2014

Motha, S., & Lin, A.,. Non-coercive rearrangements: Theorizing desire in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(2): 331-359, 2013

Motta, S., Introduction: Pedagogizing the political and politicizing pedagogy. In S. Motta, & M. Cole (Eds.), *Constructing twenty-first century socialism in Latin America: The role of radical education* (pp. 1-16). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014

Mouffe, C., *The democratic paradox,* London, UK: Verso, 2000

Mouffe, C., *On the political,* London, UK: Routledge, 2005

Moussu, L., & Llurda, E., Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research, *Language Teaching, 41*(3): 315–348, 2008

Norton, B., Identity as a sociocultural construct in second language education, In K. Cadman, & K. O'Regan (Eds.), *Tales out of school: Special issue of TESOL in Context* (pp. 22-33), Cambridg, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2006

Norton, B., & Kelleen T., *Critical pedagogies and language learning*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2004

Park, S., March 2. Samsung Group embarks on recruitment in March. The Korea Times. In H. Shin. "*Gireogi gajok: Transnationalism and language learning*. PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2010

Pederson, R., Representation, globalization, and the native speaker: Dialectics of language, ideology, and power. In K. Sung, and R. Pederson (Eds.) *Critical ELT Practices in Asia* (pp. 1-23), Amsterdam: Sense Publishers, 2012

Pederson, R., Hegemony in applied linguistics: Issues of clarity, cohesion, and praxis. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics, 34*(2), 95-127,

2018

Pennycook, A., *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. New York, NY: Routledge, 1998

Pennycook, A., *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2001

Pennycook, A., "Performativity and language studies." *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 1*(1), 1-19, 2004

Phillipson, R., *Linguistic imperialism*. London, UK: Oxford University Press, 1992

Quirk, R., The English language in a global context. In R. Quirk, & H. Widdowson (Eds.) *English in the World Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (1-6). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985

Raimes, A., *How English works: A grammar handbook with reading*s. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1990

Ramanathan, V., *The English-vernacular divide: Postcolonial language politics and practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2005

Ranciere, J., *On the shores of politics*, trans. Liz Heron. London, UK: Verso, 1995

Rubdy, R., Unequal Englishes, the native speaker, and decolonization in TESOL. In R. Tupas (Ed.) *Unequal Englishes* (pp. 42-58), London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism,* New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 2015

Sardar M., Why critical literacy should turn to 'the affective turn': making a case for critical affective literacy, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 37*(3), 381-396, 2016

Seargeant, P., Language, ideology and 'English within a globalized context'. *World Englishes, 27*(2), 217-232, 2008

Selvi, A., The non-native speaker teacher. *ELT Journal, 62*(2): 187-189, 2011

Shin, H., "Rethinking TESOL from a SOL's perspective: Indigenous epistemology and decolonizing praxis in TESOL." *Critical Inquiry in Language*

Studies, 3(2 & 3): 147-167, 2006

Shin, H., *"Gireogi gajok": transnationalism and language learning*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, 2010

Shin, H., & Crookes, G., Exploring the possibilities for EFL critical pedagogy in Korea a two-part case study. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 2*(2), 113-138, 2005

Solano-Flores, G., Language, dialect, and register: Sociolinguistics and the estimation of measurement error in the testing of English language learners. *Teachers College Record, 108*(11), 2354-2379, 2006

Spivak, G., Can the subaltern speak? In L. Grossberg, and C. Nelson (Eds.) *Marxist interpretations of literature and culture: Limits, frontiers, boundaries* (66-111). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1988

Spolsky, B., *Language policy: Key topics in applied linguistics*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2004

Stavrakakis, Y., *The Lacanian left: Psychoanalysis, theory, politics*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2007

Traugott, E., Pragmatics and language change. In A. Keith, and K. Jaszczolt (Eds.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics* (549-566), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012

Trivedi, H.,. Revolutionary non-violence: Gandhi in postcolonial and subaltern discourse. *International Journal of Postcolonial Studies, 3*(4), 521-549, 2011

국문초록

원어민-비원어민 이분법과 종속 상태: 응용 언어학의 사회적 변화를 위한 정치적 및 정신분석적 접근*

로드 페더슨
인천대학교

응용 언어학 문헌에서 지난 30년에 걸쳐 진행 중인 원어민-비원어민(NS-NNS) 이분법에 대한 논쟁은 대개 정체성(Norton, 2006), 언어적 제국주의(Phillipson, 1992) 및 중심과 주변의 힘의 관계(Kachru, 1996)의 문제에 주안점을 두어왔다. 이들 이론 중 다수는 비판적 교수와 후기 구조주의(Morgan & Ramanathan, 2005)에 기반을 두고 있음은 잘 알려진 사실이다. 최근 들어 Gramsci(2000)의 헤게모니 이론으로부터 발전된 역사화, 탈식민주의 및 종속 상태에 대한 탈식민지 이론이 응용 언어학에 전용되고 있으며 실제적인 영어교수의 비판적 접근과 통합되고 있다(Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Shin, 2006). 이들 접근법이 응용 언어학의 실제에 대한 사회적 변화를 위해 의도적으로 사용되어왔지만 그 효과는 아주 제한적이었다(Graddol, 2006). 이와 관련하여 많은 교육학자들이 교육에 대한 비판적 접근법을 쇠퇴시키는 메커니즘으로 신자유주의를 인용한다(Giroux, 2010). 이 논문의 목적은 진정한 변화에 실패한 이유를 파악하기 위해 관련 문헌을 검토하는 것이다. 이를 위해 정치적(Mouffe, 2005) 및 정신분석적 이론(Stavrakakis, 2007)을 토대로, 본 저자는 후기 민주주의 이후의 사회가 어떻게 정서 또는 열정을 이성으로 대체하고, 응용 언어학에서 역 헤게모니적 운동을 완전히 실행하려는 정치적 의지를 감소시켜왔는지 기술하하고자 한다. 이러한 문헌 검토는 정서와 열정이 사회적 변화에 필수적임을 시사한다.

* 본 연구는 2019년 인천대학교(국제 협력) 연구기금의 지원을 받았다.

주제어 : 탈식민주의; 비식민지화, 종속 상태, 비판적 교육학, 원어민주의, 사회단체

▌논문접수일 : 2019. 08. 10
▌심사완료일 : 2019. 09. 01
▌게재확정일 : 2019. 09. 03