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The role of EFL educators in Turkey in the era of globalisation: an analytical auto-ethnography of an EFL educator turned administrator at the IPRIS

Summary

Globalisation, a major aspect of English foreign language (EFL) education in the twenty-first century, can be described as the worldwide circulation of goods, services, and capital as well as information, ideas, and people. EFL educators encounter relentless demands to shift their positions, perspectives, and identities, and to assume many roles because they must accommodate new cultures and people in order to teach in their chosen field. We also have to accommodate differences in ideologically constructed representations of our roles as educators in terms of culture, class, gender, race, and religion within their various contexts. Thus, it can be difficult to determine exactly what one’s role is in the context of globalisation.

Using an analytic, auto-ethnographic, and naturalistic research design, I purposefully selected five EFL educators (six, including me) and investigated how we fit/belong at IPRIS, what our perceived roles as EFL educators are, and how our roles as EFL educators in full relate to globalisation. Bourdieu’s experiences in Algeria, his theories arising from them, and Bhabha’s notion of the third space, which is synchronistic with postcolonial theory, formed my theoretical framework. I collected data through interviews, reflexive journal, and critical incidents that were member checked to ensure trustworthiness. The inductively oriented data analysis yielded the themes and categories that are the foundation of this research.

The emergent findings in this research were key in showing how the backgrounds of the participants positioned each of us so differently one from another as EFL educators. The varied ways in which the participants have discerned their roles as individuals and as EFL educators unfolded. The explicit commentary of all the participants in this study (including me) reflected a deep commitment to the needs of the students at IPRIS as we expressed our views on our roles.

This research revealed the knowledge that I have built concerning myself, both in my context and in relation to others, by investigating the spaces in between coming and going, participant and researcher, educator and administrator; it has helped to reveal the fault-line spaces that shift in perspective and has thus helped me find my fit/belonging. The flipped researcher-participant roles allowed me to explain and further interrogate my own views of my role at IPRIS, as the primary participant, in relation to the secondary participants’ perceptions of their roles. This research has also revealed both the positioning of the EFL educator and the space that English occupies globally, in which it has an opposing logic that sometimes results in hybridisation.

The secondary participants’ comments in this study reflected their perception that they needed to bring information from their prior experiences, both as educators and as people living in the world, to bear on their primary role of teaching English to Turkish students. Thus, none of the participants felt that they were enabled in their role, as all
reported that they needed to add old experiences with the new in order to teach their
assigned students and to navigate the terrain at IPRIS. Drawing from the definition of
globalisation in the literature, I was also able to use the participants’ current perceptions
of the role of English as a global language to reveal their relationship to globalisation.

As a result of my thesis research, I can recommend the use of analytic auto-
ethnography as a form of professional development and evaluation. The degree of
reflexivity involved can enable EFL educators at IPRIS and elsewhere to raise their
own awareness of other people and of their institutional and cultural contexts.
Chapter 1

1.1 Introduction

This theoretical analytical auto-ethnography attempts to explain the roles of English Foreign Language educators, including mine, at the Istanbul Private Research and International School (IPRIS) in Istanbul, Turkey, in this era of globalisation. According to Biddle (1986, p.68), a role can be defined as the social position one holds in a certain society and the expectations which come with that position. Further, Biddle (1986) wrote, roles reflect the norms, attitudes, contextual demands, negotiations, and evolving definitions of a situation as understood by the involved individuals; thus, these individuals may perceive themselves, their roles in a given society, and the role expectations of that society differently from the way the society views them. Tsui (2007) further asserted that individuals’ perceptions of the roles they play are shaped by the broader socio-cultural and socio-political context. Kincheloe (1991, p.35) has argued that educators who critically examine their role(s) are ‘mindful of the relationship between teachers’ and administrators’ consciousness, and the socio-historical contexts in which they operate’. I believe that as English Foreign Language (EFL) educators, our perceptions of our roles are based on our socio-historical, socio-cultural, and socio-political contexts of origin, as well as our contexts, both current and those planned for the future. Sarup (1996) also argued that roles are situational rather than fixed and, hence, are related to occurrences. The roles of EFL educators and others, therefore, can vary according to their personal contexts, which include their beliefs and actions.

EFL teachers, more than any other group, encounter relentless demands to shift their positions, perspectives, and identities, and to assume many roles because they must
accommodate new cultures and people in order to teach in their chosen field. Because EFL educators potentially work in an enormous range of institutional, national, and cultural contexts (Holliday 2005), they are subject to a wide variety of normative role expectations, reflecting the demands of both their organisations and society at large (Biddle 1986). Biddle (1986, p.83) posits further that given the multiple sources for norms, EFL educators ‘are often subjected to role conflicts which in turn produce role strain and must be resolved if the individual is to be happy and the organisation is to prosper’.

In our globalised era, EFL educators’ decisions tend to be characterised by a borderless world. As an EFL educator living and working in Turkey, I believe that globalisation affects perceptions of the roles of EFL educators because English is a global language. Sung’s (2012, p.24) research indicates that ‘in China and India, despite the current economic recession due to the U.S. oriented subprime mortgage and European financial crises in 2007-2008, English is touted as a must if one does not want to lag behind in the fast-changing society and ever-increasing competition in the world’. Pennycook (1994) and Holliday (2005) observe that EFL teachers in this era have to shift both their social and geographical positions constantly according to their cultural and institutional contexts. According to Pennycook (2007, p.112), ‘English is globalisation, English is human capital’. In this context, both utilitarian and economic rationales for teaching and learning English are usually accepted without a close examination of the historical, sociocultural, and political contexts of the adoption and promotion of English in various regions.
Personal background

My background – including my upbringing in New York City by Guyanese parents and the cultural values and practices inculcated into me since my earliest memories – influenced my choice to teach EFL and to conduct research in Turkey. The codes of behaviour I learned during my formal schooling in Catholic school from grades 1 through 5 and in public school from grades 6 to 12 also shaped my choices. In the 6th grade, my public school peers would often remark among themselves, loud enough for me to hear, ‘Why he talkin’ like he a White boy?’ These experiences made me feel like both an insider and outsider among other black males despite my evidently being a part of them.

At age 16, I started dancing on scholarship at the Martha Graham School of Contemporary Dance. At that time, the predominant method of dance choreography used forms of classical ballet that were familiar to audiences worldwide. During the same period, I also studied and performed African and Caribbean dances with a Pan-African dance troupe that was in New York City. Among other things, I learned and performed capoeira, a Brazilian martial art fused with dance that was used as a form of cultural and political resistance by slaves in that region. These dance experiences constitute my earliest recollection of my agency within postcolonialism.

After high school, I specialised in contemporary dancing at an arts conservatory and earned a university diploma. From 1996 until 2007, I was a professional dancer. During that time, visiting 23 countries and living on three different continents, I continually tried to find commonalities between me and the people I encountered – not always successfully. I experienced culture shock in Greece because at that time, I had never lived where only a few people looked like me or spoke to me in English, my mother
tongue. I felt greatly isolated while living in Athens, and even after I began to acquire
the language, I felt I would never be able to fit in. I would always be celebrated for
what my colleagues and employers at the time referred to as my ‘exotic features’.

After leaving Greece in 2002, I returned to New York where I needed to reinvent
myself because of monetary concerns. I decided to leave the contemporary dance world
for commercial dance because it is generally more profitable. In 2003, because my
mother was under considerable financial strain, I felt that I should help her because of
the traditional male role throughout time as family provider. I sought work with Disney
and landed a job in Tokyo, Japan, where I moved out of a sense of obligation.

Thus, my dancing, which had started out as a passion, turned into a duty. At the same
time, I became painfully aware of how my body was perceived and, increasingly, of
what my body represented within each new context, to different people, and always for
different reasons. I sometimes heard gasps from predominantly white audiences when I
stepped on stage, which made me cringe and reminded me of dance teachers who
taught me that my body was not suitable for contemporary ballet, a distinctly European
and elitist art form. W. E. B. DuBois (1903, p.3), who arguably initiated the
postcolonial movement, wrote of ‘the peculiar sensation, the double consciousness, and
the sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others’. Jackson (2006)
asserted that the ‘Black male corporeal inscriptions are indicative of a market that
chooses to represent Black male bodies as foreign, exotic and strange’. I now realise
what was happening, but back then, my double consciousness became dizzying. When I
found myself trying to dismantle the colonial structures that had been inscribed on my
body (Childs and Williams 1997), I started searching for a new career.
In 2007, I moved back to New York from North Carolina after completing another bachelor’s degree and began studying urban education to acquire a master’s degree at Mercy College as part of a New York City Teaching Fellowship (NYCTF). I began teaching English as a second language (ESL) and English language arts as a special education teacher in grades 6, 7, and 8 in the Bronx public schools. Though my master’s degree GPA was 3.8/4.0, my knowledge and skills were continually questioned by administrators and other teachers, who consistently opposed me. In addition, although I identified with the students – familiar as I was with their neighbourhoods and their challenges – they did not necessarily identify with me, and most of them would have preferred to be anywhere other than in my classroom. In short, I was miserable. I became worn out, as well, from preparing two-page lesson plans daily for six different classes, pursuing a doctoral degree, and, as the lead special education teacher, mentoring new special education teachers who were entering the teaching profession through the NYCTF.

The demands on me increased steadily. One day in the winter of 2010, I declined to monitor after-school tutoring sessions, owing to my extremely heavy workload. My principal thereupon suggested that I lacked the commitment necessary to become an educational leader. My difficulties increased because I was also inundated by requests from the teachers that I mentored and from the other subject area teachers as well.

The students I taught were predominantly black male students who were learning ESL in New York City. Specifically, they were first-generation Americans, mainly from Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic, from families living below the poverty line. Black males have been overrepresented within special education for at least four decades (Blanchett et al. 2009). Most of these students were labelled ‘at-risk’, having been given educational support for specific, diagnosed problems, such as emotional
disturbances, learning impairments, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. As Raby (2002) has argued, the label of ‘at-risk’ is simply a guise for instilling discipline to justify mechanisms of social control. Despite these glib labels, these young people are in reality often overwhelmed with feelings of shame and self-doubt because of their ‘special needs’ placement and excluded from mainstream classrooms, being deemed unsuited for the general education setting.

I saw my position as ‘experientially recognizable’ (Holloway and Jefferson 2000, p.100) and felt I knew these students ‘both from the outside in and from the inside out’ (hooks 1984, p.ix). They were my students, but they were also younger versions of me. I understood then, as I do now, their exclusion. However, the people that I perceived as a younger version of me did not always view me as an older model of themselves. For example, my Black and Latino 6th-grade students would often ask, ‘Yo mista, why you talkin’ like you white?’ These children, though growing up in the same lower-income neighbourhood that I did, had learned that speaking Standard English is equated with whiteness.

Overwhelmed by the problems I saw in the public schools, I became certain that my ability to contribute was limited. After completing the NYCTF, I decided to earn and save enough money to enrol in a doctoral programme, and it was primarily this economic goal that led me to Turkey. Because the rent for my apartment in New York City consumed half of my income, going to Turkey was really a matter of strategic planning as well. In addition, I had lived in Greece from 1999 to 2002. Greece and Turkey share a similar history and similar politics dating to the Ottoman Empire, to which both countries belonged at one time. Because I had been celebrated in Greece for my exotic features, I imagined that I would be celebrated in Turkey as well, though I hoped that my intelligence would be of more interest than my looks. On 28 June 2010,
I received an offer of employment from the former Director General at IPRIS, which I accepted on 3 July 2010.

Until now, I have worked as an instructor at IPRU University, which has loaned me to IPRIS for the past 4 years. At IPRIS, I worked with prekindergarten students (aged 4) from 2010 to 2011. I then worked with kindergarten students (age 5) from 2011 to 2013, when I began providing English additional language (EAL) support for students from grades 1 through 4. The students at IPRIS are mostly children of the most affluent families in Turkey. Because for many people the English language may symbolise one’s economic and social status, it is quite important for the children of such affluent families to acquire a high level of proficiency.

When I first came to IPRIS on the first day, I did not plan to work at IPRIS beyond the initial contract, which is 2 years for all newly hired faculty members. During my first year of teaching at IPRIS (2010–2011), I sought for doctoral programmes in which I could enrol, as I considered leaving after the first year if I could find a suitable programme. When I found the international professional Doctorate of Education degree programme offered at the University of Sussex, I thought then – as I think now – that it was a suitable fit for me.

In my job as an educator at IPRIS, I have learnt both that I need to know the experiences of my students and colleagues and that what I know, feel, and see depends on my experiences and context as an individual. I can come to know and understand the realities of others in many ways. One aim of this research has been to gain a better understanding of how my perceived realities relate to those of others. My perception of myself in my varied roles over time has shifted according to my experiences, which have indeed influenced my decisions and actions, and I suspect the same is true for my
fellow EFL educators at IPRIS. I have constructed an analytic auto-ethnography in order to examine my role within the cultural context of Turkey, the institutional context of IPRIS, and the framework of critical theory against a backdrop of globalisation and the experiences of five other EFL educators.

In this analytic auto-ethnography, wherein I examine my role in relation to context, theory, and my colleagues, I inhabit the hyphenated space characteristic of analytic auto-ethnography because it breaks up the unity of the ‘autoethnography’. The hyphen reflects the tension created because of my uncertainty concerning my fit at IPRIS; in my shifting position as an EFL educator, researcher, and participant in this study; and in these unstable globalised times. Inhabiting the hyphen then, for me, also reflects the ‘unhomeliness’ mentioned by Bhabha (1994), in which I am neither settled nor homeless, rather occupying a space of constant and uneasy accommodation of self to others, both globally and locally.

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to investigate my perceptions of my role as an EFL educator as I live and work in Istanbul, Turkey, at IPRIS in our globalised era. My international mobility and awareness of social differences have affected my experiences and current perceptions, and shaped my role. I include myself in the study’s six participants as I explore the impact of my background on my role in Turkey and at IPRIS, and compare myself to five other EFL educators. This study comprises the sociological characteristics of our roles including gender, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, socio-economic status in our home countries, and our political worldviews, all of which affect our roles as EFL teachers. The motivation for this study is my need to represent my histories, my experience, and my embodied realities, in a new and
previously un-researched light as well as myself. Thus, I adopted a naturalistic auto-ethnographic research design frame (Lincoln and Guba 1985) as well as an analytic research design framework (Anderson 2006a). The first and third person pronouns are used as the ‘my/ours’ aspect is interwoven in the descriptions analysis and commentary when comparisons are made between my experiences and those of my colleagues.

Pratt (1991) conceived of auto-ethnography as an enquiry based on the politics of people representation, whereby people who may be colonised can represent themselves in ways that engage the coloniser on the coloniser’s own terms; my postcolonial perspective is similar. Because my group has been over-researched, I aim to analyse the falsehoods that have been presented as truths in many research texts. Thus, two of my goals are as follows: first, I hope to rewrite the ways that black men like me have been constructed in academic discourse. Second, I aim to represent my subjugated knowledge and experiences while involving fellow EFL practitioners as I consider and reflexively examine their and my roles. I hope to supply the lack of sociological imagination in many of the existing treatments of EFL education.

This enquiry also arises partly from my status and experience as an EFL educator; having taught both ESL and EFL, I have encountered many educators with a monocultural perspective. According to Genc and Bada (2005, p.75), most ESL and EFL educators are culture-bound, espousing ethnocentric views ‘because they have difficulty understanding or accepting people with points of view based on other views of the world’. I have seen such problems in at least two different settings: first, in a New York City public school, in which learners from low-income families lived in an ‘inner circle’ country (i.e. the United States; Kachru 1992, p.38) and second, teaching students from mostly wealthy families in Turkey, a developing or ‘expanding’ circle (Kachru 1992 ibid.) in which English is recognised as an international language, even
though the country has not been colonised by an ‘inner circle’ country. In both these roles, I have seen that English language teaching (ELT) maintains similarly colonial language policies, which have been shifted into our current globalised era. EFL educators need to examine what they do and why they do it, accounting for socioeconomic and political factors, so that hierarchical power relations are not reproduced between individuals and existing organisational structures.

Finally, my research for my doctoral work has increased my understanding of those who are not necessarily part of a dominant class, though they are so perceived. For example, I do not perceive myself as part of a dominant class because I am in a minority group in the U.S.; nonetheless, people outside the U.S. may perceive me as belonging because I have an American passport. Thus, perceptions arise out of the contexts where we were socialised and which we inhabit.

1.3 Rationale and research questions

Arising from the rationale for this study and my background, the questions for this analytic auto-ethnography are as follows:

(1) How do I fit in/belong as an educator at IPRIS?

(2) What do EFL educators perceive as our roles at IPRIS?

(3) What relationship as EFL educators do we have to globalisation?

The idea for the research questions and for this analytic auto-ethnographic thesis originated in a critique of two articles in Phase 1, Module 1: ‘What Culture? Which Culture? Cross-Cultural Factors in Language Learning’ by Luke Prodromou (1992) and ‘Multiple Identities: The Turkish Perspective’ by Derin Atay and Ayse Ece (2009). The first article focused on Greek students, whereas the second focused on the identities of
Turkish teachers. I was curious about the experiences of students that learn EFL in Greece and Turkey because they share a similar history and have similar politics.

Realizing that the two countries have been enemies in recent history because of an unresolved conflict over Cyprus, I also wondered what might have occurred in the EFL field during the 17 years between the publishing of the two articles. According to Atay and Ece (2009 p.22), the socio-cultural identities of Turkish EFL students have been compromised as a result of language acquisition. Atay and Ece argued that the Turks’ search for identity began during the period of Westernisation ‘between 1908 and 1918’ wherein Ottoman officials aimed to ‘provide Turkish citizens with a new view of the world that would replace the one shaped by religion and religious culture’ without intending to change the identity of the people. Turkish adoption of the Westernised identity carried the challenge of keeping up with a rapidly globalising world, and the English language became an integral part of national education in Turkey.

A significant question arose during the second phase of the first module from my article critiques and observations at IPRIS: Why are predominantly white Anglo-American teachers employed at IPRIS and why is American English the standard form? In addition, how does the English language serve IPRIS and the Turkish nationals who send their children to this institution? It became obvious that research was needed on this topic, as well as what material should be researched. Following Kvale (1996, p.88) in terms of study design, I intended to co-construct knowledge by elucidating the roles of the teachers and their perceptions of their rationale for teaching English at IPRIS.

Thus, in my initial research questions, I aimed to discover the extent to which IPRIS professes or reinforces the need to assume its English teachers’ nationality and/or identity. One of my interview questions at first was ‘What is wrong with learning English primarily from a Turkish teacher?’
I realised that this was a leading question that illegitimately influenced the answer. Thus, I rethought the questions as I discerned how to access, research, and report upon the world. Because I wanted to collect data that accurately reflected the participants’ life situations, I aimed to have them present their views without restraint through interviews. The tentative findings from that first small research project helped further my understanding. As I analysed the data from the interviews, I realised that I was adding new experiences to the old and, in turn, making naturalistic generalisations (Stake and Trumbull 1982).

One of the reasons Chew (2010, p.85) identifies for learning English has to do with what he calls ‘linguistic migration’. Such migration is typically necessary in the search for linguistic capital that is readily exchangeable in the global marketplace for other kinds of capital. Two of the respondents from my first small-scale study revealed that their reasons for leaving their home and learning English were related to this linguistic migration.

Then, I began to consider my own case: I had lived and worked in Greece, Turkey, and Japan for long periods of time. I am pursuing an international professional doctorate at the University of Sussex in England because of its status in university rankings, which means my degree will be internationally recognised. The country in which I am pursuing a degree is one of the greatest colonisers in history; it colonised the country my parents came from. All these facts led me to consider that what I originally perceived as English linguistic imperialism at IPRIS may simply arise from the current role of the English language in this era of globalisation. Though I began thus to consider English differently in terms of reasons people might want to learn and be affiliated with the language, questions remained concerning why educators teach English in this era of globalisation.
In this way, my thinking shifted from my earlier premise, which had begun with the views of Phillipson (1992, p.54), who, finding unequal relations of power to be central in ELT, asserted that in the teaching of ESL and EFL, power inequalities abound because the ELT discipline has inherited the mechanisms of ‘anglocentricity and professionalism’, which operate within a structure wherein unequal relations of power are legitimated. Phillipson (1992, p.54) labelled this process ‘linguistic imperialism’, arguing that English teachers play a pre-eminent role in promoting the assimilation of linguistically and culturally diverse children to Anglo norms. Pennycook similarly refers to the worldliness of English: its relationship to class, education and culture, the materiality of its imposition on students, the implications of their eventual success in and through English. Unlike Phillipson, Pennycook did not target EFL teachers, but he argued that English acts as a gatekeeper to positions of wealth and prestige, thereby maintaining the prevailing unequal distribution of wealth, resources, and knowledge. As my perceptions began to change through my research experiences, I began to agree with certain findings positing that institutional practices and the roles of EFL educators have a direct relationship with globalisation and not simply with imperialism, as I had once presumed.

In Phase 2, Module 3, I conducted a yearlong critical analytical study (CAS) wherein I attempted to discover my role as an EFL educator. I focused on understanding the EFL teacher’s role when working in low- and middle-income countries in an era of globalisation and inequality. In the CAS, I aimed to situate my own actions and those of my global colleagues in a broader theoretical framework by seeking answers to the following questions: 1) What theories [or theoretical framework] support an understanding of the role of the EFL teacher working in low- and middle-income countries in an era of globalisation and inequality? 2) Where do I locate myself in terms
of identity and role as an EFL educator within these theories? Based on the findings from the CAS, I proposed creating an analytic auto-ethnography for my doctoral thesis in Phase 3. This frame has indeed facilitated a critical examination of my perception (at that time) of my role as an EFL educator, of how those perceptions came to be, and of my biases and values, especially considering my role in relation to those of five other EFL educators in the same context.

Zeichner and Liston (1987) argued that context is very important: within it, educators can reflect upon and consider their personal experiences, attitudes, and beliefs to gain greater insight into their development as people and practitioners. In forming my own views, I have gained much from Bourdieu’s (1977) theory of reflexivity. Bourdieu (1984, p.471) showed that ‘a sense of one’s place’ becomes progressively inscribed in minds through systems of ‘family’, ‘education’, ‘language’, and the ‘perception of the social world’ in everyday life. For Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992, p.40), reflexivity meant that the researcher’s knowledge must consist of the sociological conditions of its existence and must make visible the ‘reflexive analyses to the un-thought categories of thought which delimit the thinkable and predetermine what is actually thought’.

In critical theory, according to Giroux (1988), the enquirer’s voice is that of the transformative intellectual. As a critical theorist, and specifically from a postcolonialist perspective, I examine the processes of globalisation that have exacerbated the systems of social inequality which I observe or have experienced and which are sustained in society (Tollefson 2006). I also explore issues of power and justice within economic spheres, as well as race, class, ideologies, and discourses within IPRIS, in the field of EFL education, and in the context of the intersecting cultural dynamics. I also investigate the unequal power relations often created by ideological distortion to form
discourse – that is, to form a language for talking about and representing knowledge in order to construct topics in a certain way (Hall 1992).

Such discourse – which presents an ideological, and hence partial, way of seeing the world – is designed to control reality and other people. Foucault and Deleuze (1977, p.206-7) assert that ‘there is nothing but action of theory and action of practice which relate to each other as relays and form networks’. Here Foucault, much like Bourdieu, points to the situated nature of intellectuals and calls for a more reflexive interpretation. Burrell (1998) observed that for Foucault, power does not reside in things, but in systematically interconnected relationships. Through this line of thought, I conceived my role, as both researcher and participant in this study, to re-write the ways that I and other black males are often used as objects of study rather than as participants in the research.

The aim of relational networks, as considered in my thesis, is to mount a collective struggle against dominant forms of power. As I urged the participants to consider their role as EFL educators at IPRIS, I asked the same questions in two different interviews to ascertain the meaning they constructed of their circumstances in our shared context during and after our conversations. With the insights garnered from my colleagues, I also constructed meaning for myself in relation to my circumstances, my colleagues, and in context. These ideas and methods allow me to achieve ontological authenticity, the evidence of which, Guba and Lincoln contended, can be observed in statements that document growth in the research participants’ understanding of their own lives and in the researcher’s own ‘progressive subjectivity’(1989, p.248). As a result, I here attempt to (re) present myself, along with the secondary participants, in an effort to disrupt extant ideologies in academic discourse.
I further intend to ignite catalytic validity, which Cohen et al. (2011) show, ensures that research leads to action. I hope that EFL educators and researchers alike will be reflexive and will become activists in their fields. In my new role as an administrator at IPRIS, I have suggested that my colleagues, in lieu of a traditional yearly evaluation, create an auto-ethnographic text. I am interested in ‘opening up understanding’ and ‘facilitating reflection’ as Alvesson and Willmott, (1996, p.175) suggest; however, I recognise that my aim is not a guarantee of success.

1.4  Context

1.4.1  An era of globalisation

Social theorists use the term ‘globalisation’ to characterise an intensification of capital flows and the commodification of relations between states, people, entities, that is grounded in modernisation and fuelled by the expansion of Western capitalism (Jay 2001). It is inextricably linked to the rise of transnational corporations and the spread of marketplaces across national boundaries. Robert Robertson’s (1990) significant study of globalisation, which accurately linked the relationships between commodity, economy, social behaviour, and culture, outlined the emergence of globalisation in five distinct phases:

1. Phase 1, the ‘germinal phase’, which occurred from 1400–1750. National communities began to grow during this phase, marking the beginning of the temporal-historical path to our present era of globalisation. European expansion and intercontinental trade intensified around 1500 (Mauro 1961). In my small-scale research assignment, whereas I initially labelled the English-language teaching situation here at the IPRIS as being ‘imperialistic’ (Melville 2012), I now think that
globalisation, is not simply an ineluctable universal force but one that is locally mediated (Dale 2000).

2. Phase 2, the ‘incipient phase’, which lasted from 1750–1875, represents a sharp shift toward homogeneous unitary states and formalised international relations. It is important to note that the Industrial Revolution – which began in Britain and spread through Western Europe and the US – was linked to cotton, coal, steel, spinning and the trade in commodities between the UK and the USA. It was also tied to slavery and the colonisation of Africa by the Victorians. In Turkey, this time was known as the Tanzimât period.

3. Phase 3, the ‘take-off phase’, lasted from 1875–1925 with significant developments in science, politics, warfare, and technology. There was a sharp increase in global communication; and global competitions, such as the Olympics and the Nobel Prizes, began during this phase (Robertson 1990).

4. Phase 4, which Robertson (1990) calls the ‘struggle for hegemony phase’, occurred from 1925–1969. This phase was characterised by numerous disputes and wars over the fragile processes of globalisation. This period of modernisation gave rise to the nation-state and to dramatic increases in literacy rates, as well as to what Frieden (2006) proclaimed the rise of global capitalism.

The modern modes of social organisation, emerging from Europe but spread through European exploration and colonisation, played an important part in cultivating an image of the English language that helped maintain societal inequalities: ‘English [is]…presented as better adapted to meet the needs of “modern”, technologically developed, democratic post-industrial information-driven societies. Thus, English as a foreign language and its teachers (perhaps inadvertently) has projected an ideology of
success, national “unity”, democracy and other such positive features’ (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000, p. xi).

5. Phase 5, the ‘uncertainty phase’, began in 1969 and continues to ‘display crisis tendencies in the early 1990s’ (Robertson 1990, p.27). This phase has been marked by heightened global consciousness and exemplified by such globally significant events as the moon landing, as well as societal issues like ‘multiculturality’ and ‘polyethnicity’ (Robertson 1990, p.26–27). Globalisation may be linked with the rapid deterioration of traditional culture and disruptions in the boundaries of nation-states. This phase coincides with Giddens’ (1990, p.64) view of globalisation as an extension of modernity and representing the ‘intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities as are shaped by events occurring many miles away’. Appadurai (1996, p.7), in rejecting the idea that globalisation is synonymous with homogenisation or Western domination, insists that the consumption of mass media and the rapid rise of technology promote virtual travel, which encourages physical travel and thus creates a culture that provides a context for the exercise of power – for ‘action’ rather than ‘escape’.

Acar (2004) echoes Appadurai’s sentiments in terms of ‘consumption of mass media’ as a factor that has played an important role in globalisation. He adds that ‘mobility of populations’ owing to ‘tourism and migration’, ‘transnationalization of markets’, and ‘the end of the cold war that bought a sense of engagement and mission instead of isolationist policies’ have also been important factors in the process of globalisation, particularly in Turkey (Acar 2004, p.2), as well as the Turkish government’s educational and cultural policies since the 1980s. Acar (ibid.) asserts that ‘the increasing use of English in Turkey reflects a rise in the intensity of a wide variety of cultural flows which make transnational encounters more frequent’.
1.4.2 The context of English in Turkey

English was initially introduced into the Ottoman Empire (whose capital was in the modern Republic of Turkey) through British trade relations around the 1530s. Because traders made few attempts to learn one another’s languages, Greek, Jewish, and Armenian minorities in Istanbul and Izmir were employed as translators (Dogancay-Aktuna 1998). The Tanzimât period (the reorganisation of the Ottoman Empire from 1839–1876) was marked by Westernisation of the Turkish educational system, along with severe economic and political setbacks (Kirkgöz 2005, as cited in Kirkgöz 2009). Westernisation was the result of opposing political movements. The Young Ottomans encouraged the state to follow liberal European ideals, while the opposing Islamists believed that modernisation would lead to the loss of cultural identities (Atay and Ece 2009). For the Young Turks, modernisation was a process of embracing and internalizing European culture (Keyder 1997). The year 1913 was a turning point in the ideological currents in the empire just as it was in political and economic developments, creating a social debate of ‘us versus them’ (Zurcher 2004, p.127). Turkish society embraced a new mentality, outlook, and value system, and education played an important role in the country’s transformation (Eskicumalı 1994, p.101). When Christian missionaries were granted permission to teach in the Ottoman Empire, English was taught for the first time in what is now the Republic of Turkey.

In 1863, two important institutions were opened in Turkey. First, Cyrus Hamlin, an American missionary, opened Robert College where English was taught alongside Arabic. The school’s students had diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and English acted as the lingua franca (History of Bogazici University 2009). Robert College (now Bogazici University), was exceptional in that the Turkish government
approved its opening (Zok 2009). Second, a college (high school) for training female teachers opened in Istanbul. Founded as part of Sultan Abdul-Aziz’s efforts to modernise the Empire through Westernisation, the college offered lessons in English (Abadan-Unat 1978). This college symbolised the growing influence of women and the English language in the about-to-be-formed republic.

The concurrent modernisation and Westernisation movements infused Turkish culture with European and American elements, accelerating the spread of English within the country. Soon English gained precedence over French, which had previously been the preeminent foreign language in Turkey (Kirkgöz 2007). The new republic relied upon English to communicate with the outside world economically and socially, and the use of English accelerated Turkey’s modernisation and Westernisation (Demirel 1990). However, the spread of English is not necessarily externally influenced but is driven by internal needs and interests (Spolsky 2009). The young Turkish nation-state felt the need to adopt a Westernised identity, thus mandating greater proficiency in foreign languages to keep up with the rapidly globalising world. Soon thereafter, English language education became an ‘integral part of national education in Turkey’ (Atay and Ece 2009, p.23).

In order to construct a Western educational system, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk sought out multi-lingual Turkish pedagogical reformers educated in the Western-style schools of the Ottoman period (e.g. Robert College), as well as foreign experts such as John Dewey (Soriçoban and Soriçoban 2012). Atatürk also replaced the Arabic and Persian alphabets with the Latin alphabet within a 5-month period in 1928. Like other cultural reforms of the time, romanising the alphabet was intended to align the Turkish culture with that of Europe (Ergil 1975). The Arabic script, which had been used by the Ottomans for over a thousand years, was abandoned on 1 January 1929 and replaced by
Roman script. This phonetic alphabet was thought to be much easier to use in teaching the largely illiterate population (Baki 2003, as cited in Zok 2009).

English language teaching (ELT) has undergone many politically motivated changes (Kirkgoz 2007) in Turkey since then. English continued to gain popularity in Turkey from the 1950s through the late 1970s (Dogançay-Aktuna 1998). The spread of English during this period was no accident; Turkey became a member of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 1948 and joined the Council of Europe and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in 1952. These events were signs of ‘the realization of Atatürk’s dream of Turkey as part of Europe’ (Müftüler-Bac 1997, p.53), and they propelled the teaching and learning of the English language to new heights.

On becoming a member of NATO, Turkey was introduced to the political and diplomatic circle of America and Western Europe. The value of establishing these relations was inestimable, enabling Turkey to establish itself as a European power (Müftüler-Bac 1997). The political, economic, and commercial relations with the West, along with an introduction to the parameters of a liberal economy and the opportunities provided for free enterprise, significantly encouraged and promoted a more Westernised Turkey, particularly after 1980. English words were no longer unknown for the general population, as they were easily visible as names of fast-food restaurants, shops, markets, imported items, or terminology for newly introduced concepts (Dogançay-Aktuna 1998). In sum, since the mid-1980s, Turkey has increasingly been influenced by the forces of globalisation through the English language, which is used to meet economic, social, and cultural demands for both local and international communication (Sariçoban and Sariçoban 2012).
In 1997, the language policy in primary education underwent a significant reform nationally, mandating the integration of primary and secondary education into a single stream, extending ‘the duration of primary education from five to eight years. A further result of the reform was the introduction of English for Grade 4 and Grade 5 students, thus shifting the introduction of EFL from secondary to primary schools in order to provide a longer exposure to the foreign language’ (Kirkgöz 2009, p.220). Turkey’s language policy underwent further changes in 2005. In 2012, significant changes were made in the structure of the Turkish educational system: compulsory education was increased from 8 to 12 years and divided into three phases, each of which involved 4 years of schooling (Uztosun 2013). In this new structure of compulsory public schooling, as Uztosun (2013, p.25) attests, ‘students take 3 hours of English classes per week in the first phase and 4 hours in the second phase’.

In sum, I think that the tenets of post-colonialism are applicable in Turkey at IPRIS, a view shared by some Turkish scholars who are now required to publish their research in English rather than in their mother tongue. One such scholar is Ali Fuad Selvi, a faculty member of Middle East Technical University. Selvi (2011, p. 196) states that the context of English in Turkey ‘attracts considerable attention, primarily because it is a context where the impact of the English language is felt extensively, in spite of the absence of a historical colonizer-colonized relationship’. Absent of such a relationship, English has spread in much the same way it began in the decline of the Ottoman Empire and just before the formation of the Turkish republic in terms of both intended and unintended diffusion. Selvi (2011, p.196) continues this argument, noting that ‘[w]hile the former refers to the state-planned more controlled and desirable spread of English in Turkish life and language, the latter refers to the undesirable and uncontrollable spread of English in culture, business and language’.
1.4.3 Istanbul Private Research University/IPRIS

Istanbul Private Research University/IPRIS (pseudonym) covers an area of more than 5,000 acres. The university has three campuses: east, central, and west. Though IPRIS is on the eastern campus, its five separate buildings are spread across all the campuses because of the increased desire in Turkey to learn the English language from ‘one of the best schools’, as one of the five secondary participants stated. To accommodate the increasing demand for English language instruction, IPRIS has recently erected a new elementary building to match the middle school that was built 2 years ago, creating a mixture of physical structures that were built between 1992 and 2014. The university, too, is expanding to accommodate the increased demand for English medium instruction. The instruction takes place in classrooms that generally accommodate 25 students and one or two teachers comfortably. The students, mainly Turkish nationals, usually come from the middle-to-upper class, who pay the equivalent of university fees from ages 4 through 18 for this English school. Very few of the students, roughly 10%, are not Turkish nationals, but this number is highly variable, being dependent on the enrolment of the children of educators from outside Turkey who teach at IPRIS.

The school administration consists of two principals in the elementary, middle and high schools, one Turkish national and the other typically from the United States. Both of these principals at these divisions at IPRIS select and lead grade level coordinators from pre-kindergarten through Grade 12.

Although the salaries are not high, IPRIS educators who are not Turkish nationals are provided with on-campus accommodations. The accommodations are modest, usually two bedroom lojmans. In Turkish, lojman means housing that can be provided for
employees of a university or a government entity for either non-Turkish citizens or highly desirable Turkish nationals.

1.5 Chapter summary and thesis structure

The introduction has provided a brief rationale for the research and the thesis, which is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 contextualises the study and describes the problem, purpose, and research questions. This chapter describes the way I have come to know myself as an educator and researcher, the English situation in Turkey, and the progression of globalisation. Chapter 1 also furnishes information on the process of globalisation and its historical origins as theorised by Robertson (1990).

Chapter 2 depicts the investigation’s theoretical framework emerging out of the literature review, clarifying major theories and the traditions that guided the collection and analysis of the data. This chapter outlines the development of the major theories to delineate a path from their origins to their present relevance, showing how they have informed this research.

Chapter 3 contains a detailed discussion of the methodology and process of collecting and analysing the data. Six EFL educators at IPRIS in Turkey (including me) were interviewed twice. All interviews were recorded and transcribed. The study began in October 2013 and ended in August 2014. I construed my position by reading and committing to the analytic auto-ethnographic approach.

Chapter 4, using an inductively oriented analysis on the data collected in the interviews with the secondary participants, reveals the elements that may explain how our perceptions of our roles have been formed. From this process, in which my reflexive journal was also included, three themes emerged. The over-arching topic of ‘teacher background’ was the most pronounced, and from that larger theme, the sub themes
were derived: (1) background to the fore, (2) from family structure to occupational structure, (3) before IPRIS, and (4) at IPRIS.

Chapter 5 furnishes a more explicit, deductively inclined rendering of the participants’ perception of their roles as EFL educators at IPRIS and their perceptions of the role of English as the global language. As a critical theorist, I recognised the need for us professionals to acknowledge and reflect on the English language in terms of its role in the process of development and globalisation. This acknowledgement and reflection led some of us participants to an understanding of how our roles as EFL educators implicate us in furthering the role of English as a global language in these globalised times.

Chapter 6, the concluding chapter, summarises the main findings of the study and discusses its limitations and how I addressed them. The chapter presents the significance and implications of my research, culminating with the key part: my original contribution to knowledge – which includes the findings, my space in theory, and the development of a relatively new and innovative method of enquiry. Finally, Chapter 6 offers recommendations for EFL practitioners, school administrators, and researchers who may engage with analytic auto-ethnography as a form of professional development, an evaluation tool, and a method of enquiry.
Chapter 2

2.1 Theoretical framework

Chapter 2 presents my theoretical framework, built upon Pierre Bourdieu’s concepts of capital, habitus, field, symbolic violence, and reflexivity. I first detail the methods used to collect the literature and then furnish an overview of the concepts of capital (Bourdieu 1977, 1986, 1990), habitus (Bourdieu 1977, 1991a, 1996), and field (Bourdieu 1993, Wacquant and Wilson 1989, Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, Swartz 1997).

I draw on Bourdieu’s theories to illustrate how his concept of field emerged out of the wider concept of colonialism and his experiences in colonial Algeria. I also use the works of writers who focused on his early ethnographic experiences in Algeria and extended his foundational theories (Calhoun 2006; Reed-Danahay 2004; Wacquant 2004; Goodman and Silverstein 2009; Yacine 2004; and Go (2013).

In the section that follows, I draw theoretical links between Bourdieu’s theories and experiences and postcolonialism, as well as the spread of the English language in Turkey. I link Bourdieu’s notion of the cultural sabir with Bhabha’s third space of enunciation and the notion of hybridity as I discuss the experience of colonialism, westernisation, domination, and capitalism extant in language mixing. The chapter concludes with discussions of Bourdieu’s notions on symbolic capital and symbolic violence.

In each discussion in this chapter, I attempt to illustrate how these writers and concepts inform my methodology. To accomplish this, I aim to explain the secondary participants’ positioning and to elucidate how their capitals comprise their habitus – which consists of their situation in the EFL field in Turkey at IPRIS in a globalised era.
2.2 Methods of collecting the literature

Multiple perspectives and theories were required to provide the best answers to the research questions:

RQ1: How do I fit in/belong as an educator at IPRIS?

RQ2: What do we EFL educators perceive as our roles at IPRIS?

RQ3: What relationship as EFL educators do we have to globalisation?

Because the scope of the literature is relevant to global perspectives, I used various approaches to explore the main issue of the EFL teacher and surrounding themes, such as role, migration, race, class, domination, and power relations. The collected literature presents arguments from both developed and developing countries without adding to or reproducing the epistemologies of a dominant Western culture (Scheurich and Young 1997, p.8), which typically focus on constructing ‘the world’ or ‘the real’ in their own image and according to their ways of doing things.

In order not to collect literature that supports only my own view of the world, I started by using electronic database searches, such as SCOPUS and ERIC, to locate both peer-reviewed articles and conference papers. In these searches, I used specific search terms for every section. For instance, for the discussion on globalisation, I used the term ‘EFL teacher globalisation’ to search the SCOPUS database, which yielded eight papers as did a search on ERIC. Of the eight results in both searches, two were peer-reviewed articles that appeared in both. I used the term ‘cultural capital’ on the SCOPUS database while limiting the search to the social sciences, which yielded 3,954 studies. I then limited the search term to ‘cultural capital education’ which produced 632 results. Further narrowing the search, I used the term ‘cultural capital English education’, which yielded 54 results.
For abstract reviews, I placed the selected files into coded folders on my computer to be read in their entirety and found that the studies treated predominantly English education in North America, not taking into account EFL as it is taught in foreign contexts. I reflected on my reading on the selected articles and book chapters, which I recorded in a personal journal. I included articles if the studies had been undertaken in the education sector; if they focused on the role of EFL teachers, preferably in low and middle-income countries; and if they portrayed the researched groups as having voices of their own.

2.3 Biography from Bearn to Algeria

Bourdieu was born in a working class family in south-west France and later moved to the Left Bank in Paris to attend the Ecole Normale Supérieure. In the early 1950s, he studied philosophy, being most interested in competing, socially constructed forms, or explanatory discourses rather than in a priori explanations, such as transcendental categories (Robbins 2005). Robbins contends that it was Bourdieu’s reading of philosophy that provided him with a language for speaking objectively about the dualities of his experience, whilst the content of those studies provided him with a philosophical discourse for articulating this dual experience. Wacquant (2004, p.387) also demonstrated a duality, observing that ‘Bourdieu’s early field studies conducted concurrently in colonial Algeria and in his childhood village of Béarn in south-western France…reveal the twinned ethnographic roots of his theoretical enterprise’.

As a top graduate of the École Normale Supérieure, Bourdieu joined the Army Psychological Service in Versailles. There, he reported engaging in ‘heated arguments with high-ranking officers’ who wanted to convert him to “l’Algérie française” (a political and militant movement, created in 1960 in Algiers, in favour of French
Algeria), which soon thereafter earned him a reassignment to Algeria (Bourdieu 2004b, p.492).

Disenchantment soon emerged with what Bourdieu characterised as his fellow soldiers’ blind ‘submissiveness towards the military hierarchy and everything that it imposes’ (Bourdieu 2004b, p.418). In his personal crisis, Bourdieu became increasingly aware of his privileged position and confrontation with the Algerian war and with the transformations wrought by French colonialism and capitalism (Calhoun 2006).

Bourdieu’s consciousness (and conscience) was also awakened by the racism of his fellow soldiers, many of whom had come from the brutality of the French colonial regime (Go 2013). Bourdieu (2004b, p.416) later referred to his circumstances at the time as a ‘personal challenge represented by that tragic situation’. He further exclaimed, ‘[T]here never existed in Algeria a truly isolated community, completely untouched by the colonial situation’ (Bourdieu 1959, p.63, as cited in Go 2013).

After military service, Bourdieu (2004b, p.423), wanting to feel useful, accepted a post at the University of Algiers where, he writes, ‘I was able to continue my ethnological inquiries and then my sociological inquiries’. In these early enquiries, he collected data using interviews; for example, he recalls a peasant’s description of being tortured by the French army that shook him ‘profoundly’ (Bourdieu 2004, p.425). Here, Bourdieu’s display of reflexivity becomes clear as it was his listening to accounts of a peasant’s torture that led him to his keen feeling of disjointedness between his reality – as a white Frenchman working on the side of the French in a war torn environment – and that of the people that he conversed with and of whom he took photographs.

While collecting data for what appears to be his naturalistic research (in the sense of being emergent, contextually based), Bourdieu (2003, p.13) found that ‘[i]t is
indisputable that every action derives its meaning from the context in which it is performed, in this case the colonial system’. Further, Bourdieu et al. (1963, p.258) contended that

\[ \text{the colonial system is a given with which the ethnologist must recount because he finds himself placed, by the force and the logic of things, in the presence of a social form that exists before him, that he has not created, that he must bear with even as he disapproves of it or strives to disengage himself from it, and from which he benefits, even in his craft as anthropologist, since the relation between the ethnographer and the informant, like any interpersonal relation, is established against the backdrop of the objective relation of domination obtaining between the colonising society and the colonised society.} \]

Bourdieu saw himself as a mediator between France as coloniser and the colonised Algerians, and he aimed to bridge that gap by way of communication.

Towards the end of his life, Bourdieu argued for the necessity of what he called ‘self-analysis as part of the research process’ (Grenfell 2006, p.234). Bourdieu (2000c, p.289) wrote that

\[ \text{…one knows the world better and better as one knows oneself better, that scientific knowledge and knowledge of oneself and one’s own social unconscious advance hand in hand, and that primary experience transformed by scientific practice transforms scientific practice and conversely.} \]

In the socio-analytic account of his own social and intellectual formation, he remembers the motivations, aims, and circumstances of his fieldwork in Algeria during the war of national liberation (Bourdieu 2004). Much like auto-ethnography, the account shows the motivations, which formed his ethnographic fieldwork experiences in colonial Algeria.

**2.4 Cultural capital**

Cultural capital, one of Bourdieu’s best-known theories, is defined as a resource or set of resources that holders can use to acquire possibly scarce information. It can be
transmitted from one generation to another and manipulated or monopolised, depending on the context. It may consist of non-financial assets, such as physical appearance and style of dress, appreciation of art forms currently defined as elite such as opera or ballet, academic qualifications, and even grade point averages. These assets can be and often are exchanged for tangible monetary rewards, which may result in social mobility. According to Bourdieu (1986), capital is the embodiment, materialisation, or institutionalisation of effort, which is then incorporated or put into practice. In Bourdieu’s notion of capital, the values and norms of the white middle class (such as access to equal education and technology) are the most appropriate. Equal access and education are norms that enable the social mobility mentioned earlier. Thus, Bourdieu seems to endorse the idea that non-white, middle-class communities are culturally and socially deficient. Though Bourdieu’s notion of cultural capital is majestic in its ability to critique the institutionalised (cultural and social) reproduction of inequities, it is also fallible: Yasso (2006), for example, finds that cultural capital reproduces both cultural and social inequities. Yasso (2006, p.73) contends that if capitals are positioned in this way, ‘deficit-informed’ research is further legitimised and reproduced because non-white peoples and their communities are continually represented as culturally deprived, as well as being inept at academic discourse.

According to Bourdieu (1986, p.83), embodied capital is external wealth that has become an essential part of a person and that embodied forms of cultural capital could be acquired without being explicitly taught. These include the knowledge and skills that ‘always remain marked by [their] earliest conditions of acquisition, through the more or less visible marks that they leave… [and that] help to determine [their] distinctive value’ (Bourdieu 1986, p.245). Linguistic accents, for example, or pronunciations of a particular class or region, (i.e. linguistic capital) as well as the social manners, style of
dress, and tastes (therefore akin to habitus) are naturally acquired, with little effort and by immersion in social situations (Bourdieu 1986, p.49). Bourdieu also believed that such capital represents the set of limits inscribed in the reality of that world, which govern its functioning and determine persons’ chances of success.

Linguistic capital as a subset of embodied cultural capital, according to Bourdieu and Passeron (1990, p.114), is the mastery of and relation to language. In 1977, Bourdieu stated that the influence of linguistic capital manifests itself in the first years of schooling, and in 1993, he asserted that linguistic capital is the power to control the mechanisms that govern linguistic prices. Bourdieu (1991, p.18) explains this idea by contending that ‘[o]n a given linguistic market some products are valued more highly than others, and part of the practical competence of speakers is to know how, and be able, to produce expressions which are highly valued on the markets concerned’.

English, for example, is valuable because the language constitutes a socio-economic currency in both the international and local markets. Internationally, knowing English creates such opportunities as receiving salary increases for one’s proficiency in English.

The demand for English has increased because material wealth is equated with educational background. For instance, as shown by Sifakis and Sougari (2010, p.305), the demand for an English proficiency certificate has increased in Greece since the 1980s because English language knowledge is currently a requirement for employment. English is also the most popular medium of education and most studied foreign language worldwide (Doğançay-Aktuna and Kiziltepe 2005).

I employ Bourdieu’s notion of capital to address the origin of the appreciations, current perceptions, and behaviours of the EFL educators at IPRIS. Our capitals, once embodied, enable us six participants to see the world, judge the world, and act in the
world in different ways. These capitals give insight into how and why the EFL educators at IPRIS currently perceive their roles the way they do (see Chapter 4 for further discussion).

2.5 Habitus

Habitus consists of the appreciations, perceptions, and behaviours that a society creates, which are then internalised by the members of that society, thus forging their dispositions. Bourdieu (1986) defines habitus as a socially constituted cognitive capacity, whilst Abercrombie (2000) asserts that socialisation involves learned knowledge and behaviours, linking people’s habitus to their character and the way they process information within a given field. ‘Class habitus’, Bourdieu (1996, p.4–5) asserts, is the capacity to realise a hope or an ambition as reasonable or unreasonable, a particular commodity as accessible or inaccessible, or a particular action as suitable or unsuitable. An individual’s capacity to buy into such realisations governed by prior experiences that either reinforce or modify that individual’s system for perception (Bourdieu 1992). Bourdieu’s notion of habitus illuminates ways that symbolic representations influence behaviour through a whole body of wisdom, sayings, commonplaces, ethical precepts (such as ‘that’s not for the likes of us’), and, at a deeper level, the unconscious principles of the ethos which determines ‘reasonable’ and ‘unreasonable’ conduct for every agent (1977, p.77). Bourdieu (1992, p.136) observed, ‘The notion of habitus accounts for the fact that social agents are neither particles of matter determined by external causes, nor little monads guided solely by internal reasons’.

He advised that one should think of habitus as ‘a sort of spring that needs a trigger, and depending on the stimuli and systems of the field, the same habitus will generate
different or even opposite outcomes’ (Bourdieu 1992, p.135). The outcomes will be different because it is impossible for all members of the same class (or even two of them) to have had the same experiences, in the same order. It is certain that each member of the same class is more likely than any other member of another class to have been confronted with the situations most frequent for the members of that class (Bourdieu 1977, p.85).

Bourdieu’s notion of habitus is used here to address the regard for and current perceptions of the EFL educators at IPRIS, as well as their behaviours in their situations in the ELT field in Turkey at IPRIS in this era of globalisation. Furthermore, the notion of habitus is applied to EFL educators’ own perceptions of how they position themselves as they mediate relationships in a way that is dependent on prior socialisation (see Chapters 4, 5, and 6 for further discussion).

2.6 The notion of field

Bourdieu’s work on fields depends in part on his notions about relationality. Fields are the broad areas in which agents are located according to their social positions, the social spaces in which individuals pursue their own goals, interact, and compete with one another. Obviously, the fields themselves are vast, encompassing all of social reality, extending from the economic at one end to cultural production on the other (Wacquant 1989, p.xi), and including the academic, artistic, religious, scientific, bureaucratic, economic, educational, intellectual, literary, gender relations, power, and cultural production fields.

Bourdieu argued that the social structure of a given field is premised upon dominant and subordinate positions, which form a ‘state of relations of force between players that defines the structure of the field’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p.99; Swartz, 1997).
In sum, fields are described as arenas of struggle for control over valued resources, or forms of capital (Bourdieu 1993, p.72). Unlike Marx who believed power struggles to be primarily economic, Bourdieu conceived these struggles to be a part of every field for all humanity and in all social arrangements. Because fields are interconnected, Bourdieu saw all social phenomena in relation to their respective fields and in relation to others in the field, asserting further that the actors in all fields, their habitus, and the capitals at stake can be understood only in relation to each other. Though fields may expand, contract, or be redrawn (Swartz 1997), Bourdieu portrays them with borders, writing extensively of both the commonalities and the boundaries of these fields. Every field is an open space with dynamic borders, he says, but within these borders, actors struggle to play ‘a game devoid of inventor and much more fluid and complex than any game that one might ever design’ (Bourdieu 1992, p.104). However, because Bourdieu does not specify how the existence of a field is to be identified or determined, Jenkins (2013, p. 89) questions whether fields ‘exist in the social consciousness of those actors who inhabit the social space in question, or are they simply analytical constructs?’

Following Bourdieu, in this study, reality is considered to be a social concept; to exist is to exist socially, and what is real is related to those around us. Social fields – whether institutions, countries like Turkey or Algeria, colonial periods, or this era of globalisation – have their own structure of internal power relations, defined and maintained by habitus, which is both individual and collective. The participants in this study, including me, comply with or resist norms and engage their current situations in their field according to their views. Our views and lived experiences influence how we view our roles as EFL educators and how we regard English as a global language (see Chapter 5 for further discussion).
2.6.1 The concepts of field, habitus, and reflexivity emerging from colonialism

In a recent effort to clarify how Bourdieu’s early experiences and thinking on colonialism contributed to his notions of the field, habitus, symbolic violence, and reflexivity, Calhoun (2006) criticises many researchers for not taking Bourdieu’s work in Algeria seriously. He argues that this oversight has impeded many sociologists’ grasp of Bourdieu’s views on education, citing Swartz (1997) as the most notable example. Several other prominent researchers have also shown that Bourdieu’s experiences in colonial Algeria spawned his conceptions (Reed-Danahay 2004; Goodman and Silverstein 2009 on habitus; Calhoun 2006 on symbolic violence; Wacquant 2004; Yacine 2004, 2008a, 2008b; Go 2013 on colonialism).

Colonial Algeria operated on a caste system – a rigid hierarchy of cultural groups cemented by strict endogamy – that is, marriage within a certain group as required by law or custom (Yacine 2004). Bourdieu’s core concern with field may have been developed in order to expose the dynamic forces tearing at the social and mental fabric of the caste society he encountered in colonial Algeria (Wacquant 2004). Bourdieu spoke of the racial hierarchies that typically formed the systems of colonialism, perceiving colonial Algeria as a ‘site of logic’ that was important to understand (Go 2013, p.55) because it displayed the ‘relationship of domination’ and system of ‘racial segregation’ at the foundation of colonial societies (Go 2013, p.64). This system based on race, Bourdieu emphasised, supported the political privilege of the white French colonising elite (Go 2013) and was founded on ‘the relation of force whereby the dominant caste maintains the dominated caste under its rule’, keeping it locked in collective ‘humiliation’ (Bourdieu 1958/1962, 1961, p.29, as cited in Wacquant 2004, p.394). Bourdieu’s conception of the colonial situation in Algeria bears a striking resemblance to his later notion of field, in which he viewed the dominant and
subordinate positional relationships as ‘specific and irreducible, much like the relationships between the colonizer and the colonized that formed the colonial situation’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p.97).

In his ethnographic and sociological research during the Algerian War of Independence, which he referred to as fieldwork in philosophy, Bourdieu (2003b) saw the brute power that lay behind colonialism, despite the French state’s assertion that they were in Algeria to ensure progress (Calhoun 2006). These experiences led to his conception of habitus, which Wacquant (2004, p.391) defined as referring to the ‘general and permanent disposition toward the world and towards others’. This disposition led displaced Algerians to cling to their inherited values in resettlement camps where the Algerian peasant ‘no longer had the possibility of behaving like a peasant’ (Bourdieu and Sayad 1964, p.154, as cited in Wacquant 2004, p.391). In other words, even when displaced Algerians were forced to surrender their habitual way of life, they held onto their traditions and culture.

Habitus thus became the mediating category, straddling the divide between the objective and the subjective that enabled Bourdieu to capture and depict the troubled and double-sided world of crumbling colonial Algeria (Wacquant 2004, p.3). He argued that, while social practice has some purpose and practical intent for the individual, these goals are located within an individual’s experience of reality. My own experience of reality has been predicated on my perception of self in specific places, at particular times, amongst certain people and is, therefore, partially defined by the external – hence the needed mediation of habitus. As Wacquant (2004) has suggested, however, in addition to perceiving the Algerians in crisis, Bourdieu himself was experiencing crisis in Algeria. His fear of death threats from the advocates of the settler regime caused his return to France (Yacine 2004).
Adams (2006) emphasised that habitus is always related to field and that although dispositions become transposable between fields, a lack of fit is always possible, even probable. This lack of fit constitutes the space where reflexivity can emerge, particularly during times of crisis (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p.131). Epistemic reflexivity means that the researcher’s knowledge must include the sociological conditions of existence and make visible the ‘reflexive analyses to the un-thought categories of thought which delimit the thinkable and predetermine what is actually thought’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p.40). Referring to the quandaries he faced in his war-time fieldwork, Bourdieu (2004, p.426-427) states that ‘[o]ne cannot survive, in the literal sense, in such a situation… unless one exerts a permanent practical reflexivity which is indispensable, in conditions of extreme urgency and risk, to interpret and assess the situation instantaneously and to mobilize, more or less consciously…’. Here, Bourdieu illustrates the utility of acquiring knowledge in the earliest experiences of life.

2.6.2 Symbolic violence

Although Bourdieu did not mention symbolic capital and symbolic violence explicitly during his years in Algeria, his witness of the terror and suffering caused by the French colonists undoubtedly also shaped his ideas about these two concepts. From the physical violence he observed in Algeria, Bourdieu eventually moved to the concept of symbolic violence, which he defined as a cultural scheme that looks natural but is actually based on power and ‘which is exercised upon a social agent with his or her complicity’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p.167). That is, symbolic violence is the built-in mechanism of domination and power, which occurs in interpersonal relationships; it may not arise from overt physical force or violence on the body but may appear in an institution’s implementation of procedural norms or misrecognition of
individuals. In colonialism, representing the colonial subject through imperialist discourse was designed to simultaneously legitimise the power of the coloniser and to exclude the ways of knowing the world of the colonised (Young 2001). As a result, the colonised might come to see themselves within that discourse (Ashcroft et al. 1998).

Likewise, in schools, educators ‘are often the least aware of symbolic violence especially that wielded by the school system given that they are subjected to it more than the average person and that they contribute to its exercise’ (Bourdieu 1992, p.170). Bourdieu here specifically identifies teaching as being symbolically violent in the sense that teachers impose arbitrary notions of a single dominant culture. However, this action is deemed legitimate, given that the teacher is often part of the dominant culture, which seeks to reproduce its power. Thus, symbolic violence is exercised on a social agent with that agent’s complicity (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990).

Bourdieu’s notion of symbolic violence can be applied to ELT in Turkey. In his 1983 study, Alptekin showed that Turkish students learning English are disturbed by the native English teacher’s ‘incompetence’ in terms of understanding ‘the ways and minds’ of the students, who are Turkish nationals (p.59). The ‘incompetence’ of which Alptekin (1983, p.59) speaks is ‘closely related to the ethnocentric conviction that the social and material aspects of the Anglo-American culture constitute the mainstream which the rest of the world is expected to adopt’. To examine how such a situation develops, we must look at the lingering effect of colonialism as portrayed by Bourdieu.

2.6.3 Bourdieu, colonialism, and the spread of English in Turkey

Bourdieu’s earlier work, from the late 1950s to the early 1960s, reveals his experience in which the colonisers were the French colonialist powers who exercised power through systems of hierarchies, often based on racial grouping to rationalise the
injustices and inequalities associated with colonisation. Race distinctions were pertinent to the rise of colonialism (Cesaire 1972), in which the binaries of civilised and primitive (or smart and dumb, beautiful and ugly) also awakened the colonisers’ buried instincts of covetousness, violence, and race hatred. The ideologies of racism are currently embedded in the neo-colonialist spread of English, both past and present. Pennycook (1998) points out that not only did discourses of colonialism legitimate racial distinctions in the past but also they continue into the present. Class ideologies were similarly a partial construction of colonial discourses that served to maintain unequal power relationships. Ashcroft et al. (1998) point to the primary importance of economic control in imperialism, which involved reconstructing the economic and social resources of colonised societies.

Bourdieu’s fieldwork experiences in colonial Algeria, in tandem with his theories, inspired me to create this analytic, auto-ethnographic account, which is also inspired by Anderson (2006a), (sociologist and ethnographer) by gleaning material from my own experiences, both from my earlier life and in Turkey. Although Turkey itself has never been colonised, my postcolonial perspective has been partially constructed through my experience as an EFL teacher. As both an EFL teacher and an American born to parents from British Guyana, I recognise that English played a crucial role in colonisation by the British, which also involved brutality (Pennycook 1998). Because the English language is deeply rooted in the tradition of colonialism, it has continuously favoured certain groups of people who master it while brutally excluding others who do not have the means to learn it (Pennycook 2005). ELT as a professional field has significantly implemented and maintained the policy of colonialism and postcolonialism, and has also played a pivotal role in colonial capitalism (Pennycook 1998), which appears again to be shifting toward becoming the centrepiece of globalisation. Therefore, EFL
educators need to examine what they do in a way that includes socioeconomic factors and their influence on ELT (Warschauer 2000). Is the role of EFL educators neutral, or is it rather aimed at reproducing hierarchical structures already existent in societies globally, but particularly in low and middle-income countries such as Turkey?

Though Turkey has never been physically colonised, my postcolonial perspective is comparable to that of Turkish scholars who view the ELT practices in Turkey in a similar way, as I would not attempt to impose my views on a country and its people in the way that has been done to me and people like me in academic research. For instance, as shown by Doğançay-Aktuna and Kiziltepe (2005, p. 254), English is the most studied foreign language and is the most common medium of education after Turkish. The desire of the Turkish elite to master English in particular is ever-increasing. In the private sector, the rapid increase the number of schools that offer English medium programs at the basic level and even in pre-kindergarten, as is the situation at IPRIS, is astonishing. Thus, Atay and Ege (2002) claim that traces of colonialism are evident in Turkey’s educational system and especially in ELT, elucidating what Bhabha (1994) might call the ‘unhomely’ (unsettled) ascent of the English language in Turkey. Doğançay-Aktuna and Kiziltepe (2005 p. 257) further argue that:

> [t]he language-in-education situation in Turkey displays similarities to colonial education policies with private and state schools where the medium of instruction is English, while even former colonies of the US and UK are moving away from this trend in favour of national languages. The colonialist tendency in education is interesting given the fact that Turkey was never colonised by foreign powers and was herself the colonial power in the Balkans and the Arab peninsula for 500 years.

Though many countries have taken measures to keep English away from national affairs while encouraging its use for international communication (König 1990), Turkey has increased the use of English as the instruction medium from elementary to
tertiary education. In addition to the Turkish elite, many young Turks from working class families are using English mixed with Turkish in their communication. The newer language is a hybrid: elements of Turkish and English together form a new language that is used primarily amongst the younger generation. Appadurai (1996) calls such hybridisation the ‘production of locality’ wherein networks confound older models of language contact and mixture.

2.6.4 Language and hybridity

Tarzanca, a mix of Turkish and English, is the new language often spoken by young people in Turkey (Zok 2009, Acar 2004). As one example, many of the young Turks now use English expressions such as ‘part-time’, ‘full-time’, and ‘cool’ (Kirkgöz 2005; Zok 2009). The wide use of English formally and the informal mixture of Turkish with English reflects the way postcolonial nations have used the language of the coloniser (Doğançay-Aktuna and Kızıltêpe 2005). This mixing of English and Turkish arises from what Hommi Bhabha (1994) referred to as the ‘third space of enunciation’ (to be discussed presently; Kirkgöz 2005; Zok 2009). In the Caribbean and South America this mixture of language, race, and culture forms a new construct known as ‘creolisation’ (Brathwaite 1971, p.11). Bourdieu (2004) called his prelude to this hybridity the ‘cultural sabir’, and I recognise it in ‘Guyanese Creole’ (Gibson 1998).

The ‘cultural sabir’ are the common people who wished to stand apart from traditional Algerian society and adopt certain Western models, and the term refers to two different and even opposing logics that are locked in a double-sided expression in all realms of existence (Bourdieu and Sayad 2004, p.464-466). Bourdieu (2004) exemplifies this double approach in his observations of the elders of Algeria, who are the guardians of
tradition. These elders viewed the ‘cultural sabir’ negatively, perceiving their actions as cultural betrayal.

Bourdieu further elaborated that the logic of the colonial situation has produced new types of persons who can be defined negatively twice over: by what they no longer are and by what they have not yet become. Bourdieu’s opposing logics are similarly exemplified by Bhabha’s (1994, p.86) sentiment of ‘white but not quite’ whereby he aimed to undermine the fictive perception of the self as created by the colonised as they attempted to live in the world of the coloniser. There is also an attractive ambivalence about such in-between spaces which indicate identity as fluid and not fixed.

The merger of two separate and unequal groups, then, creates what Homi Bhabha (1994) called a ‘third space of enunciation’ which expresses new cultural ideas that are first generated and then displaced from the thought of the initial separate groups. It is this merger of two groups within the third space that constitutes hybridity, which is synonymous with the postcolonial theory of Moore-Gilbert (1997). Bart Moore-Gilbert asserted that ‘all cultures are impure, mixed and hybrid’, citing Bhabha’s admission that ‘all forms of culture are continually in a process of hybridity’ (1977, p.129). Moore-Gilbert’s assertion indicated that hybridity is a ‘characteristic predicament of the late twentieth century and early twenty-first century’ (1977, p.195), and is not specific to a colonial or postcolonial context, as Bourdieu and Sayad (2004) attested. The term may also apply to those who seek new positions and placements across social differences – whether in terms of class, race, or gender.

Hybridity may form a new cultural identity and even a new category of speech used by a distinctive social group which engages in common dialogue; it is the outcome of a new social cultural formation of self within the culture. As asserted by Gandhi (1998),
once hybridity has formed, a return cannot be made to ‘purity’, a concept evoking racist foundations that can be traced to the colonialist era and which has remained since then. It is not only race that suffers from this eugenic logic but also other social categories, which are haunted by notions of infection and abnormality. I have found that to step outside of oppressive norms is to risk misrecognition, as Bourdie would say. Even with these racist implications, as argued by Ashcroft (1998), there is power in not replicating the binary categories and developing new anti-monolithic models of communication.

Though in mythology, hybrids are monsters and non-humans, as a researcher with a postcolonial perspective, I do not think the concept of hybridity is necessarily negative. In language, for example, the progressive ‘third space’ enables the speaker to be understood only by those others who speak the same language, enabling them to retain their collective power. Gibson (1988) discussed the Guyanese creole, a mixture of the British English that was taught and the distinct West African dialect that came before, as a characterisation of this third space in terms of culture and linguistics. Thus, hybridity can, on a wider plane of social action, offer scope for radically undermining the power hierarchies of essentialism.

In sum, hybridity can be a theoretical stratagem for evading binary modes of thought and for realising the agency, resistance, and deflection against the powerful. The concept of hybridity, which I attempt to actualise in Chapters 4 and 5, represents both my and the other participants’ varied views of the world as EFL educators.
2.7 Critical theory and postcolonial theory

Postcolonial theory is rooted in critical theory, as Guba and Lincoln (1994b) note. They explain critical theory as a set of several alternative paradigms, which include Neo-Marxism, feminism, materialism, and participatory inquiry. However, according to Guba and Lincoln (1994b, p.112), the ‘differences in paradigm assumptions have important consequences for the practical conduct of inquiry, as well as for the interpretation of findings’. They argued that ‘[i]ndeed critical theory may itself usefully be divided into three sub-strands: poststructuralism, postmodernism, and a blending of these two’. Ahluwalia (2010, p.3) articulates the rationale behind this blending when he explains that ‘post-colonialism is a counter discourse that seeks to disrupt the hegemony of the West, challenging imperialism in its various guises, whereas poststructuralism and postmodernism are counter discourses against modernism that have emerged within modernism itself’. Linstead (2010) alternatively showed that the term ‘poststructuralism’, which indicates neither a theory nor a movement, came into use in the 1960s as a response to the dominant intellectual movement of structuralism in France. Structuralism is neither a school, a movement, nor a vocabulary, but an activity that reaches beyond philosophy, that consists of a succession of mental operations which attempt to reconstruct an object in order to manifest the rules of its functioning (Barthes 1967). In other words, structuralism focused on the objective structures of language and culture that give shape to human action, whereas poststructuralism retains an emphasis on language but is interested above all in how literature (and other phenomena) escape or exceed the instruments we deploy to attempt to explain them (Culler 1983).

Postmodernism is an intellectual and cultural movement that seeks to disrupt modernist modes of thought and representation. Scheurich (2014, p.64) represented the modernist
as using ‘dead contextualized monads of meaning, the tightly boundaried containers, the numbing objectifications to construct generalisations believed to mirror reality’. Sandovnik (2008, p.24) asserted that modernist social theory traces its intellectual heritage to the Enlightenment, wherein researchers assumed that there ‘is a single tangible reality that an investigation is intended to unearth and display’ (Lincoln and Guba 1985, p.294). The modernist preoccupations with all-encompassing explanations of the world have now been replaced with postmodernism (Sandovnik 2008), which aims to create space for diversity by arguing that representations provide only a partial perspective (Linstead 2010; Pennycook 1998). My aim here is not to conflate poststructuralism (which is not just a theoretical position but was a social and intellectual movement) with postmodernism but instead to situate the former inside of the wider terrain of the latter. Agger (1991, p.171) contends that ‘[l]ike poststructuralism, postmodernism is profoundly mistrustful of social sciences that conceal their own investment in a particular view of the world’.

In sum, as Lincoln and Guba (1994b) contend, the two strands of critical theory (postmodernism and poststructuralism) blend to create postcolonialism. Tikly (1999) accurately states that postcolonial discourse is effective in disengaging from colonial ideologies. Ideologies are forms of shared, societal cognition that are not solely individual and are not limited to dominant classes or false consciousness Hall (1996). Rather, any social group may develop an ideology, sharing social representations and group perceptions based on the values and norms gradually learned and applied during socialisation and interaction with other social groups (van Dijk 2000). Postcolonial discourse, then, involves taking positions on language and performance, focusing on ideologies to rally against what is known and the way it is known. Ahluwalia (2010) finds that the experiences of Derrida and Bourdieu in colonised Algeria are supreme
illustrations of the merger of poststructuralism and postmodernism that formulates postcolonialism. He writes that both Bourdieu and Derrida (the latter being white and Jewish) occupied an ambivalent space between coloniser and colonised, and that the duality of their state provoked their questions about European modernity while they remained intimately tied to the colony. Ahluwalia (2010, p.14) contends that ‘[Algeria] is the very site that makes post-structuralism and postmodernism fundamentally post-colonial’.

Thus, Bourdieu’s work on colonial Algeria sets the stage for our current postcolonial discourse. In its wide range, Bourdieu’s work foreshadows modern postcolonialism, which engages with such diverse fields as literary theory, cultural studies, philosophy, geography, economics, history, and politics (Moore-Gilbert 1997). His work engaged with and transformed the social, political, cultural, economic, and ethnic structures that had constrained and exploited humankind (Guba and Lincoln 1994b). Calhoun (2006, p.1406) discussed Bourdieu’s break with conventional structuralism as he sought a way to move beyond the dualisms of structure and action, objective and subjective…and especially to inject a stronger account of temporality into social analysis. In sum, I regard postcolonial theory as syncretic, not monolithic, as it is linked to theoretical frameworks that are intended to capture how colonialist, imperialist, and postcolonial and neo-colonial practices influence contemporary culture, society, and the economy (Styhre 2008).

Though people tend to conflate colonialism and imperialism, it is necessary to distinguish between the two because they influence subjects’ understanding of their lives in different ways. Imperialism is the practice, theory, and attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre that rules a distant territory, as opposed to colonialism, which involves the settlement of a distant territory (Said 1993). Colonialism may be
motivated by the desire for living space and/or economic reasons, such as the extraction of riches (Young 2001), and colonisers assert domination locally through settlement while maintaining allegiance to the original culture (Ashcroft et al. 1998).

Thus, colonialist powers needed to justify the imperial enterprise by creating systems of hierarchies, typically based on racial grouping, to rationalise the injustices and inequalities associated with colonisation. Quayson and Goldberg (2002) have proposed that postcolonialism emerged strictly as a direct result of colonialism, standing as a historical indicator that the empire has been superseded. However, the current definition of postcolonialism also includes the political/intellectual stance that refuses to mime the colonialist mind-set and models of making sense of the world.

Neo-colonialism, according to Tikly (2004), could alternatively be called the ‘new imperialism’ because it has moved from direct violence and coercion (by western countries over non-western) to more subtle forms of domination and control, such as cultural imperialism, to influence countries, policies and people.

For this analytic auto-ethnography, a chief interest is how the competing views and role perceptions of the five other participants relate to my own. I, the primary participant, come from the Guyanese tradition. Some of the secondary participants, also EFL teachers at IPRIS, are from colonised countries as well, notably Australia and Jamaica. In subsequent sections, I will connect Pierre Bourdieu’s concepts of capital, habitus, and field to postcolonialism and to our lived experiences here at IPRIS in Turkey. The accumulated capitals of the participants are presented in Chapter 4 to show how our prior socialisations (habitus) have spawned the educators’ habitus, also discussed in Chapter 4.
The converging elements of this theoretical framework are illustrated in the following diagram. It illustrates my critical theorist postcolonial ontology, which is influenced by a Bourdieusian epistemic reflexivity and, in turn, influences the analytic naturalistic research methodology that frames this research.

Figure 1. Illustration of theoretical framework

2.8 The theoretical framework in relation to the research questions

In this chapter, I have discussed the elements that contribute to the perception of EFL educators in Turkey at IPRIS in an era of globalisation: capital, habitus, and field. Özbilgin and Tatli (2005) argue that the meso level of Bourdieu’s work brings together the micro and the macro, as Bourdieu aimed to connect the micro concept of habitus via accumulated capital to the macro level of field. The habitus constitutes the socialised body (mine and those of the other participants). Bourdieu, (1998a, p.81) argues that it is ‘a structured body, a body which has incorporated the immanent structures of a world
or of a particular sector of that world – a field – and which structures the perception of that world as well as action in that world’. Bourdieu (1985b) also asserts that the field constitutes an attempt to ‘transcend dualisms of agency-structure, objective-subjective and the micro-macro’. Stahl (1999) believes that the contexts most affected by globalisation are the products of circulating ideas, texts, styles, and people (i.e. migrant labour, consumers, tourists, refugees) around the globe. The individual’s habitus is mediated by the particular terrain, which, for the participants of this study, is Turkey and IPRIS at the meso level. Territories and places arise from field, possessing their own logics, social structures, and social relations with networks that serve as a bridge to the micro level where subjective construction of reality occurs.

I analyse what influences our perception of our roles as EFL educators, especially the unconscious aspects. The literature indicates that capitals collectively form the way people position themselves or use their habitus strategically to operate in a field. For Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992), field, habitus, and capital operate only in relation to each other: a field is inhabited by social agents who accumulate different forms of capital, and this capital bears value only in relation to the fields where it is situated. From insights concerning the participants’ capital and habitus in a field, I could interpret the empirical data in order to answer RQ2: What do we EFL educators perceive as our roles at IPRIS?

In exploring Bourdieu’s notions of field and symbolic violence, and by situating my work in relation to Bourdieu’s ethnographic beginnings and the work done by other Bourdieu scholars, I establish my own position as a postcolonial researcher and work reflexively to understand my own situations. Bourdieu’s work was ‘predicated…on the
colonial setting in which he carried out his research’ (Goodman and Silverstein 2009, p. 3). As Grenfell (2005, p.234) pointed out, it was

…the epistemology and theory of practice he had derived from his personal and practical engagement with the world in a way which drew on his own life experience as part and parcel of the process of understanding the social forces which acted on him, and thus everyone occupying his own temporal zone. This world view, beginning in colonial Algeria, spawned his notion of epistemic reflexivity, a trademark of his work that informed his methodological choices and mine in turn. His notions and my interpretations of them were helpful in answering RQ1: How do I fit in/belong as an educator at IPRIS?

The answer to the final research question relates to the postcolonial spread of the English language in Turkey, Bourdieu’s notion of the cultural sabir, and Bhabha’s third space of enunciation, along with the concept of hybridity as applied to language mixing. EFL educators are implicated in the spread, and the English language in Turkey is distributed in an unequal way that favours the elite and forces the lower classes to create new forms of English, Tarzanca being an example. I ground my position as a postcolonial theorist in my attempt to use my research to equalise power relations among individuals in society. I regard the spread of English in Turkey as a neo-colonial practice using global capitalism and the globalised field of ELT. These theoretical viewpoints assist in finding an answer to RQ3: What relationship as EFL educators do we have to globalisation?

I use a range of theoretical perspectives not only to help answer the research questions but also to compel me to remain open to the data. I link Bourdieu’s theories with literature from Turkish scholars on teaching EFL because it is difficult to locate this study within a single discourse.
The theoretical framework also influences the methodology because Bourdieu believed that through a dialectical methodology, a social scientist could justifiably leap over the binary modes of thought without being either strictly subjective or strictly objective. I link this notion to the conception of analytic auto-ethnography from Anderson (2006a, p.390), wherein he insists on ‘dialogue with informants beyond the self’ that forms an ‘intersection of biography and society…where knowledge in large part is constituted by – and in turn helps to constitute – the sociocultural contexts in which we live’. He found ‘that there is value in using ethnography to analyse social life…for the purpose of exploring how people come to construct social worlds, what the consequences are, and how we might construct better worlds and enrich our collective lives in the process’ (Anderson 2006b, p.459). Through dialogue with participants, the critical theorist attempts to transform ignorance and misapprehensions into more informed consciousness, (Guba and Lincoln 1994b) and to link such understanding to elements of critique and hope (Giroux 1988). To match reality, which consists of many forms of conceptualisation, I have pulled these notions together so that they re-shape my realities as researcher and primary participant along with the secondary participants. Figure 2 demonstrates how the methodology materialised from the theoretical framework.
Figure 2. Convergence of methodology with theoretical framework
Chapter 3: Methodology

In this chapter, I present the methods used in this research study, beginning with a brief discussion in section 3.1 of how the research design was developed. Section 3.2 sums up my preference for naturalistic inquiry as the chosen paradigm of this study; Section 3.3 outlines the ontological and epistemological stance that informs this enquiry. Section 3.4 defines and discusses auto-ethnography as a method of enquiry, explaining its wider purpose, and provides a rationale for choosing the analytic auto-ethnography that forms this thesis. In section 3.5, I discuss issues concerning reflexivity and representation. Section 3.6 details the study’s ethical considerations. In section 3.7, I outline the sampling procedures and the profiles of the study’s participants. Section 3.8 provides details concerning the data collection for this study, and section 3.9 concludes the chapter with the study’s data analysis.

3.1 Research design

I began this research with the initial ‘design’ (Kvale 1996, p.88) of investigating the perceptions of English foreign language (EFL) teachers at IPRIS within the context of globalisation. However, the study took on what Lincoln and Guba (1985, p.41) describe as an ‘emergent design’. Because I aimed to remain open to the research process, a number of my own assumptions about the research process and about me as a researcher and educator shifted once I engaged in the fieldwork. As I engaged with Bourdieu and his theories, the research design of this study became based much more on critical theory, specifically a postcolonial theoretical framework.
3.2 My chosen paradigm: Naturalistic inquiry

I chose to work within the model of naturalistic inquiry because it ‘offer[ed] contextual relevance and richness unmatched by any other paradigm’ (Guba and Lincoln 1981, p.235). Cohen et al. (2011) describe naturalistic inquiry as value bound: the investigator is deliberate, intentional, and creative. Geertz (1973a) points out that the investigator seeks and co-constructs holistic and multiple realities wherein biography and history intersect; these should include thick (i.e. detailed), rich descriptions of contextualised behaviour because context (institutional, cultural, and temporal) both shapes and is shaped by an individual’s actions. In essence, the naturalistic approach, like Bourdieu’s work, contains a sense of the dialectical nature of structure and action and allows one to gain a sense of how actors in various fields live their structures (the habitus).

3.3 My ontological and epistemological stance

Bourdieu’s ‘habitus’ is a way of social being that is ‘sedimented history’ carried into new situations and operating at an unconscious level; attuning individuals to the circumstances of their existence, habitus is the ‘feel for the game’, the ‘design for life’. An understanding and critique of postcolonialism have been fundamental to my perception of the forces that have formed my consciousness and identity in my multiple roles.

My postcolonial ontology reflects my view of the world, which has been brought about by my experiences in various societies, leading me to interpret the power relations that have shaped my experience and understanding of the world as a co-constituted process of domination and maintenance of privilege and power. These power relations at IPRU resemble those in Bourdieu’s Homo Academicus (1988), which analyses the societal
and educational relations of power in the context of the intellectuals and university system of France.

When I began my international doctorate in education, I was assigned the small-scale research project referred to in Chapter 1, wherein I questioned how I, a black male (i.e. from an over-researched ‘category’), would conduct research about other people. Studies have reported that black males lead in homicide statistics as both victims and perpetrators, and we occupy the same position in suicide statistics (Poussaint and Alexander 2000). Black males contract HIV and AIDS more often than males from other racial groups (Auerbach, Krimgold and Lefkowitz 2000); are most likely to be arrested, convicted, and incarcerated (Noguera 1995); and are limited by living in poor neighbourhoods and by a lack of role models, which induces us to be absent fathers (Jarrett, Roy and Burton 2002). We are most likely to be unemployed (Sabol and Lynch 2003) and to suffer from depression (Watkins 2013).

Reading such representations of myself as a black male, I remembered a question posed by W. E. B. Du Bois (1903, p.1), ‘How does it feel to be a problem?’ I asked this question, not to assert that I was a problem but to determine how I felt about being ‘made’ or marked through academic discourse. In this way, ‘research’ has traditionally been tied to domination in academia, and my voice and voices like mine have been silenced.

Engaging in this research project has stimulated a greater reflexivity within me than teaching had. Addressing issues of power in the researcher–researched relationship, I worked with my interviewees to build genuine connections that were based on reciprocity through working at the same institution and sharing a professional environment. The other participants and I also shared similar experiences in having
been treated as inferiors by a dominant group. One respondent said, ‘It felt as though I was getting my hand slapped when we planned as a team’. Another exclaimed, ‘Every time I said something in those meetings, it was as though I was invisible’.

These researcher experiences for me were an early moment of reflexivity wherein the realities of my peers helped me to reconcile my postcolonial ontological and epistemological stances.

My truth, realities, knowledge, and mode of knowledge acquisition all reflected my epistemological position, which has fragmented and constructed through multiple experiences in different locations. My epistemology has helped me to understand that others have created and will continue to create their own truths, realities, and knowledge, and it aids my understanding of ‘others’ who, like me, do not belong to a dominant class.

3.4 Auto-ethnography

As Jensen-Hart and Williams (2010, p.454) attest, ‘To write auto-ethnography, one must think carefully about … how we know and make sense of ourselves and others’; auto-ethnography shows the connection of the personal and the social (Ellis 2004). I chose auto-ethnography as a method of enquiry because it shows how individuals are socialised and shaped by society and culture, and how they are simultaneously guided by their socialised experiences and understandings.

3.4.1 History of auto-ethnography as a method of enquiry

Auto-ethnography as a method of enquiry seeks to describe and systematically analyse personal experiences in order to understand cultural experiences (Ellis 2004). The term ‘auto-ethnography’ consists of two key components. The foundation is ethnographic,
and the prefix ‘auto’ reflects the autobiographical or personal narrative component of the term.

Hayano (1979) conceptualises the term ‘auto-ethnography’ as a qualitative method of research, and Hintzen and Rahier (2003) expand on this notion by arguing that it occurs when native anthropologists study their own cultural, social, and religious groups. Hayano (1979, p.99) uses the term ‘auto-ethnography’ with respect to ‘anthropologists’, although he also employs it in a broader sense with reference to ‘social scientists’ to encompass a wider range of studies. By supplanting anthropologists with social scientists, he includes sociologists, linguists, economists, historians, psychologists, and educators as viable writers of auto-ethnographic texts. He envisages that all of these analysts ‘become formally and informally socialised, after indoctrination, into a specific group or role type with some specialised knowledge or way of life’ (Hayano 1979, p.100). Hayano found it problematic to implement the professional skills of a researcher without giving reflexive attention to knowledge-making processes, critically relating that knowledge to the wider society, hence his preference for conducting extensive research in natural field settings. In reference to conducting research, Guba and Lincoln (1981, p.233) contend that ‘its distinguishing features are that it is carried out in a natural setting (hence the term naturalistic)’. Thus, an auto-ethnographer can be guided by the paradigm of naturalist inquiry (Lincoln and Guba 1985).

Auto-ethnography thus refers to a method of anthropological research that places the self in a social context (such as a school, country, or era), while simultaneously uniting the personal and the cultural in research and writing (Reed-Danahay 1997). This definition leaves room for the incorporation of multiple ‘personal’ and ‘cultural’
factors. I prefer Hayano’s (1979) definition to that of Reed-Danahay because of the former’s broader vision, which embraces more than ‘cultural’ and ‘anthropologist’ to include ‘social’, ‘religious’, and ‘social scientists’.

Both Hayano’s (1979) and Reed-Danahay’s (1997) conceptions of auto-ethnography are informed by concerns for legitimacy and representation. Pratt’s (1991) belief that auto-ethnography is grounded in the politics of representation (like all research, I think) has also deeply resonated with me because of my postcolonial perspective.

Pratt (1991) argues that an auto-ethnographic text emerges when people who have been colonised describe themselves in ways that engage with the coloniser on the latter’s own terms. In this way, the colonised (like me) increase their capitals as they navigate their habitus within social and political differences and thus over-write the dominant discourse. In Pratt’s (1991, p.35), own words:

[A]auto-ethnography is a text in which people undertake to describe themselves in ways that engage with representations others have made of them. Thus if ethnographic texts are those in which European metropolitan subjects represent to themselves their others (usually their conquered others), auto-ethnographic texts are representations that the so-defined others … construct … in response to and in dialogue with such representations.

Like Pratt, Gannon (2006, p.475) argues that ‘auto-ethnography is part of a corrective movement against colonizing ethnographic practices that erased the subjectivity of the researcher while granting him or her absolute authority for representing “the other” of the research’.

Auto-ethnographers, as activists, advocate the self. They seek self-reclamation and affirm their right to employ reflexivity for correction. Reflexivity in auto-ethnography is a method of inquiry that gives researchers the space to reflect critically on the social conditions wherein they have constructed their own accounts. Their constructed
accounts ‘speak back’ and demand the self-appraisal of the researcher (Hodder 1998, cited in Dunne et al. 2005, p.87), as well as appraisal from the broader community of researchers and academics. Pratt (1991) further contends that auto-ethnographic texts are points of entry for marginalised groups into the dominant print culture and are aimed at both their authors’ communities and a wider metropolitan audience. Pratt’s conception of auto-ethnography dovetails with my position as a postcolonial researcher and my objection to certain representations of people like me whose lives and experiences cut through others’ binary assumptions.

Auto-ethnography serves as a reminder that ethnography, as a form of cultural representation, may worry the people portrayed in the text because the text is usually not of their own making (Ellis and Bochner 1996). Traditional forms of ethnography involve an alien ethnographer coming into and representing a native culture. Ethnography is most often connected to anthropology, which is based on contemporary direct observation and interviews, leading to written reports of the subjects’ ways of life (Ashcroft et al. 1998). To this end, ethnography has been historically concerned with gathering data from people whose experiences were seen as geographically and culturally distant (and different) from normative European and North American ones (Ashcroft et al. 1998). To speak of ‘gathering data’, however, seems to reduce people to empirical data or to objects like wild fruits or flowers, which await finding and gathering (Dunne et al. 2005). A (re)construction of the development of a person ‘in a Darwinian way’ (Ashcroft et al. 1998, p.85) may be implicit in the verb ‘gather’, a process which further distances the researcher from the researched and serves to justify the exercise of power on a ‘bizarre and exotic other’ (Geertz 1988, p.14). The process of seeing and studying people in this way not only sets the researcher apart but also creates a useful hierarchy for building colonial discourses and empires. Therefore,
fieldwork in ethnography can no longer be conducted ‘under the wing of friendly colonial authorities’ (Hayano 1979, p.99).

3.4.2 Purpose of auto-ethnography

According to Ellis and Bochner (2000), the purpose of auto-ethnography is to allow the co-participation of the reader and the researcher. Such a relationship allows both parties to ‘co-construct meaning’ as well as ‘self-identity’ (Dunne and Leach 2007, p.311), much like the co-construction of knowledge, which I created with the other participants in the interview process of this analytic auto-ethnography. The theory-rich auto-ethnography also allows the reader to construct lessons inductively for his or her sphere of practice (McIlveen 2008). Thus, part of my aim with this research was to find a way to use auto-ethnography to enable others to become more critical by devising an insider text relative to international education and development in the IPRIS context.

3.4.3 Locating types and styles of auto-ethnography

Auto-ethnography can take several forms (Ellis 2004), depending on how much the ethnographer focuses on the study of others, the self, interactions between the two (Ellis et al. 2011), and the wider socio-cultural arena. For example, Furman (2005) uses poetry and narrative inquiry to reflect on his personal experience of the death of a companion animal. Antilla’s (2003) auto-ethnography revolves around teaching and learning dance in an elementary school in Helsinki, Finland. Grant (2010b, p.577) produces an auto-ethnography ‘based on the author's battle with alcoholism over two decades’. He uses literary devices, such as figures of speech and time changes, as a means to end ‘us-them’ divisions between writers and readers. These devices describe the author’s sense of feeling increasingly stigmatised and treated as an ‘other’ by members of the humanistic counselling and therapy fraternity. McAllister and O'Brien
(2006) investigate the use of self that is inherent in the role of the mental health nurse, producing a suggestive auto-ethnographic text. In these types of auto-ethnography, evocative writing is used as authors explore particular social issues by sharing personal stories.

Denzin (1997, p.228) supports evocative auto-ethnographies because they ‘bypass the problem of representation by invoking an epistemology of emotion moving the reader to experience the feelings of the other’. He also characterises auto-ethnography as a ‘performance text . . . turning inward, waiting to be staged’ (1997, p.199). Nonetheless, while evocative auto-ethnography is a viable approach in qualitative research, its method often fails to convince its critics. Anderson (2006a), for example, though applauding evocative auto-ethnography, recognises that the emotional aspects of such studies can prevent understanding of how they fit with other traditions of social inquiry. Similarly, Coffey (1999) questions the rigour of evocative auto-ethnographies and calls them narcissistic.

Thus, auto-ethnographies have become more critical in their approach to convince the reader of the ‘rigour’ of the research. For example, blending the arts and the social sciences, Holman Jones (2005) uses performance studies and critical approaches to address and embrace differences and social change. By drawing on feminist critiques and queer theory, Jones (2005, p.764) proposes that the auto-ethnographer ‘writes of a world in a state of flux and movement between story and context, writer and reader, crisis and denouement’. Again in the social sciences, McIlveen’s (2008, p.1) text applies ‘the qualitative research method [to] auto-ethnography and its relevance to research in vocational psychology and practice in career development’. He regards
auto-ethnography as a vehicle that can become trustworthy by operationalising social research and practice.

Guba and Lincoln (1989) provide a model of trustworthiness, divided into four sections, which they suggest for qualitative researchers conducting naturalistic enquiry:

1. Credibility. Closely resembling internal validity, credibility suggests the need for alignment between the methods and the phenomenon of study. Member checks are ‘the single most critical technique for establishing credibility’ (Guba and Lincoln 1989, p.239).

2. Dependability. The reliability of the research may be achieved through the use of overlapping methods, such as a second interview and/or an audit of research methods by a competent peer. Here, ‘researchers should at least strive to enable a future investigator to repeat the study’ (Shenton 2004, p.63).

3. Transferability. The researcher needs to provide enough details of the fieldwork context that the findings can justifiably be applied to another setting (Shenton 2004). Transferability is largely synonymous with external validity (Guba and Lincoln 1989).

4. Confirmability. This quality is an issue of presentation (Lincoln and Guba 1985). Researchers must demonstrate that findings emerge from the data and not their own predispositions.

A significant number of auto-ethnographers approach their research from a thorough grounding in critical theory. Burdell and Swander (1999, p.21) review four edited volumes of what they term ‘critical personal narrative and autoethnography in education’. These volumes ‘combine autobiographical narratives with a variety of theoretical perspectives, including the critical and dialogical’. In conclusion, they argue
that auto-ethnographies are ‘both a method and a text’ (Burdell and Swander 1999, p.22). In Canagaragah’s (2012) ethnographic self-reconstruction, the author represents his negotiation of the differing teaching practices and professional cultures of the periphery and the centre in the development of a strategic professional identity.

Canagaragah’s auto-ethnographic text, similar to mine, is rooted in his postcolonial position as a researcher and his role as ‘teacher of English to speakers of other languages’ (TESOL), which enables him also to speak of wider professional discourses and practices.

These examples of auto-ethnography both highlight the rigour that Coffey (1999) claims is absent in the method and demonstrate its use of critical theory. The critical and dialogical components enable the researchers operating within this paradigm to draw on their particular ontological and epistemological perspectives. In all of these auto-ethnographic texts, the researchers examine the ways in which their views influenced their research, which then becomes value-laden. It is true that such value-laden, didactic, practical social science is quite different from the traditional, positivist notion of science. Positivists generally assume a neutral or value-free stance in social science research that aims to mimic the methodology of the natural sciences, whereas for auto-ethnographers, the act of writing itself becomes a way of being and knowing. The researcher assumes that reality is unpredictable but is shaped, over time, by societal structures, such as culture, politics, and economics (Guba and Lincoln 1994b).

Epistemologically, critical theorists believe that knowledge is constructed through the interactions of the researcher and the researched and, therefore, that knowledge is interdependent of the values that each holds (Guba and Lincoln 1994b). This process permits self-reflexivity to become a normative requirement for a rigorous methodology (Bennett 1998); indeed, many critical theorists employ reflexivity to translate the
dialectical technique of personal formation into a dialectical historical method. Jensen-Hart and Williams (2010, p.450) find that the relationship between auto-ethnography and reflexivity is a ‘natural fit’.

3.4.4 An analytic auto-ethnographic thesis

I used Anderson’s (2006a) model of analytic auto-ethnography for this thesis, primarily because it clearly distinguishes between evocative and analytic auto-ethnography. According to Anderson (2006a), analytic auto-ethnography, which he advocates, represents a more traditional scientific approach, while evocative auto-ethnography is characterised more by a free-form style (Ellis 2004; Ellis and Bochner 2000). Whereas Anderson’s analytic auto-ethnography aligns with the post-positivist and constructivist-interpretivist paradigms of psychology, evocative auto-ethnography conforms to the critical-ideological paradigm. Ponterotto (2005, p.130) claims that the critical-ideological paradigm goes beyond the constructivist stance by ‘conceptualising reality and events within power relations and… using the research enquiry to emancipate oppressed groups’, primarily because it ‘provides a framework for examining socially constructed and culturally sensitive aspects of research (i.e. race, gender, power, and privilege). Anderson’s (2006a) analytic auto-ethnography approach consists of five key elements:

1. The researcher has complete member-researcher (CMR) status. Anderson (2006a, p.383) expresses this idea as follows: ‘[The] auto-ethnographic interrogation of self and others may transform the researcher’s own beliefs, actions, and sense of self’.

2. Analytic reflexivity is a central component. The researcher’s reflexivity involves the reciprocal influences of the auto-ethnographer, the participants, and
the setting under observation. The researcher’s self-conscious introspection is guided by the need to understand the self and others better by analysing all participants’ actions and perceptions in dialogue with one another (Anderson 2006a).

3. The auto-ethnographer has a dual role as a member of the studied social group and as a researcher in a specific society; thus, as Anderson (2006a, p.384) contends, auto-ethnography demands the ‘textual visibility’ of the researcher’s self, which demonstrates a personal engagement in the social world under study. This visibility, which is presented in analytic insights through recounting a researcher’s own experiences and thoughts as well as those of others, demonstrates his or her social engagement. Researchers should openly discuss changes in their beliefs and relationships over the course of fieldwork, thus revealing themselves as grappling with the same issues as other participants in a fluid rather than static social world (Anderson 2006a, p.384).

4. Social knowledge is formed in the relationships of the researcher and others. At the ‘intersection of biography and society, . . . knowledge in large part is constituted by – and in turn helps to constitute – the sociocultural contexts in which we live’ (Anderson 2006a, p.390).

5. Finally, using theoretical analysis requires co-constructed data for insights into broader social phenomena than that provided by the data themselves. The theoretical analysis is an emergent feature of the research design. This theoretical grounding and rigour provide the empiricism that is often perceived as absent in auto-ethnography and is most visible in the simultaneity of data collection and data analysis.
In tandem with Anderson’s (2006a) key elements, Van Maanen advocates the inclusion of ‘lived experience’ in research. He describes this approach as a ‘textual reflection on the lived experiences and practical actions of everyday life with the intent to increase one’s thoughtfulness, and practical resourcefulness or tact’ (1990, p.4). Cohen et al. (2011), Kincheloe and McLaren (2005), and Lather (1986), also discuss the effect of lived experience, referring to such thoughtfulness as a catalytic principle that becomes political by moving research participants to understand their worlds in order to transform them. In this study, the participants were invited to reflect on, speak, and write about their own experiences so that after I collected and analysed the data, readers of the final text could reflect on their perceived roles and practices.

3.5 Reflexivity and representation

Because an auto-ethnographic approach as a method of enquiry is also a means for me to describe myself in a way that engages with the representations others have of me, I frequently use the first person singular pronoun. This ‘I’ perspective was the starting point for this study, but I also represent myself in relation to five secondary participants in the cultural context of Turkey and the institutional context of IPRIS in an era of globalisation. Therefore, the ‘I’ is also represented reflexively.

Van Maanen (1988) explains that ‘as a general criterion, what reflexivity communicates is that researchers cannot hide behind “third person” omniscient exposition’. The un-reflexive sociologist typically takes a distant position, ‘neutrally’ uncovering hidden structures and mechanisms misrecognised by social agents (Bourdieu 1977). As noted in Chapter 4, I reject such a stance and move instead between the omniscient third person and myself, which is reminiscent of the third space referred to by Bhabha and which I see as a hybrid space. Atkinson (2006, p.402) defines reflexivity in
ethnography as ‘the ineluctable fact that the ethnographer is thoroughly implicated in the phenomena that he or she documents’. Atkinson (2006, p.402) further explains that no social scene exists in a ‘state of nature’ independent of the observer’s presence. Thus, I probe my own perceptions as an EFL educator to understand my perceptions and experiences in relation to the five secondary participants who are also EFL educators.

I also distinguish between being reflexive and being reflective – between the reflexive ‘I’ and the reflective ‘I’ – according to Dewey (1938, p.86–87), who states that ‘to reflect is to look back over what has been done so as to extract the net meanings which are the capital stock of intelligent dealing with further experiences’. Although reflexivity may be rooted in the idea of reflection, the two are distinct in terms of meaning and use in social science research. ‘To be reflective does not demand an “other”, while to be reflexive demands both another and some self-conscious awareness of the process of self-scrutiny’ (Chiseri-Strater 1996, p.130). Bolton (2010, p.13) writes that ‘reflection involves reliving and retendering: who said and did what, how, when, where and why’, whereas reflexivity ‘is finding strategies to question our own attitudes, thought processes values, assumptions, prejudices, and habitual actions to strive to understand our complex roles in relation to others’. In short, reflectivity is more personal than reflexivity, which requires a social context.

Anderson (2006a, p.387) contends that analytic auto-ethnography, which is grounded in self-scrutiny, seeks to go beyond self-experience to ‘gain insight into some broader set of social phenomena’. For the writer, the insights of being a member and a researcher emerge not from detached discovery but from engaged dialogue. Thus, the ‘I’ is also important regarding the internal dialogue among my various components: researcher,
primary participant, colleague, boss (who is also bossed), colonised, and coloniser (in terms of my culpability in spreading English), as well as the different researcher selves that have emerged as I have learnt the research process.

To this end, I introduced the ‘critical incident’ concept into this emergent research design. Tripp (2012) defines critical incidents as including commonplace happenings, not necessarily dramatic or obvious events that occur in everyday life. Instead, they are mostly straightforward accounts of conventional events that occur in professional practice; however, they are critical because they indicate underlying trends, motives, and structures. Tripp recommends that researchers use critical incidents to understand social contexts (such as schools and other human service organisations) and to uncover the constructions of those who operate in them. The critical incident may also be a surprising or problematic situation that stimulates a period of reflection or a solution to a problem (Schön 1987). Berlak and Berlak (1981) add the observation that critical incidents may present as dilemmas wherein individuals have at least two options as solutions.

In a research context, critical incidents consist of particular events, embedded in their natural contexts, in which the researcher is also a participant (Angelides 2010). Critical incidents highlight the subjectivity in naturalistic research, allowing readers to see that the writer/researcher eventually follows one of these options. The critical incident concept fit with my analytic auto-ethnography in two ways. First, it helped me to identify meaningful events that highlight or affect my self-conceptualisation (Boufoy-Bastick 2004). Second, it helped me heighten my level of awareness of my institutional and cultural context, and thus better understand my role as an EFL educator and a researcher.
3.6 Ethical considerations

I live and work in Turkey, in a political climate in which the country continually allies itself with the US in protecting its borders with Syria and where there are now an estimated 1.35 million Syrian refugees; thus, gaining access to IPRIS where all the participants worked was not taken for granted. Therefore, my first ethical consideration was to e-mail a formal letter of intent to the rector of the university and the director general in order to gain access to the institution. I had previously spoken informally to the university rector and the director general, and they were both in full support of this study, which would lead to a final thesis at the University of Sussex. The formal letter presented the aims of the research, the people who were to be interviewed, and the material on which I initially intended to report, as well as a general timetable (Cohen et al. 2011). In these letters, I also outlined and explained the research, providing details of the title, purpose, and the methods of data collection, as well as its duration; and I fully disclosed what my intent was during the research process. However, because this research is steeped in the paradigm of naturalistic inquiry, it has an emergent design in the sense that the ethnographer does not know the course the work will take, certainly not in detail (Hammersley and Atkinson 1995). Thus, the gatekeeper was told only what I knew at the time the access was granted. I was granted permission to conduct research in the institution, but because I did not clearly request the use of the university’s name in this thesis, I have used a pseudonym and changed the location to conceal the identity of the institution.

After gaining permission for research access to the institution, I informed the participants that they had the right to withdraw at any time without repercussions and that they could choose to ask me questions during the interview process. I also offered
an incentive for their participation, which was the opportunity to express their views and thoughts about their roles in relation to IPRIS and Turkey. Additionally, I informed them that they could access both the transcripts of the interview data and the final write-up. I also offered to buy the participants coffee or tea during our initial conversation as a small return for their allowing me time in their busy schedules.

Analysing my own actions and perceptions in reference to the chosen participants is central to the pursuit of this analytic auto-ethnography. I aimed to disrupt my own ontological and epistemological stance and (perhaps) to raise the consciousness of the other educators of EFL. Patai (1991) believes that justifying research solely in terms of ‘consciousness-raising’ borders on arrogance, particularly in terms of who might benefit most from it. To address this issue, I first spoke with the potential participants, disclosing the study’s aims to the five other participants. I considered self-disclosure to be essential, particularly because of my position within critical theory. I wished not to recreate exploitative practices in the process of data collection, the analysis, or the representations in the final report, so I used continuous member checks to ensure sustained reflexivity. Because the issues at stake were related to the power relations between the researcher and the researched, I built affinities and rapport through constant and prolonged interactions with the participants. Our communicative modes were always respectful, as we had our professional environment at IPRIS in common. We were mindful that being ‘friends’ or ‘colleagues’ offers scope for more, not less, exploitation of such ‘affinities’.

Because all of us are in the same institution, the setting is an ‘intensely political climate’ and ‘not neutral’ (Drake and Heath 2008, p.140). In such a climate, informed consent is the most central of ethical considerations (Howe and Mosses 1999). After an
initial conversation with the potential participants, I e-mailed an information sheet to those who responded affirmatively that explained the voluntary nature of their participation and the withdrawal option before the data analysis, which was scheduled to begin in late November/early December 2013.

Privacy is the second central principle in the ethical treatment of participants (Howe and Mosses 1999). Therefore, participants were made aware on both the information sheet and the consent form that they could choose a pseudonym for use in the final write-up. Participants were also aware of the two-way nature of the research process, as mentioned earlier, which would leave them free to pose questions and make suggestions that would contribute to my research and/or raise my consciousness as an EFL educator.

Because all the participants work at the same place, they were also informed that they had the right to choose in advance the site where the interview would be conducted. At the very end of the first interview process in November 2013, I asked participants for a convenient time in early to mid-December 2013 for the second interview. Because the semi-structured interviews were the primary method of data collection, my relationships with the participants were a prerequisite for the co-constructed knowledge that would emerge from the interviews. During the interview process, some of the participants also asked me questions, a stratagem used with Drake (2010, p.87) in mind, who states that in insider research, there is always a danger of assuming a ‘shared understanding’ on the sole premise that our mutual occupation of ELT in the cultural context would produce a shared lens of viewing the world.

After the interviews and transcription, the participants were invited to review the transcripts and their portrayals in the text because I did not aim to represent an ‘other’
in the final text. Instead, I sought to present the experiences of the participants and of myself in a way that is supported by critical theory of our own making. A central problem has been that falsehoods are presented as truths in research about people like me; hence, I have become more aware of ways that people are intersected by power because of such elements as gender, geographical origin, and age. Therefore, I felt compelled to present a text wherein all the participants find their representation agreeable. I invited participant review not only to keep the trust of the participants but also to keep our relationships intact, undisturbed by my engagement in this research activity.

3.7 Sampling and the research participants’ profiles

In this study, I was the primary participant; however, five secondary participants were surveyed through interviews. Initially, I selected seven or eight participants in the event that one or more of the five participants would withdraw. The secondary participants and I engaged in ‘dialectical processes’ through the interviews, which were aimed at cultivating knowledge through historical revisions that continuously erode misapprehensions. Guba and Lincoln (1994b) offer a useful discussion on the centrality of this dialectical process, which enlarges insights, in the methodology of critical theory. Since my approach was an analytic auto-ethnography, the selection of the participants gave me greater insight into my own postcolonial position as a researcher and raised my consciousness as an EFL educator. I chose five other EFL teachers because I sought to understand their perceptions of their roles at IPRIS in an era of globalisation. Because I, as the primary participant, had worked at IPRIS for the past 4 years, the other participants also had to have been employed by the institution for a minimum of 4 years. Their selection was also ‘purposive’ (Guba and Lincoln 1981,
1985; Patton 2002). Because analytic auto-ethnography requires a dialogue with
participants (Anderson 2006a), I intentionally selected secondary participants who were
as different from me as possible.

Patton (2002) labels this strategy ‘maximum variation sampling’ and asserts that
maximum variation sampling using a relatively small sample works well for high-
quality, detailed descriptions of central themes that cover a wide range of variations.
Although using a ‘sample’ may seem to be a characteristic of quantitative enquiry,
Lincoln and Guba (1985) assert that this sort of purposive sampling labelled maximum
variation sampling, is usually chosen in naturalistic investigations because these
enquiries are closely tied to contextual factors. Because this study’s focus is the roles of
EFL teachers at IPRIS in relation to globalisation, the differences of the participants
included geographical origin, ethnicity, gender, age, race, and socioeconomic status in
their home countries. This strategy aligns not only with my position as a critical theorist
who identifies with postcolonialism but also with Anderson’s (2006a) conception of
analytic auto-ethnography. Because I used maximum variation sampling, I had to
assume the existence of the multiple social realities of the participants in addition to my
own (Lincoln and Guba 1985). Table 1 illustrates maximum variation sampling as it
relates to this analytic auto-ethnographic study.
### Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Years at IPRIS</th>
<th>Years teaching</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity according to participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selen</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabitha</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tila</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Syrian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Participants

#### 3.7.1 Participant Profiles

Can has worked as an EFL educator for the past 12 years, 8 of those at IPRIS. He communicated a clear sense of his role as an educator and stated that his TESOL certificate was from Australia but that he began teaching in private schools in Istanbul. Initially, Can volunteered to participate in a pilot interview (along with another colleague); thus, he helped me formulate the final interview questions for all the participants. As Davies (1999, p.47) attests, ‘…consideration must be given to how to express these questions in language that is meaningful to participants’. Can said that
English is his ‘first spoken language’ and Turkish is his ‘second spoken language’; so he was able to help me form questions that would be clear to both Turkish and English speakers, especially when it came to ‘language that may have both popular meanings and a rather different specialised interpretation’ (Davies 1999, p.47). He noted, ‘I went to school in Australia…I was immersed in the English language…but I solely spoke Turkish at home’.

Dexter’s professional experience consisted of 6 years of teaching in Jamaica after he earned his bachelor’s degree and 4 years of teaching in the US where he earned his master’s degree, also in education. Though he is not an emotional man, Dexter’s voice was hoarse when he said,

> Initially I didn’t want to become a teacher. I wanted to become an entrepreneur, but the fees were too expensive for my mother; my father had died…so it was much easier to go to a teachers’ college because they offered scholarships. *(Dexter, first interview, 25 November 2013)*

In the first interview, Dexter was a bit unclear about his role as an EFL educator, but in the second interview, he expressed his perception of his role with sharp clarity. This shift in his response between the first and second interview reflected a raised level of awareness in terms of his role as an EFL educator, which Guba and Lincoln (1989) refer to as ontological authenticity. I believe that Dexter’s increased awareness may have resulted from the dialogue he and I shared in the interview process.

Selen differed from Dexter; she had initially wanted to become a teacher:

> I was always helping the teachers in the classroom, and they would sometimes leave me in charge, they would comment that I would become a fine teacher…the seed was planted, and I became a teacher. *(Selen, first interview, 22 November 2013)*

Selen’s professional experience was based on teaching in London, England, for 4 years as a reserve teacher and for 3 years as a middle-school classroom teacher at another
private school in Turkey before her 10-year stint at IPRIS. Selen earned her bachelor’s degree in linguistics, a TOFEL certification from UCLA in the States, and finally a master’s degree in international business, from a university in London. On this shift in careers, Selen commented,

Having taught in Turkey for many years, I was not using my language skills. I thought of changing fields, but teaching is like a virus – it never leaves you – and so I continued to teach. (Selen, first interview, 22 November 2013)

Unlike Selen, Tabitha, the eldest of the secondary participants, had not changed careers and had been teaching for 38 years. She had taught previously in the United States in both public and private schools. The last five of those years had been spent teaching at IPRIS. The two interviews I had with Tabitha reflected her strong sense of self and her clear understanding of her role as an EFL educator – that is, the expected role and her perception of that role. She had become a teacher after graduating with a bachelor’s degree in art history. In the first interview, Tabitha asked which way I leaned philosophically, and when I mentioned Pierre Bourdieu, she replied, ‘Oh yes, capitals; let me add that my parents paid for my tuition and my board, and I worked for spending money...’.

In terms of age, Tila is Tabitha’s opposite: she was the youngest of the secondary participants and had been teaching for a total of 8 years, the last 4 at IPRIS. Both times that I spoke with Tila, she demonstrated a high level of commitment to her role as an EFL educator, differing sharply from the other two female participants, Tabitha and Selen. In both interviews with Tila, she demonstrated a great sense of urgency in the way she spoke about her perception of her role at IPRIS and how she became interested in teaching: ‘When I was in kindergarten, I would role play and would copy my mom who was a teacher; I would sit with my friends and act as though I were teaching them’.
Tila, who has a bachelor’s degree in English literature, acquired her teaching credentials in Syria soon after and then began her teaching career in Lebanon where she stayed for 4 years.

In summary, I found all of the participants eager to share their perceptions of their roles as EFL educators. As expressed in their responses, the views of the participants on the role of English as the global language pointed to their and my relationship with globalisation even though most had not been acquainted with globalisation as a concept. The responses about their role as EFL educators and the global English language from these purposefully selected participants helped me gain a deeper understanding of my own role as an EFL educator at IPRIS in this era of globalisation.

3.8 Data collection

After selecting the secondary participants for this study, I discussed it with each of them briefly. I then sent an e-mail to all of those who responded affirmatively, expressing my gratitude for their willingness to participate in the analytic auto-ethnography and seeking to allay any concerns about either the issues or the data collection process, such as the length and number of the interviews. I fully disclosed the aims of this study during the initial discussion with the participants and then reiterated them in the e-mail, which also included a participant information sheet that made the aims of my research explicit (see Appendix A for an example). My decision to communicate with the secondary participants after the initial discussion through e-mail was motivated by my respect for their busy schedules and my desire to build rapport with each participant. Although I had been working with all the participants for a minimum of 4 years, I saw nurturing a firm rapport as necessary so that I would reduce the risk of anyone withdrawing from the study before its completion.
Data collection occurred in three successive phases: (1) orientation and overview; (2) focused exploration; and (3) member checks and closure.

(1) Orientation and overview

For the first phase, Lincoln and Guba (1985, p.266) suggest the use of prolonged engagement and open-ended approaches in collecting auto-ethnographic data. In what they refer to as the ‘I don’t know what I don’t know’ phase of collecting auto-ethnographic data, I used a ‘reflexive journal’, which they advise. Lincoln and Guba (1985, p.327) describe a reflexive journal as a ‘kind of diary’ in which the investigator records each day (or as needed) a variety of information about himself or herself (hence the term ‘reflexive’). I also drew from my assignments completed for Phases 1 and 2 at the University of Sussex, my recall of verbal and written communications with professional colleagues, and e-mail correspondence, all of which provided sources of auto-ethnographic data during this initial phase of data collection.

The reflexive journal coincides with Anderson’s (2006a) conception of analytic auto-ethnography, as discussed earlier. The reflexive journal, which was stored electronically, was organised in two separate folders on my laptop. Folder 1 held my personal diary with reflections on what I saw in terms of my own values and interests and unfolding insights. These were regularly noted after teaching activities, meetings, professional development opportunities, and gatherings where I have interacted with the school culture at IPRIS. Recording information in the reflexive journal helped me to externalise my assumptions and reactions to people and occurrences that might not have been otherwise acknowledged. An example of the assumptions externalised in the reflexive journal was my philosophical positioning that continually shifted and continues to shift throughout the research process.
Folder 2 contained the logistics of the study, including the recollections of unexpected ‘episodes’ (Guba and Lincoln 1981, p.371) that occurred during all three successive phases of data collection, and were motivated by the objective of establishing validity for the reader. In a naturalistic inquiry within the critical-ideological paradigm, validity in the positivistic sense is called trustworthiness, as discussed above (Lincoln and Guba 1985b, 1986). The data from the two folders aided me in answering RQ1: ‘How do I fit in/belong as an educator at IPRIS?’

(2) Focused exploration

In the second phase of data collection, I used a more focused approach, employing semi-structured interviews to collect data from the secondary participants. Later in the research process, I also used the concept of the critical incident to collect and analyse auto-ethnographic data (see section 3.5). I interviewed all five of the secondary participants twice, first in early November, second in early to mid-December of 2013. The schedule for both interviews coincided with the times of extant professional development opportunities at IPRIS, during which the teachers had a little more time to be interviewed and to be reflexive. I conducted two interviews three weeks apart, primarily because doing so permitted me to describe the extent to which the five other participants have reoriented, over time, the conceptions of their roles as EFL educators and their rationale for teaching EFL at IPRIS in Turkey. Lather (1986) explains this process as Catalytic validity which makes recognisable the impact of the research process itself and its influence on the respondents’ self-understanding and, ideally, their self-determinations through research participation. Further, the time in-between the interviews allowed me to conduct member checks, triangulate the data, and further build rapport with the secondary participants.
Both of the interviews lasted approximately 30–45 minutes each, and all were semi-structured. The questions explored the participants’ varying perceptions of their roles as EFL educators, and provided insight into the factors that have contributed to the perceptions of those roles. The data gleaned from the interviews allowed me to answer RQ2: ‘What do we as EFL educators perceive as our roles at IPRIS?’ and RQ3: ‘What relationship (as EFL educators) do we have to globalisation?’

Understanding Bourdieu’s insistence that there may be two logics in opposition and that dialectical relations play a role in reconciliation (Swartz 1997), I took a dialectical approach in the interviews, following Guba and Lincoln’s (1994b, p.104) assertion that ‘human research is inherently dialectical. . . . Dialectics is a way of thinking about human experience in terms of contradictions and conflicts’. In addition, ‘dialogue must be dialectical in nature to transform ignorance and misapprehensions . . . into more informed consciousness’ (Guba and Lincoln 1994b, p.110). Therefore, during the second phase of the semi-structured interviews, rather than merely posing questions to the secondary participants, I asked each of them to pose questions to me also or to make suggestions. Of the five secondary participants, Dexter, Tila, and Can did both, whereas Selen and Tabitha said that they did not feel ‘knowledgeable’ enough about doctoral studies to do so. I analysed this collected data and presented it in Chapter 5. Because of these participant statements, which revealed some potential problems with unintended gendering, I offered them the opportunity to write about their views in an e-mail response, which I include in appendix D.

Because the interview process was conducted in this way, the data revealed conflicting or complimentary information about the differing ways in which we perceive our roles as EFL educators. Listening to the participants speak about their life experiences and
their roles at IPRIS brought to my mind a wide range of factors that contributed to my own discernment of these realities. I found that writing about my heightened consciousness helped me better understand how and why I perceived my role as an EFL educator at IPRIS the way I did. The critical incident was particularly useful in this area. Tripp (2012, p.xiii) contends that a written description encourages a ‘better understanding of self for the better understanding of self, practice and the system’.

3) Member checks and closure

The third phase of data collection began with the second round of interviews, 3 weeks after the first interviews, around 15 November. Thus, I had time to transcribe the interview data and to reflect on the first interviews. At the same time, the interval was not so long that the participants would disengage from the process. Each of these second interviews was followed by a member check.

I did a second interview for several reasons: because ethics is central to the paradigm of critical theory, the second interview helped to ‘erode ignorance and misapprehensions’ (Guba and Lincoln 1994b, p.115) during data collection. In addition, I could develop further rapport with the other participants so that they would feel more comfortable about our discussions. Because the participants were my colleagues, we had a level of rapport from 4 years of working together, but I did not take it for granted. The second interview also reinforced the naturalistic nature of this study; it provided a way to triangulate the data, to validate the sources through comparison, and to sustain the trustworthiness of the data’s presentation (Guba and Lincoln 2005). The ontological authenticity was also increased, providing a criterion for evaluating an increased level of awareness in the research participants (Guba and Lincoln 1989). When I received advice and new perspectives on my research from colleagues at IPRIS, the discussions
we had helped me to contextualise the accounts within ‘my’ world and to analyse the data in a more nuanced way. Having finished this process, I understand better the role of peer review in triangulation (Lincoln and Guba 1985).

Both interviews followed the same process; each began with a ‘briefing’ (Kvale 1996) containing the same elements: participants were prompted to choose a pseudonym; I reminded them that confidentiality would be maintained; I told them that the interviews would be recorded with their permission. All agreed to be recorded, and I supplemented with handwritten notes only to indicate answered questions or a need for further explanation. Thus, I was still able to observe gestures, body language, eye movements, and other social cues during the interview process.

After each interview, I ‘debriefed’ (Kvale 1996, p.128) the participants thanking them for speaking with me and promising to send the transcripts for their review. This participant review for assessing whether the manuscript has captured their intentions is the ‘member check’ (Lincoln and Guba 1985). Though I had planned only one member check, additional ones became necessary, as the data collection process is not always sequential but often iterative, interacting with data analysis and interpretation (Chang 2008). I sent the transcriptions to the participants via e-mail, asking them to elaborate on and/or clarify any information if they wished and to ensure they were represented to their satisfaction, either through meeting with me or by indicating revisions in the text. Using the member check is thus a ‘means of equalizing power relationships within the research relationship’ (Koelsch 2013, p.171) by facilitating the co-construction of knowledge researcher and participants.

The member check, a reflexive and even ongoing process (Cho and Trent 2006), is also an important component of validating qualitative research (Seale 1999; Koelsch 2013).
and an effective way to determine trustworthiness and credibility (Guba and Lincoln 2005). As an example of the procedure, 2 months after the two interviews with Tabitha, I sensed during data analysis that my initial understanding of Tabitha was not adequate and that I could not merely ‘fill in the blanks’ (which would be unethical). Therefore, when I sat with her at lunch one day and she asked how my research was going, I mentioned to her that I had been reading and re-reading the portion of the interview text where she mentioned her daughter. I asked if she would mind answering one more question about it. Then I asked her what her daughter thought of her coming out of retirement from teaching. With a small smile she replied, ‘I and my daughter knew that I needed another challenge’.

3.9 Data analysis

To analyse the data, I drew directly from the theoretical framework by seeking the forms of capital visible in the secondary participants’ responses and the way they described their habitus. This is particularly evident in Chapter 4, continuing into Chapter 5 wherein the participants’ capitals and habitus are shown to intersect with the field. The strategy I used to analyse the data was inspired by the constant comparative analysis method developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Cohen et al. (2011, p.473) suggest that ‘[i]n constant comparison the researcher compares newly acquired data with existing data and categories and theories that have been devised and which are emerging, in order to achieve a perfect fit between these and the data’.

I began interpreting the data while still conducting the semi-structured interviews, forming the theoretical framework and writing in my reflexive journal. Because I was still collecting data while writing in my reflexive journal, reading Bourdieu’s theories provided a framework for my ideas. Interpretation continued when I listened to each of
the five digitally recorded files immediately after both the first and second round of
interviews. Afterwards, I transcribed all of the digitally recorded files, organised the
electronic transcriptions in chronological order, and stored them in protected files on
my password-protected personal laptop. While transcribing the interviews, I also read
my reflexive journal, which included the typed notes I had handwritten during each
session. All of these soft copies of recorded text were subject to continued
interpretation and analysis (Dunne et al. 2005). According to Chang (2008, p.9) this
back-and-forth movement is particular to the interpretation and analysis of auto-
ethnographic data, as the auto-ethnographer moves ‘between self and others’. Likewise,
Jansick (2010, p.176) contends that the role of the researcher is to move back and forth,
between the data and the self, like the choreographer who creates a dance, seeking
‘knowledge of where they fit in the history of the dance’. This movement between my
reflexive journal and the transcribed interviews allowed me to identify recurring themes
in the data.

The data analysis lasted from 15 November 2013 to 30 July 2014. From the data set, I
inferred the elements (capitals) that contributed to the way the participants viewed the
world in the way that they did (habitus). Three different themes emerged which all
signalled ‘teacher background’.

Those themes were (1) ‘from the background to the
fore’, (2) ‘from family structure to occupational structure’ and (3) ‘before IPRIS’. An
example of how I arrived at the inductively oriented themes is furnished in Appendix
B.

Despite having research questions and a theoretical framework for my analysis, I did
not begin with a hypothesis to be confirmed or verified (Lincoln and Guba 1985). After
identifying the themes, I quickly read through all the collected data to ‘make sense’ of
them (Merriam 1998, p.178) and categorised them in relation to my research questions. Next, I did a more detailed re-reading wherein I devised conceptual categories, a process that is largely systematic as it is informed by the purpose of the study (Merriam 1998): to explain the roles of EFL educators, including mine, at IPRIS in an era of globalisation. Cohen et al. (2011) contend that in naturalistic research, categories may emerge from the data, but this does not preclude the value of research questions.

To create coded categories, I read and re-read the two interviews with each participant together, comparing the data sets among themselves and to the material in my reflexive journal. I next compared the secondary participants’ data sets with each other and again to the data from my reflexive journal. I then colour coded the raw data from the interviews with the secondary participants and my reflexive journal according to the research questions. In the end, therefore, the categories emerged inductively from the data and the interpretations of the researcher, rather than only or necessarily from pre-existing theories (Cohen et al. 2011).

I first addressed the data that related to RQ2 first, and then that for RQ3, ending with data relating to RQ1. Following this order and using the critical incident to write up and thus externalise my internal assumptions, I became more aware of the reciprocal influences between the secondary participants, IPRIS, and me; of my role(s) at IPRIS; of the expectations that I had for myself as an individual and as a professional. In my process of comparison and interpretation, I continually moved back and forth between data, theory, and my research questions so that the interpretation was wrested from this movement which shaped and saturated the following categories: 1) my fit in-between, 2) I view my role as being… and 3) the role(s) of English as the global language. All of these categories are presented as the headings in Chapter 5. The many data comparisons
(among interviews, reflexive journal, and critical incidents) also enhanced the credibility of the study (Lincoln and Guba 1985).

Finally, I checked with the other members of the study to ensure that my interpretation and analysis of their perceptions in the text were fair and balanced (Guba and Lincoln 2005). For example, on February 24, I took my laptop to Tila’s classroom and asked her to read my analysis of her interview data. After reading the paragraphs, Tila smiled and said, ‘Edmund, this is fine, really!’ I was relieved and thenceforth more confident in representing Tila and my perception of her experiences with greater ease. If Tila had not agreed with my representation, I would have asked her for suggestions for achieving greater accuracy. Continuous member checking ‘is the most crucial technique for establishing credibility’ in a research study (Lincoln and Guba 1985, p.314).
Chapter 4: Findings, Part 1

4.1 Introduction to teachers’ backgrounds

The ‘teacher background’ theme, which emerged inductively from the data analysis, serves as an umbrella for the following subthemes: (1) background to the fore, (2) from family structure to occupational structure, (3) before IPRIS, and (4) at IPRIS. I structured this section chronologically to illustrate my progress as a researcher, to present the backgrounds of the secondary participants, and to illustrate how their background relates to me as the primary participant. Participant backgrounds are presented in detail, and the chronological analysis gives shape to the current perceptions the participants have of themselves, personally and as EFL educators at IPRIS in Turkey and in an era of globalisation, and how this ‘coming to be’ affects our perceptions of our role, which is discussed in Chapter 5.

4.2 Background to the fore

In the first round of interviews, I asked the participants about their age and nationality, and then about their parents’ origins. Both Can and Selen, of Turkish descent but born abroad, simply answered the questions posed, whereas the other three secondary participants disclosed further information. Tila (from Syria), Dexter (from Jamaica), and Tabitha and I (from the United States) are considered the ‘international teachers’, whereas Can (from Australia) and Selen (from Germany) are considered ‘Turkish teachers’ because both their parents and grandparents are Turkish nationals, even though they were not born or raised in Turkey and although we are all EFL educators at the same institution. As Biddle (1997, p.499) asserted, the nationalities of EFL teachers are significant with regard to ‘expectations for the role of the teacher and teacher role behaviours in the classroom’. The key point in these findings is how our backgrounds
position us so differently one from another as EFL educators. Further, the findings here give me outstanding insight into how the secondary participants came to be EFL educators. Expectations for teacher roles arise from the entire IPRIS community, including the students, their parents, and the Turkish environment. The additional information given provides a thick, rich description of the participants’ origins and how those origins affect their present perceptions.

Selen stated,

I was born in Germany; my parents are Turkish, and my grandparents are as well. (Selen, first interview, 22 November 2013)

Can said,

I was born and raised in Melbourne, Australia. But my parents are Turkish and are both from Turkish descent. (Can, first interview, 2 December 2013)

Tila provided a wealth of information that gave me great insight into how she viewed herself:

My mother and father are both Syrian. My grandparents from my mother’s side are Syrian, and my great-grandfather came from Turkey, and he was Turkish and Jewish. We, of course, became Muslims later on. This is what we were told by my uncles and my father, but and we are not the only ones (people); lots of the Jewish people flee to Syria. They hid their religion because they were afraid of execution. But their grandsons and granddaughters later brought their conservative Muslim beliefs to the front. That is how we were raised…; that is how I got my point of view; it is what makes my story so rich. (Tila, first interview, 29 November 2013)

That Tila, without prompting, chose to foreground religion as an element of her lineage and development suggests that her background influences her current perception of herself as an EFL educator. Here, Tila shows that her uncles and father initially hid their own ‘religious capital’, defined by Bourdieu (1991, p.23) as ‘the product of accumulated religious labour’. Religious capital is the investment individuals make in
their faith. Stark and Finke (2000, p.121), in further articulating Bourdieu’s notion of religious capital, defined it as ‘the degree of mastery of and attachment to a particular religious culture’. Because Tila’s uncles and father were Jewish, however, their religious capital needed to remain hidden when they sought refuge in Syria. In Bourdieu’s (1984, p.471) terms, they needed to shift their doxa, which is ‘adherence to relations of order’ and of ‘structure [s] both [in] the real world and the thought world [that] are accepted as self-evident’. Deer (2008) points out that doxa is understood as comprising field-specific sets of beliefs that inform the shared habitus of those operating within the field.

Tila’s uncles and father, while needing to acknowledge their previous Judaism to the other Jews that had fled to Syria, simultaneously had to adhere to the social limits in Syria by immediately conforming to Islam. Their religious capital was converted into a new religious habitus as a strategy to safeguard their lives and to improve what would otherwise be perceived as a subordinate position in Syria. Their newly acquired religious habitus, in turn, gave rise to Tila’s habitus. Tila’s recognition of her religious habitus as she presented it echoes sentiments by Mead (1934, p.199), who asserts that ‘the self is something which has a development; it is not initially there at birth but arises in the process of social experience and activity’. Tila’s ‘social experience and activity’, inherited from her uncles and father, gave rise to her own experiences as she currently lives in the country from which they fled. Tila’s familial history, her religious background, and her Syrian nationality are at odds. This conflict causes a significant imbalance between the way that Tila perceives her role because of her lineage (which includes Turkish language proficiency and knowledge of the culture) and the expectations of IPRIS, signalled by her being categorised as an ‘international teacher’ as opposed to a ‘Turkish teacher’.
Dexter also offered information beyond the questions posed, bringing his background to the fore in an attempt to establish a link between him and me that preceded both our parents and grandparents. Dexter explained that he comes from a line of black Jamaicans, making a point to distinguish among the blacks in Jamaica because, as he states, ‘you know there are Indian Jamaicans and Chinese Jamaicans, too’:

All Jamaicans, for example, know that the word ‘Coolie’ means someone who is of Indian origin. Maybe that is another connection we have, Edmund, because I know that the Coolies were the indentured workers bought to work in many parts of the Caribbean. But my parents and grandparents were all black Jamaican. (Dexter, first interview, 25 November 2013)

When Dexter states ‘Maybe that is another connection we have’, he is referring both to his knowledge that my own parents are from Guyana and to our similarity as the black males who teach EFL at IPRIS. At first, I thought nothing of Dexter’s statements, except that he might have been reciprocating my effort to build rapport between us. However, in analysing the data, I discovered an inference that I found difficult to interpret. After our initial interview, I recorded the following in my reflexive journal: ‘He [Dexter] always seems to want to tell me something, but it always seems to be coded’ (Edmund, 27 November 2013). At first glance, Dexter and I do seem to have quite a bit in common, as we are both 39 and have both taught in the elementary division at IPRIS. However, Dexter’s statements began to jog my memory in terms of a deeper connection, evoking the demographic similarities between Jamaica and Guyana. Both countries were colonised by the British, and both have a large number of Indian and black nationals. My parents had told me about the racial strife prevalent between the Indians and the blacks in British Guyana during their adolescence. In the early 1960s, race riots occurred between the Indians and the blacks as a result of competition for scarce resources between the two groups (Jain 1988). Here, Dexter seems to be giving himself and me, by extension, greater social and cultural capital because we both
are black rather than mixed race or Indian, even though this accumulation of capital is from several generations and countries away.

Dexter’s statements compelled me to consider my postcolonial position as a researcher and how I got there. In Guyana, formerly part of the British Empire, the strength of British political power rested on creating a surplus labour force – first slaves and then indentured labourers – to work for their profitable enterprises. The African slave trade had been outlawed, so Britain imported indentured labour, mainly from India, into its colonies in the Caribbean. Continued Indian immigration depressed the wages of both Africans and Indians, creating racial antagonism between these two working class factions after the 1880s (Jain 1988). The situation was similar in Jamaica, Dexter’s country of origin and that of his parents and grandparents. In both Guyana and Jamaica, ‘one of the most important features of the colonial enterprises was their organisation around the forced labour systems’ (Jain 1988, p.98), which, in the Caribbean, included Amerindian and African slavery, and Indian indentured labour (Jain 1988).

In his notion of field—developed in the context of French-colonised Algeria—Bourdieu indicated that fields are to be thought of as ‘memory joggers’ to remind researchers to think rationally (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p.228). In this case, my memory was jogged to realise that part of Dexter’s and my connection was that both our parents had been reared in colonial societies. Bourdieu’s notion of field particularly applies to the colonial societies of Jamaica and Guyana as ‘arenas of struggle for control over valued resources’ (Bourdieu 1993, p.72), such struggles being rooted in dominant and subordinate positions (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p.97). According to Jain (1988, p.98), ‘in Jamaica, Guyana, Surinam, and Trinidad, Blacks and East Indians were incorporated as mutually exclusive segments of equivalent status by their
common but mutually distinct subordination to the ruling whites’. However, our own backgrounds are more nuanced and complex than Jain’s reductionist view portrays.

As I see it, this background significantly affects Dexter and me as EFL educators in Turkey. As Ashcroft et al. (2002) have contended, our ancestors’ language was systematically destroyed by enslavement and was replaced and appropriated by English. Our shared occupational roles as EFL educators stem from our shared colonial history, giving rise to our present shared relationship with globalisation, which is the main force driving the spread of English today (Yildirim and Okan 2007). The unavoidable relationship between postcolonial theory and globalisation lies in the structure of the power relations still flourishing in the twenty-first century as the economic, cultural, and political legacy of western imperialism (Ashcroft et al. 2002).

The unsolicited details Tabitha provided gave me greater insight into her origins – particularly in terms of class.

Both my mother and father were born in the US. I know my grandfather, on my mother’s side, was born in Norway, because he was on the Olympic cross-country ski team, when he was 18. And my grandmother, on my mother’s side, was from Ireland. (Tabitha, first interview, 4 December 2013)

That Tabitha’s grandfather ‘was on the Olympic cross-country ski team when he was 18’ demonstrates he was in a social space where his dispositions were mobilised through his sporting preference. The grandfather’s capacity to see his skiing ‘ambition as reasonable’ (Bourdieu 1996, p.4) reflects Bourdieu’s theory of social and cultural reproduction, and this ambition was reproduced in Tabitha. In a different portion of the interview transcripts, Tabitha disclosed that her mother would ‘often play tennis on the weekends’, and Tabitha’s first job as an educator, required someone who was ‘experienced in horseback riding’. Tabitha also remarked that her grandfather’s skiing
experience ‘must run in the family’ because her ‘daughter was also a swimmer for many years’. All of these activities as sporting preferences, much like art and music, may be linked with class habitus (Bourdieu 1984). Bourdieu perceived that the upper classes maintain their dominant position by handing on to their children the life chances with which they were endowed. Such sports are not so much limited to particular people within certain classes as they are socially exclusive by bourgeoisie design. Sports consumption, Bourdieu believed, requires appropriate preferences and tastes, as well as skills and knowledge, stemming from what he terms ‘cultural capital’, which is unevenly distributed socially.

More significant than economic barriers as an explanation for the class distribution are the ‘more hidden entry requirements… [of] family tradition and early training [and] socializing techniques that keep sports closed to the working class and to upwardly mobile individuals from the middle or upper classes’ (Bourdieu 1984, p.217). Bourdieu further suggested that there is a correlation between social and cultural reproduction, and that class alignment exists in sporting preferences and stratification, resulting in a relationship between the two.

Tabitha’s detailed answer highlights the significant difference in her class habitus and my own. However, Bourdieu’s theory of the correlation between social and cultural reproduction, and class alignment does not quite stack up in my case. Classical ballet and contemporary dance, the art forms I prefer, are typically reserved for the elite because the economic qualifications to participate are usually high. Though my working class family expressed no interest in such activities, I had a great desire to participate in the performing arts. Calhoun (2006) has characterised Bourdieu as short-sighted on this issue, providing socially and historically specific accounts of how
capital can be converted into the habitus of individuals who were not originally endowed with it, which is what happened in my case.

To sum up, the extra information that emerged from the data (see Appendix B) provided by Tila, Dexter, and Tabitha encouraged me to consider the reasoning behind my habitus formation. Although most of the participants and I shared similarities outside our occupations, our interactions in our initial conversations showed me that I had not fully internalised the same sense of limits that they had, in the same way. Bourdieu referred to these limits as ‘doxa’, which, according to Deer (2008, p.120), ‘is the pre-reflexive intuitive knowledge, shaped by experience, of unconscious inherited physical and relational predispositions’.

Bourdieu (1992, p.136) also characterised habitus as partly determined ‘by external causes’, asserting that social agents are not ‘guided solely by internal reasons’, noting that habitus is ‘a sort of spring that needs a trigger’ (Bourdieu 1992, p.135). Tabitha’s account triggered my realisation that although my natural class habitus would not have stimulated a preference for classical ballet and contemporary dance, I acquired it because I wished to express myself through physicality. Conversely, Tila’s reference to religious capital reminded me that I had always questioned religion and had consciously decided, against my family, to quit attending church.

4.3 From family structure to occupational structure

The connection between familial structure and occupational structure actually emerged as the first theme. This theme, relating to how family structure leads to occupational structure, was present in the responses of all five secondary participants. Turner (1990, p.88) refers to an individual’s ‘structural status role’, which is ‘attached to position, office, or status in particular organisational settings’. The conscious decision that
almost all of the participants made to come to Turkey was, in some way, informed by their familial role. To this end, Selen’s role as a daughter and wife, Dexter’s role as a husband, and Tabitha’s role as a mother are illustrative. I asked the secondary participants what influenced their decisions to come to Turkey, eliciting various responses. Selen said,

I think when I was 16, my parents were kind of scared that I would become too German, and they wanted my schooling to continue in Turkey; and then I finished my high school here in Turkey. I was about to go back and study in Heidelberg [Germany] when I met my husband, and I stayed. So it was more not what I wanted, but more kind of outside forces, one from my parents and the second from my husband when I decided to stay in Turkey. (Selen, first interview, 22 November 2013)

Selen’s response suggests that ‘outside forces’ – her parents and husband – were the primary factor in her decision. Her role as a member of her family, which Turner (1990) referred to as a structural status role, was the decisive factor in Selen’s coming to Turkey. When Selen accommodated her parents and husband, these conditions may have caused what Turner called ‘the initial destabilisation that created an impetus to role change’; and this change in role was ‘brought on by demographic changes and reinforced by cultural change’ (Turner 1990, p.101).

Dexter’s structural status role as a husband influenced his decision to come to Turkey:

Coming here for me … was a total accident; I and my wife were sponsored in the US by a teaching fellowship for three years. But I was teaching in Georgia, and she was teaching in Virginia…we were apart for a long time. After [the fellowship], the deal was that the program would recommend us to find a job overseas. (Dexter, first interview, 25 November 2013)

Similar to Selen, part of what influenced Dexter was a desire to live and work in the same location as his wife. Like me, he had not originally had Turkey as a country on his agenda. Rather, it was the opportunities for work that led me here, as well as Dexter
and his wife. The opportunity for work is often what determines the countries where many EFL teachers will work around the globe.

Tila’s response was quite different from Dexter’s:

The culture is what brought me to Turkey; I am familiar with the culture and also speak the language, [and] I thought Turkey would be a very good start for me. I thought that it would be a good start for me because I won’t suffer from culture shock. (Tila, first interview, 29 November, 2013)

Like Tila, I made a decision based on knowledge of the culture; however, she had direct knowledge of the culture and the language. The Turkish culture and language were ‘taught by my father and grandfather as well as [by] our frequent trips to Turkey’, according to Tila, as a way for her to hold onto the culture from which the father and grandfather had come. Tila later recounted that ‘they taught me and my brother about the Turkey they left …we came to Turkey a lot when we were children’. Thus, she had a deep knowledge of the language, the country, and its people.

Can responded much like Tila during the first interview:

I worked in the private sector and was burnt out; I needed a new line of work. I got my credentials to teach and came to Turkey. I knew the culture, I knew the language. So that was the reason I came across to Turkey.... I said, ‘I'm going to explore the country of Turkey where my ancestors are’. My family, my extended family, was all here. We had no family in Australia…. (Can, first interview, 2 December 2013)

Can’s reason for coming to Turkey seems to illustrate the different forms of capital conceived by Bourdieu. ‘Burnt out’ from his previous line of work, Can sought economic capital, which is that type ‘immediately and directly convertible into money’ (Bourdieu 1986, p.243) by pursuing a teaching qualification. His new educational credentials (cultural capital) and the fact that his family members were all in Turkey (social capital) reasonably explain what influenced Can to come to Turkey. Can’s
capitals could be converted into economic capital only indirectly, through engagement in activities that involve such long-term relationships as employment, family, and marriage.

Tabitha’s response, though not indicating a sense of obligation to family, showed some similarity to my experience, as her role in her family did play a part in her decision to come to Turkey:

I retired [from teaching] in Seattle at 60. I went to Egypt to see a friend, who was teaching in Cairo, before all the problems..., and it was so much fun. I saw all the benefits she got, hanging out with the teachers, going on the Nile, having...little picnics and going to sites with groups of teachers, just like I do here. I thought maybe I should go back to teaching and applied to IPRU. My daughter had done a study abroad at ODTU (the public medium university in Istanbul). I called her up and said ‘How did you like Turkey?’ and she said, ‘Oh, it's wonderful!’ (Tabitha, first interview, 4 December 2013)

Here, we see that Tabitha’s maternal role influenced her decision to come to Turkey and re-engage with her teaching role, from which she had retired. Tabitha’s actions illustrate Turner’s (1990) contention that a person’s basic role, including age and gender, is defined by the wider society in which the individual lives. In turn, an individual’s basic role and structural status role need to be examined in tandem because age and gender are fundamental organizing principles in families (Turner 1990).

Though age and gender as social structures exist outside the family, Tabitha’s response may relate to Turner’s findings that a new role can be created when an established role is dissolved. Turner (1990, p.101) contends that an individual’s basic role and structural status role may work together to provide an ‘impetus to change in the misfit between role and person’. Though gender looks different in ‘traditional’ societies than in highly developed societies, Tabitha’s impetus was derived from her daughter’s experience in the country, leading her, in turn, to make ‘demographic changes’ and providing a
‘further impetus … by the discovery of a new role formulation generally rewarding to all’ (Turner 1990, p.101).

Thus, both culture and family seemingly have had a significant impact on the five secondary participants’ decisions for coming to Turkey to live and work in two clearly different ways. The families of Can, Selen, and Tila (who are all of Turkish descent) played an important role in their decisions because they all had first-hand knowledge of the culture. Although Tabitha’s role as mother and Dexter’s role as husband were also important in their decision-making, they decided to live and work in Turkey more serendipitously. The same was true for me, particularly with regard to culture: as stated previously, my own decision to come to Turkey was based on my knowledge of the Turkish culture when friends and colleagues in Greece informed me that the two cultures were similar.

4.4 Before IPRIS

All the participants in this study seemed to regard employment at IPRIS as a second rather than a first choice, which suggests that the secondary participants mostly did not come to IPRIS as a matter of building the ‘structural status roles’ of which Turner (1990, p.101) speaks wherein ‘a person’s occupation is attached to position or status in a particular organizational setting’. Rather, it seems that all of the participants chose IPRIS because, for them, it was ‘employment of the last resort', which Bennell and Akyeampong (2007, p.10) discuss in their research.

Participants procured employment at IPRIS owing to varying sets of circumstances and influences that affected their decisions. For me, the decision to work at IPRIS was a matter of ‘the package that was offered combined with the opportunity that I saw’ (reflexive journal, 13 February 2014).
Tila desired to ‘work in an IB school’, which did not respond to her, and then she realised that the Marshall High School ‘only employ[s] Americans’. In describing her decision to come to the IPRIS, Selen spoke of her aspiration to leave the classroom and work in a school ‘that is run with a Western culture’ in which she would feel more comfortable. Dexter explored numerous other schools as he ‘decided to go to a job fair in Philadelphia’ and came to IPRIS after a ‘successful … interview’. Can noted that he had been ‘unaware that IPRIS was the premiere English medium institution in Turkey’ and that he had come to IPRIS because of a lead from a friend. My own interest in ‘the package that was offered combined with the opportunity that I saw’ (reflexive journal, 13 February 2014). In this regard, Tabitha was the outlier because she stated that she had made her decision to come to IPRIS, in part, because of a lead from her daughter, who remarked about the ‘wonderful library’. In short, all of the participants had come to IPRIS, not because of the reputation that the institution has in Turkey but rather because IPRIS provided a viable option for working in an international school. All of this illustrates what Bourdieu et al. (1999) refer to as ‘making sense of circumstances’. Because of the economy, it made sense for all of us to take up the offer of employment, especially given that five out of the six participants wanted to secure employment elsewhere.

Tila: I wanted to work in an IB school; the Istanbul International Community School (ICS) – this is the one that I wanted to go to first, and the other was the Marshall High School in Istanbul, but they only employ Americans. ICS did not respond. I then came to IPRIS after applying; this was how it happened.

Selen: I wanted to get out of the classroom; I thought that I would like to work in an office where I could use my new master’s degree in international business. I looked at TED college in Istanbul and, secondly, at IPRU in Istanbul. I wanted to work more in a school that is run with a Western culture that I would feel more comfortable in, and that’s why I chose IPRU in Istanbul.

Dexter: The programme that sponsored me in the United States from Jamaica recommended me for job fairs in international schools. We [Dexter and his
wife] decided to go to a job fair in Philadelphia, and we were successful in our interview for this school; that’s how we came here.

Tabitha: My daughter always told me that it’s such a nice campus and about the wonderful library. So I applied, and they asked me if I wanted a job….

Can: I didn't know of IPRIS when I came to Turkey in 2006, that it was considered to be one of the best schools. I needed a job, and I had a friend who was working at the British embassy who told me about an opening at IPRIS. I rang and spoke to the principal back then. I had an interview, and here I am.

It is reasonable to infer that it was our habitus(es), which are the product of our prior social conditionings (Bourdieu 1990), that enabled us to respond to our immediate material conditions. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) asserted that under normal circumstances, the habitus functions in a way that entails ‘neither introspection nor calculation’; however, it is only when ‘crises occur that reflexivity and rational strategizing enter the scene’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p.116). Thus, our circumstances, including global financial crisis, and our reflexive responses to our circumstances led us here.

4.5 At IPRIS

The working conditions at IPRIS caused all of the participants to report their not being enabled in their roles as EFL educators, and all of the participants said they strove for recognition from this institution. The role expectations of its educators, as loosely defined by IPRIS, are as follows:

**Instruction**-‘Demonstrates a current and appropriate knowledge of the subject’;
‘has clearly defined long-term and short-term written goals for each curriculum area/unit’; ‘maximizes instructional time due to prior preparation’. 
**Classroom environment**- ‘Organizes the teaching area to maximize student learning’; ‘exhibits positive, professional relationship with students’; ‘creates an atmosphere that motivates students to do their best’.

**Professional responsibilities**- ‘Actively demonstrates commitment to school wide, divisional, and individual goals’; ‘contributes to co-curricular program and supports school activities’; ‘models and enforces IPRIS mission, aims and policies’.

The disjuncture between these loosely structured role expectations and the participant EFL educators’ own perceptions of what their roles ought to be was reflected in their comments. Lack of support and recognition was a common theme.

Selen, for example, explained her decision to leave IPRIS as follows: ‘For anyone to realise their role in any position they have to be enabled; …at IPRIS I was not enabled at all’. Similarly, Tabitha, who has also decided to move on with her life, observed that she couldn’t ‘be expected to teach two sections… write 140 report cards… help new teachers and think that I am supported or just accept verbiage that says that I am!’

Similarly, Tila did not feel enabled in her role as an EFL educator, but for different reasons; she said, ‘I don’t think that I am enabled here, but…I think it has a lot to do with the nature of the country; they are not allowing other influences in’.

In sharp contrast, the three male participants Can, Dexter, and I had strong views on the way our roles were enabled at IPRIS. Can, who works primarily in the elementary division at IPRIS, stated, ‘I do see myself as an asset to this school…many schools want to have male teachers in their elementary divisions, but there isn’t a plethora of male elementary teachers and/or early childhood teachers out there’. Can’s comments certainly apply to me and also relate to Dexter’s views when he says,
To a degree, I have been enabled in my role at IPRIS; I mean…it's a benefit to have males in your staffing. It seems to be easier to get it [enabling] as a male than it is as a female because I would say 95% of the elementary school teachers are females back home [in Jamaica].

I find it reasonable to infer that they are now somewhat more satisfied with their positions at IPRIS because of their reflective engagement as participants in this study, given that both men initially stated that they were not enabled in their roles as EFL educators. This implication is significant because it indicates that both men reflected on their professional experiences and better understood them in relation to the wider social context as a result. This increased understanding was also a purpose of this study, as I discussed in Chapter 1. The catalytic validity that Klinceloe and McLaren (2005) write about may indeed move research participants to better understand their worlds. Both Can’s and Dexter’s comments resonate with me and affirm my perspectival shift (discussed in section 5.1). Further, their comments enable me to see that IPRIS as an organisation may have always viewed me as an asset. Can’s and Dexter’s comments, taken together, also indicate that males may indeed be more enabled in their roles at the IPRIS than their female counterparts in this study. Patterns of institutionalised recognition according to gender may show in how the participants have been positioned at IPRIS and may influence participants view of themselves as enabled or not.

4.6 Chapter Summary

The findings presented here came out of my understanding of postcolonial theory combined with Bourdieu’s key notions—namely, those of capital, habitus, and field. The theoretically informed, inductively oriented (Anderson 2006b) findings emerged as I reflexively analysed the collected data. Although I had conducted research previously on EFL educators (Melville 2012), I was not a participant in that study. Now, as a full
member of the group under investigation, I conceptualise the field as the industry of EFL located in the specific context of Turkey and IPRIS.

In this field, I investigate how the other EFL educators see themselves and the ways that I may be seen by others, which enables me, in turn, to consider the different ways that I see myself. All of this background information on the secondary participants and on me, as the primary participant, affects the ways that we think, act, feel, and perceive as mutual inhabitants of the field. In Chapter 4, I have garnered background information that provides insight into the agency that we have or think we have. This background information also illustrates how we have pulled from or developed our accumulated capitals as EFL educators prior to pushing (or being pushed) into the field which we now mutually inhabit. Our stories reflect the ways our historical and cultural backgrounds have steered us in the high tide of globalisation as we have entered the IPRIS in Turkey as neither victims nor agents of EFL. Our stories reflect the ways our historical and cultural backgrounds have steered us in the high tide of globalisation as we have entered the IPRIS in Turkey as neither victims nor agents of EFL. Selvi (2011) expands upon my notion when he states that Turkey is, by far, the most pivotal agent of language diffusion. Its status as such is primarily because Turkey demonstrates the traits of former colonies of the English-speaking powers, such as state-supported education policies that support the spread of English education at the expense of the native language in a top-down manner. Nonetheless, Selvi (2011) and the host of Turkish scholars from whose work I have drawn in this study are not victimised by the spread of the English language in Turkey: it is their primary tool for building their economic capital. This chapter has focused on where the secondary participants and I (as the primary participant) garnered the elements that aimed to explain how our perceptions of our roles were formed through inductively oriented analysis that
included race, nationality, class, and gender. In the next chapter of findings, I more overtly investigate how I fit, what our perceived roles as EFL educators are, and how these roles relate to the wider social context. Our roles’ relation to the wider social context is investigated by our perceptions of our primary teaching tool: the English language.
Chapter 5 Findings, Part 2

5.1 Introduction

The previous chapter focused on where the secondary participants and I (as the primary participant) garnered the elements that aimed to explain how our perceptions of our roles were formed through inductively oriented analysis. This chapter is more deductive, furnishing our current perceptions of how we fit in/belong at IPRIS, our roles as EFL educators, and our relationship with globalisation. Although this chapter answers the research questions more directly than the last, the focus is also on the ‘in between’ of the research process, which leads to answers for the research questions: 1) How do I fit in/belong as an educator at IPRIS? 2) What do we EFL educators perceive as our roles at IPRIS? and 3) What relationship (as EFL educators) do we have to globalisation? I was able to answer the research questions by investigating the space in between coming and going, participant and researcher, educator and administrator. It is the in-between, the cracks, the fault-line spaces that shift in perspective and help provide answers to the questions.

5.2 My fit in-between

Tripp’s (2012) idea of a ‘critical incident’ here enables me to analyse the circumstances that I faced when I came into the IPRIS, which brought me to the point of leaving. Drawing from the theoretical framework, I can align the critical incident with Bourdieu’s (1990, p.56) core concept of habitus, which he regards as ‘embodied history’. The critical incident for me has been a practical way of documenting my habitus to enable reflection and reflexivity on the various elements of my perception.

My current role at the IPRIS is Language Program Coordinator; this role has materialised only within the past year. From the fall of 2010 to the fall of 2013, I taught
in early childhood, in pre-kindergarten from 2010 to 2011, and in kindergarten from 2011 to 2013. In the summer of 2013, I taught in an intensive English programme that aimed to prepare students from grades 9 and 10 at another IPRIS school in northeast Turkey, near Georgia. These summer sessions prepare students to receive the International General Certificate of Secondary Examination (IGCSE). The summer program for the Eastern Private Research School was held at the IPRIS in Istanbul. Like all of the faculty members at IPRU and the IPRIS, its connected international school, I work on contract. My contract specifies that as an employee of the Graduate School of Education at IPRU, I may be asked to perform duties if needed at the Laboratory School of the University (i.e., IPRIS) or other APRU institutions as needed. Since I began at IPRIS, then, I have continuously needed to assume professional responsibilities and have been asked to understand the unique nature of the PK-12 school connected to the University.

A further explanation of Bourdieu’s notion of habitus is needed for an understanding of the following critical incident. Bourdieu (1984, p.170) contends that the habitus consists of the ‘dispositions that are both shaped by past events and structures, and that shape current practices and structures and also, importantly, that condition our very perceptions of these’. Here, in relating the critical incident and providing screenshots of e-mails with my interpretation of them, I show how my perception of my ‘fit’ at IPRIS was shaped by my earlier situation as an EFL educator in the school culture of IPRIS. The critical incident below describes the period near the end of summer session with another IPRIS school before I thought I would begin my role as an EAL specialist.

Towards the end of the session, the current director general sent an e-mail stating that he wanted to speak with me. During our conversation, he said, ‘I know that you are an English additional language specialist this year, but we are in a bind’. These words prepared me for what was to come next as he continued, ‘Would you be willing to teach grade 3 for 6 weeks because an international
teacher will be delayed?’ ‘Why is she delayed?’ I asked, to give myself more
time to digest the proposal, mainly because I had no particular interest in
teaching the bilingual (Turkish and English) classroom. In the end, I acquiesced
to the director general’s proposal, primarily because I knew that he could have
simply directed me to do it, rather than asking me. By the first week in October
2013, the initial third-grade teacher had arrived, I had taught grade 3 for only 6
weeks before I began to work in my role of EAL specialist. In this role, I put
together professional development opportunities for English foreign language
teachers in administering and assessing K–12 reading, listening, speaking,
reading, and writing assessments. I also administered literacy diagnostic
assessments to the entire elementary school. After I collected and analysed the
data, I disseminated the results to all grade levels as well as to the elementary
school principal.

I worked in this capacity for 2 months before I was again approached, this time
not by the director general but by the elementary school principal. The
‘international’ elementary school principal, along with the ‘Turkish’ elementary
school principal, informed me that they had already spoken with the director of
the Graduate School of Education and the director general of the IPRIS to gain
permission for me to replace a fourth-grade teacher that had left because of a
medical emergency. I asked them ‘Do I have time to consider this move?’ I was
then informed that, unlike the proposal asking me to teach the third grade, I was
receiving a directive to teach the fourth grade, rather than being asked. Feeling
undervalued, I said, ‘I am not a permanent substitute teacher’, and asked, given
that it was a directive, when I would need to assume my new responsibilities.
‘We will need you in the classroom on Monday morning’ was the reply; it was a
Friday afternoon. (Critical Incident)

On the morning of Monday, 18 November 2013, the following e-mail was sent to the
elementary division of the IPRIS:

Figure 3: Screenshot of staffing update email.
I was overwhelmed, primarily because I felt as though my knowledge and skills were being disregarded. Here I was, a university instructor at IPRU, working on loan at the IPRIS as a replacement teacher. I had repeatedly been asked to cover for other teachers and to perform tasks that I did not consider to be my responsibility as a teacher. I had continually watched less qualified teachers at the IPRIS rise to positions of leadership while I was asked to cover third- and fourth-grade classes. Why had I not been asked to fill in for the early childhood coordinator position, which was now vacant owing to an administrator who departed 2 months into the school year? The senior administrator knew that I was not only writing my thesis for an EdD in International Education and Development but also fulfilling requirements for my New York State certification as a school building leader. Yet, as this administrative role remained open, senior administrators at the IPRIS failed to consider me, despite repeated requests beginning in 2011.

I was experiencing ‘contextual dissonance’, which Rosenberg (1962, p.1) explained as ‘a situation in which the individual’s social characteristics differ from those of the population by which he is surrounded’. The result of this contextual dissonance is a feeling of not belonging, of not fitting, as supported by Rosenberg’s later studies (1977, 1979). Surrounded by predominantly white males and females from North America, most of whom were over 45 years of age and had only bachelor’s degrees, I felt that IPRIS was not recognising my capitals. Dually certified to teach general and special education, possessing two master’s degrees, and being a doctoral candidate, I felt as if the educational expenditure that I had put forth was not providing a very high rate of return. I saw myself in a predicament: do I stay at an institution where I feel devalued, or do I find a different institution where I can apply the theories that I have grappled with for years?
As a researcher, I used this critical incident to externalise my assumptions in much the same way as I was able to externalise my assumption in my reflexive journal. I believe that Berlak and Berlak (1981) and Lyons (1990) may have been correct in asserting that the critical incident, used as a tool for data collection and analysis, allows researchers to see their dilemmas and to make a ‘choice from at least two options of action’. My first plan of action was to ‘move on’ (reflexive journal, 10 January 2014), which would have meant leaving my hybrid role at the IPRIS (as university instructor/pre-kindergarten/kindergarten/Grade 3/Grade 4/EAL specialist/principal intern/language program coordinator) to start anew in Shanghai. I sought this new role because my perception that IPRIS did not recognise my educational investment was a terrific blow from which I struggled to recover.

Bourdieu (1992, p.131) asserts that ‘times of crisis’ created by ‘a class of circumstances’ permits ‘rational choice’ for individuals who are in a position to be reflexive. In other words, the capacity to be reflexive, for me, was pre-determined by my ability to locate and procure work at another institution in a different country. My colleagues inquired of me daily with such questions as ‘Edmund, how are you doing in your third assignment for the year?’ In response, I would often reply, ‘I am making it work for me’. By this, I meant that although I did perceive my role at the IPRIS to be futile, I knew that I could draw on these experiences as I completed my thesis and searched for an administrative position elsewhere. My response about making it work for me also meant that I would use my experience in my role as an EFL educator to prepare for assuming another role as an educational leader.

I was energised by my decision to move on, to find an institution where my capitals and my habitus might contribute to K–12 education, although my preference is indeed
higher education. Thus, I began to seek new positions in several countries. After interviewing and landing a position as the director of an ESL program at an institution in China, and while continually making progress towards the completion of my thesis at the University of Sussex, I wrote:

I do think it is time for me to move on in my professional role. This position in Shanghai [China] seems to be a good fit as I will be the director of the ESL department. I would prefer NYU to Shanghai but.... As I continually analyse the data, I find that I am able to look back on my experiences at the IPRIS with greater detachment. The self I have become during my four years at the IPRIS is very different from the self that I was at the time I came to Turkey. My professional role in China seems promising and very different from my professional role at present. Each day I find that I am genuinely able to examine the auto-ethnographic data more and more dispassionately. (reflexive journal, 10 January 2014)

As I prepared to sign that contract, I was surprised to receive an e-mail that indicated a long-awaited professional role change. For the 2014 academic year, my role shifted from Grade 3 teacher, EAL specialist/Grade 4 teacher/principal intern, which I had been for the 2013-2014 academic year to that of Language Programs Coordinator:

![Figure 4. Screenshot of language coordinator role e-mail.](image-url)
In reading the e-mail, and even now, I feel a strange mixture of positive emotions—because I have the opportunity to facilitate the growth of the language program—and negative emotions—because it took so long for IPRIS to recognise my capitals. This simultaneous attraction towards and repulsion from an object person or action is termed ‘ambivalence’, which has become synonymous with postcolonial theory (Young 1995). Bhabha (1994, p.37) uses the term ‘ambivalence’ interchangeably with ‘third space of enunciation’ and ‘hybridity’, all of which he considers the merger of two separate and unequal groups or modes of thought. This merger creates new cultural ideas that are first generated and then displaced from the thought of the initial separate groups or ideas.

Not only had my role shifted, but also my perspective in terms of how I fit/belong at IPRIS. My new professional role and new perspective opened up a space, a ‘third space of enunciation’, which, as Bhabha (1994, p.1-2) contends, ‘… is in the emergence of the interstices—the overlap and displacement of domains of difference…’. This space enabled a shift in my thinking, enabling me to say ‘I am making it work for me’ in a new way, with a different tone. My new role as Language Programs Coordinator has allowed me to view the school culture of IPRIS differently for two reasons: first, because in my new role, I must consider the needs of the school in addition to the needs of teachers and individuals (including myself), and second, because my feelings of not being valued were pushed to the background and my professional worth validated when I was offered the job I wanted. I feel now that my efforts are no longer futile but are recognised by the IPRIS. Bourdieu argued that ‘the social structure of a given field is premised upon dominant and subordinate positions’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p.97). My view has become more fluid, and is no longer premised on a rigid notion that IPRIS is a social structure in the ELT field that reproduces ‘dominant and subordinate
positions’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Before, I saw the positions of the administration as dominant and the positions of EFL educators as subordinate. Now, in my new role as a mixture of administrator and EFL educator, I realise that the needs of the IPRIS must take precedence. The way I think, feel, and act at IPRIS is based on a different value system, one that is not solely my own, which is contextually shared. My shift in thinking, feeling, and acting has allowed me to answer research question (1): How do I fit/belong at IPRIS? I believe that when Bourdieu (1977, p.18) asserts that ‘the best informed informant produces a discourse which compounds two opposing systems of lacunae’, he may indeed be correct. My perspectival shift bears out Bourdieu’s (1977, p.18) assertion that the ‘best informed informant’ is the self that uses reflexivity to bridge the gap between two or more opposing systems.

Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992, p.136) also assert, ‘It is difficult to control the first inclination of the habitus,...reflexive analysis, which teaches us that we endow the situation with part of the potency it has over us, allows us to alter our perception of the situation and thereby our reaction to it’. Using the critical incident in the design of this study has increased my awareness of my flexibility in my role(s) at the IPRIS. As I have made sense of my circumstances, my habitus has become flexible, dependent on the circumstances that emerged in the field. In conceptualizing the IPRIS in Turkey in this era of globalisation, I see that when my habitus relates to the field, the ‘lack of fit is always possible’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p.131). My own crisis in perceiving how I did not fit at IPRIS is the space where reflexivity emerged (Adams 2006) – that is, the ways that I did not fit. However, writing the incident helped me to look at various aspects from different angles, exploring different understandings and explanations, which Lincoln and Guba (1985) advised as a way of triangulating the data during analysis in a naturalistic inquiry.
Thus, as Schein (2010) suggests, critical incidents help the researcher to search in his or her own mind for deeper levels of explanation, which, in my case, helped me decipher the basic assumptions of the school culture and to avoid decision-making that would terminate the relationship. My struggle for recognition within the organisational culture of the IPRIS was based on my perception of the institution as more powerful than I. In brief, I regarded my circumstances at IPRIS as symbolic violence (Bourdieu 1990) – a cultural scheme that looks natural but is actually based on power. This perception shifted as I considered myself an asset to the IPRIS and became aware of the wealth of knowledge and experience (increased capital) that I had gained in my mixture of roles. I see now, from a researcher’s perspective that writing my experience as an EFL educator helped clear my ‘mind of emotions and feelings that may be clouding good judgement or preventing emergence of sensible next steps’ (Schön 1991a, p.308). The critical incidents gave me the opportunity to look back at my own thinking and biases (Schön 1991a). Specifically, because I saw only white EFL educators at IPRIS moving to administrator roles, I believed that IPRIS valued me less than my white counterparts, which in turn I believed to be the reason that IPRIS saw fit to move me from one role to another. In sum, I perceived IPRIS as intentionally denying my repeated request for promotion because they did not view me as worthy of an administrative role, owing to racial bias. Owing to my shift in thinking, I now believe that IPRIS asked and insisted that I work in various capacities because of my ability and wealth of knowledge. Thus, I made the decision to remain at the IPRIS in my new role as Language Program Coordinator.

In summary, it was the ‘in-between’ (Bhabha 1994), in tandem with the reflexive habitus that Bourdieu contends mediates a field, that enabled greater ontological authenticity to emerge within me as a result of the critical incident. Ontological
authenticity emerges as a raised level of awareness among research participants (Guba and Lincoln 1989), and it was the critical incident as a method of data collection that enabled reflexive data analysis, both tools being a part of the design of this study. Thus, Onwuegbuzie et al. (2008) seemingly are correct in their assertion that ontological authenticity can be facilitated by researchers’ engagement with vicarious experiences that might help to increase awareness of their own contexts. Erlandson (1993) contends that the use of critical incidents to understand social context and to uncover constructed realities may lead to rich insights for the researcher. As a doctoral researcher at the University of Sussex and an EFL educator turned administrator at IPRIS, I have found that the critical incident indeed yields rich insights. However, I do recognise that the fact I decided to remain at the IPRIS in my new role as Language Program Coordinator does not mean that I am viewed as a fixed member of the IPRIS community: as evidence, my fourth application for the role of principal was rejected without explanation. Instead, my new role, together with the rejected principal application (one year later), reflects the ‘unhomeliness’ (feelings of uncertainty) that I face in this context, and I will need to discern whether it can or cannot be mediated by increased capitals and a more flexible habitus. In the next section, then, I present another critical incident, along with what one participant refers to as a ‘scenario’, which may be regarded as similar to Erlandson’s (1993) critical incident.

5.3

I view my role as being…

The first part of the findings for research question (2) emphasises my experience as a researcher as opposed to my experience as a participant. In the latter part, the researcher-participant roles are flipped as Dexter asks me to explain my own perception of my role at IPRIS.
Much research has focused on role expectations for teachers in varying contexts. In the literature, many different terms have appeared to designate role expectations with regard to attitudes and beliefs. For example, Zeichner and Liston (2013) contend that teachers who are reflective and who consider their personal experiences, attitudes, and beliefs in the context of the school gain greater insight into their development as people and practitioners. Coldron and Smith (1999) assert that in the social space of schools, one person can have an array of possible relations to others. Some of these relations are conferred by inherited social structures and categorizations, and some are chosen or created by the individual educator.

Throughout this thesis, and especially here in Chapter 5, I use the words ‘perception’ and ‘view’ for enquiry into what we EFL educators perceive as our roles at IPRIS. All of the EFL educators in this study (including me) responded to interview questions which indicated well defined perceptions of our roles at IPRIS, and we mentioned the factors that have hindered us from or enabled us to realise those perceptions effectively. The factors that have contributed to our socialisation as individuals include our embodied capitals, which are external wealth converted into an essential part of a person.

It is important to define the expected roles in the secondary participants’ institutional context and to show how I, the primary participant, in turn influence the context that defines our perceptions of our roles. Since I have been working at IPRIS (beginning in 2010), the institution has not released a fully definitive description of the roles of the EFL educators. Thus, the educators at the IPRIS have continuously needed to rely on their previously acquired and accumulated knowledge about teaching from other contexts to educate the students at IPRIS. The EFL educators at the IPRIS have consistently requested clarification and a definition of their role expectations. However,
because of the transient nature of the school, once a definition is constructed, many educators and administrators alike fulfil their 2-year contractual obligations and secure work elsewhere. The extent to which the roles of the EFL educators have been defined in our context is described in the following critical incident. The critical incident below marks a time where I was simultaneously wrapping up one role as a grade 4 teacher and beginning my new role as Language Program Coordinator.

As I began to prepare for my new role as Language Programs Coordinator at IPRIS, I held a short meeting before the teachers left for summer holiday. At the beginning of our meeting, held on June 25, 2014, I projected my presentation on a white board in the Grade 4 classroom where I had taught from November through June. I showed part of a document from IPRIS that attempts to define clearly the roles of the EFL educators, hoping to raise awareness of the ambiguity between what IPRIS expects and how we actually perceive our roles. The document I showed is part of the ‘IPRIS supervisory packet’, which each of the teachers present would have reviewed previously. One item says that a satisfactory teacher ‘demonstrates current and appropriate knowledge’ (IPRIS supervisory packet, 2013–2014). An EFL educator (not a secondary participant in this study) asked, ‘Well… how are educators supposed to know what “appropriate knowledge” is if they are new to Turkey and new to IPRIS? I mean we are not familiar with the learning outcomes for the students as put forward by the ministry.’ In referring to ‘the ministry’, this teacher meant the Turkish Ministry of Education. I replied to her with a knowing and, I hope, a consoling nod. ‘That is the reason we are meeting today. The student learning outcomes are published’, I continued, ‘but they are published in Turkish, so we must rely on our Turkish counterparts and the Turkish principal to inform us of what those learning outcomes are’. (Critical incident, 25 June 2014)

The event above is critical because it uncovers the essence of the organization (Erlandson 1993): other events like these have been commonplace during the entire time I have been at IPRIS. The difference is that at the time of the meeting, I was in a position to work toward change by writing up a flexible set of learning outcomes for students, specifically for English language learning. The critical incident given here illustrates what I perceive as my role at IPRIS. Below, the secondary participants and I explain what we perceive as our roles at IPRIS. Collectively, these explanations answer research question 2.
I met with Selen in her classroom, which doubled as her office, where she began to talk to me and to agree to be a part of my research. She then clearly outlined what she saw as her role as an EFL educator at IPRIS.

My role is the teaching of English to Turkish students, mainly. I often compare this school to other Turkish private schools because the teaching philosophy in terms of English is so much different from ours. And, I think that’s why the parents prefer us. For example, our students have phonetic spelling, whereas Turkish students in private schools don’t have phonetic spelling. As my role, I see myself as a normal ESL teacher, really, here in the school, who is trying to catch up the students to the main level of whatever grade they are. (Selen, first interview, 22 November 2013)

Selen clearly stated what she perceived her role to be as an EFL educator at IPRIS. Her perception of her role was centred on ‘phonetic spelling’ and on ‘trying to catch up the students to the main level’. According to Aydin (2008), however, a narrow focus on ‘spelling has been found to create a negative attitude towards English courses. In his study, which surveyed 112 Turkish EFL educators at Balıksır University in Turkey, he concluded that general language anxiety, which includes fear of spelling mistakes, can impede communication with the teacher’s peers and taking test. Aydin (2008) suggested that EFL educators in Turkey could focus on altering the learning situations to allay such anxiety.

To this end, I created a professional development opportunity at IPRIS to help teachers make their students more comfortable with the writing process. In this process, the EFL educator uses personal recollections as verbal prompts to incite meaningful writing, thus building a connection between teacher and student, and allowing the student to see the teacher not only as a model of literacy but also as a person with a life beyond the classroom.

After I facilitated this professional development opportunity, which I had titled ‘My voice, your ears’ and which was offered on a Saturday afternoon, I met with Tabitha.
Tabitha suggested that we meet in her classroom, which, as with Selen, doubled as her office space.

I think my role is to bring all the knowledge I have about reading, curriculum, and instruction to the curricular framework here. In the United States, I was the educational technologist. So, while here, I have worked with the former elementary school principal to further technology and its integration, so that it would, in turn, build the literacy skills of the students. (*Tabitha, first interview, 4 December 2013*)

Tabitha’s explanation of how she perceived her role was not as clear as Selen’s. She gives examples of a perception of bringing the knowledge of ‘reading, curriculum, and instruction to the curricular framework’ at IPRIS. Her explanation centred on the use of technology to ‘build the literacy skills of the students’. At IPRIS, integrating technology into language learning has not yet been realized, though I do intend to facilitate a greater use of technology in the teaching and learning of EFL. Tabitha’s explanation of her role as an EFL educator also put the students’ needs ahead of her own, similar to the way Dexter explained his view of his role as an EFL educator.

In my first attempts to meet with Dexter, as reflected in the data pulled from my reflexive journal, I was not so sure that we were going to be able to meet.

This interview that I have with Dexter has been rescheduled twice; I do understand that he does not have a commitment to do this, but I also feel as though he is brushing me off…. [It is] Istanbul in December, nearly dark, and it is only 5:00 pm. Classes ended an hour ago, and I have Dexter’s first interview at 5:30…. Not rushing out of the school building, and sitting close to the electric heater must have worked well because I am excited about collecting this data from him if he doesn’t cancel, of course. (*reflexive journal, 25 November 2013*)

I looked at my mobile phone only to see that it was 5:30, and Dexter had not yet arrived. When I sent him a text message, he responded in less than a minute’s time stating that we would need to meet at my *lojman* instead of his. Once he arrived, he said, ‘If we were to do the interview in my *lojman*, you would need to interview X [his
child] as well’. It was during this interview that I found out how Dexter viewed his role as an educator at IPRIS.

First and foremost, I view my role as being … responsible for ensuring that my students have a lifelong love for learning. It is important for me that my colleagues and I help our students … to solve real world problems. Specifically, my key role here at IPRIS is related to the learning of English as a foreign language. (Dexter, first interview, 25 November 2013)

Dexter’s comments in this first interview clearly reflect his view of his role as an EFL educator. The second interview with Dexter on the 16th of December was quite different. Matching the theoretical framework, Dexter’s statements in the second interview reflect what Bourdieu (1990, p.114) referred to as ‘linguistic capital’. This capital, which is embodied in language, refers to one’s mastery of and relationship to language, including pronunciation and accents. Bourdieu’s (1977) notion of linguistic capital is a component of the embodied state and is manifest in the first years of schooling. With this concept in mind, we can see that the personified speaker of English would be the White American, with whom IPRIS is most familiar, and not Dexter, who is Black Jamaican; he does not have the ‘face of English’ (Melville 2012), although he is a native speaker of English. Thus, the symbol of the native speaker has defined the linguistic boundaries that position the non-native speaker of English as bankrupt (Gill, 2012); these boundaries externally predetermine Dexter’s role as an EFL educator at IPRIS. In his classroom (which he chose as the second interview site), Dexter had the opportunity to reflect on his role at IPRIS:

I can say the first year was a bit difficult for me – or I should say the first term – let's put it that way. Early on in the semester, I was told that parents were complaining that kids didn’t understand me because of my accent. So they went to the principal at the time and complained that Jamaicans are not … native speakers of English. The parents insisted that Jamaicans are actually second language speakers, and they were paying for their children to learn from native speakers of English. The principal at the time asked that I speak a little slower than I usually would in class. I told him I couldn’t do that. I told him that I
thought my kids understood me perfectly well. They understood my accent because when I asked questions in my class, the responses that I got from my kids showed that they understood. And, after a couple of weeks they were showing great interest in the accent; they were more attracted to the accent than being turned off from it. So, that was one scenario that taught me what my role was here. *(Dexter, second interview, 16 December 2013)*

I thought for a while, gazing through the window at the massive spread of land that is IPRU and beyond Istanbul, as if a response would be there. My focus went in and out between listening keenly to him as an EFL colleague and thinking as a researcher.

Dexter’s statement reminded me of what Moussu and Llurda (2008, p.316) demonstrated when they said, ‘People typically display a fairly high ability at spotting accentedness in speech. If the speaker’s accent is different from the listener’s, and the listener cannot recognise it as any other “established” accent, the speaker will be placed within the non-native speaker category’. The established accent at IPRIS currently is an American accent, and 90% of the international faculty hail from America. The American accent has been deeply embedded in the context of English in Turkey from its beginnings in 1863 with the formation of the former Robert College in Istanbul, as I have shown in Chapter 1.

Dexter’s ‘scenario’ and Erlandson’s (1993) ‘critical incident’ compelled me to recall and consider similar comments that colleagues have made to me about my accent, which I shared with Dexter.

Okay, and with that I have to tell you that since I have been here at IPRIS, many of the teachers often ask about my interesting English accent. One teacher, while asking, sat up [in] her chair and did something strange where she stiffened and elongated her neck in a mocking sort of way. Most teachers ask quizzically with a tilt of the head and furrowed brow, to boot. But of course I don’t hear this accent that they speak about. *(Edmund, data source, 16 December 2013)*
Dexter’s critical incident and my response in the second interview suggest the existence of a hierarchy of native and non-native teachers of English based on the perceived social status of the speaker/teacher. However, both Dexter and I are native English speakers, he from Jamaica and I from the United States. Rubin (1992) stated that the credibility of non-native English-speaking teachers is often challenged because of the fact that they have an ‘accent’ or (as it relates to Dexter and me) they do not look ‘American’ or ‘English’, meaning white Anglo-Saxon. I think, like Swales (1993, p.284), that concerning the native speaker/non-native speaker debate in ELT, ‘it no longer makes any sense to differentiate between the native speaker and the non-native speaker’. If we look again at Rubin’s (1992) assertion, one may surmise that my alleged ‘English accent’ may be part of the way that these teachers view me. It would explain the ‘quizzical look’, including the ‘furrowed brows’. If I am perceived by American educators to have an English accent that originates from the UK, the ‘quizzical look’ may represent confusion over why I may be associated with a more powerful group.

As we continued our conversation, Dexter folded his arms and lapsed briefly into thought. The long silence was a little uncomfortable, and I was relieved when he began to speak: ‘Edmund, what about your role? How do you view your role now that you are in your third teaching assignment for the year? Do you view your role differently than when you taught pre-kindergarten and kindergarten for the last three?’ I felt relief because he was comfortable enough to ask me questions as I had planned in the initial stages of this research. I responded as follows:

Well…I have always worn many hats in my life; sometimes those hats were chosen and sometimes they were simply put on top of my head, to speak metaphorically. The times that I worked in early childhood education were great in that I was able to introduce an idea to the students, and they were eager to grab that idea and run with it, sometimes literally, too [I laugh, Dexter smiles]. Teaching Grade 3 was not planned, as you know, but it did allow me to see how
the students were progressing in terms of their language development, particularly since many of them were my first students at IPRIS. I don’t know if you remember, but I covered kindergarten for a month before I taught pre-kindergarten when I first arrived in 2010. When I went in to work as an EAL teacher [after my time in Grade 3], I was inundated with administering language assessments when I went from one classroom to another and pulled students out; that was the base of my work that I imagined myself doing for an extended period. It was fine but… I don’t know, I felt as though my skills weren’t being used in the best way possible. The fourth grade assignment, though, really bothered me. I am certified to teach pre-k through Grade 6, but at the same time, other teachers could have been moved around as well. My role at IPRIS has always been sort of being a multi-purpose man. Naturally, I look to pull the positives of experiences, but once I saw that the same types of issues were repeatedly happening, I guess my positivity wore thin. Ultimately, I do think my role in large part has been to teach English to students whose parents are most interested in their children learning from American teachers. (Edmund, answering a question from Dexter during the second interview, 16 December 2013)

In reading and re-reading my response to Dexter, I can see a progressive disenchantment. The wearing of the ‘many hats’ that I speak of in my response to Dexter began when I worked as a university instructor and IPRU/EFL educator at IPRIS in 2010, where I already felt divided. From that time until 2014, my professional roles included teaching prekindergarten, kindergarten, high school, Grade 3, EAL, Grade 4, interning as a principal, and now in my new role as language program coordinator. In all of these roles, as I explained to Dexter, I still ‘felt as though my skills weren’t being used in the best way possible’. Howey and Zimpher (2006) refer to this increasing trend in universities connected to PK-12 schools as ‘boundary-spanning’ positions. Howey and Zimpher (2006, p.5) describe ‘boundary spanners’ as ‘those individuals who [blur] the lines of responsibility traditionally assumed by those in universities, and schools’. According to this theoretical framework, people like me who cross the traditional boundaries of professional role responsibilities, which Howey and Zimpher call ‘border crossers’, invoke notions of a third space where migrants become hybrids, and liminal positions emerge in a third space. The notion of a third space
originates from hybridity theory, which recognizes that individuals who are habitually in-between geographic locations and roles draw on multiple discourses to make sense of the world around them (Bhabha 1990).

I explicitly state what I perceive my role to be as an EFL educator at IPRIS when I explain, ‘I do think my role in large part has been to teach English….’ In looking at my response to Dexter, I can see that when I finished this explanation by saying ‘…to students whose parents are most interested in their children learning from American teachers’, my perception of my role is still informed by the fact that the majority of EFL educators at IPRIS are from North America. My perception of my role also relates to what I have learned about Americans first introducing ELT in Turkey, as I discussed in Chapter 1. From that time, the preference for an American brand of English has been noticeable in Turkish EFL educators, as Coskun (2011) points out.

In sum, all of the participants expressed a deep commitment to the needs of the students at IPRIS. Selen viewed her role as a ‘trying to catch up the students to the main level’; Tabitha believes her primary role is ‘build[ing] the literacy skills of the students’, and Dexter desires to ensure that his ‘students have a lifelong love for learning’. My own response to Dexter, that I perceive my role as ‘teach [ing] English to students whose parents are most interested in their children learning from American teachers’ expresses a dual commitment, first to my students and second to the wider societal context of Turkey and globalisation. It seems that I am unable to separate my view of my role in the same way as the secondary participants.

5.4 Role(s) of English as the global language

In this section, I present the findings from the participants’ views on English as the global language, which are that the role of English is to represent ‘the global as well as
the local, which often permeate each other’ (Canagarajah 2012, p.262). All of the secondary respondents included the word ‘now’ when describing their view of English as a global language. In exploring the participants’ view of English as a global language, it became clear that all of us had to reflect on the very thread that binds us as professionals. As EFL educators, Canagarajah (2012) notes, we cannot sustain ourselves as a homogeneous profession with a centralised organisation anymore. I see these views as crucial, particularly because the English language defines us as professionals and is central to our livelihoods.

The secondary participants’ frequent use of the word ‘now’ is explained by a small-scale research project I had conducted for Phase 1, Module 2. In that study, ‘I began to consider that what I originally perceived as English linguistic imperialism at [IPRIS] may in fact be the English language in its role of continued globalisation’ (Melville 2012). This previous research revealed that 64% of IPRIS graduates go on to study in North American universities and then return to Turkey to capitalise on their spoils (Melville 2012). Chew (2010, p.85) referred to this phenomenon as ‘linguistic migration’, and it is this perspective that caused my earlier perceptions to shift (see Chapter 1). This linguistic migration is often in search of what Chew has metaphorically labelled ‘linguistic gold’, which is English, the language typically pursued in the search for linguistic capital.

Kramsch (1999, p.138) observed that ‘[i]f there is one thing that globalization has bought us, and that the teaching of English makes possible, it is travel, migration, multiple alliances and a different relationship to time and place’. Because I wanted to know the secondary participants’ view on the role of English as a global language, a
question in the first and second round of interviews directly addressed research question 2 about our relationship to globalisation.

Can (as well as the rest of the participants) used the word ‘now’ multiple times (highlighted in red) when describing English as a global language.

English is the language of the world. I mean, English is now becoming very important as we progress in time; English is now becoming like a staple language in countries. We’ve always had this notion that a second language is beneficial; now you must know your mother tongue and English. English is a given. You have to know English. (Can, first interview, 2 December 2013)

Can clearly perceives the role of English as a global language, his comments also suggesting his relationship to globalisation for two reasons. First, his frequent use of the word ‘now’ demarks this era of globalisation. Second, his comments invoke findings from a Korean study by Sung (2012), who found that English is touted as a must if one does not want to lag behind in the fast-changing society and ever-increasing competition in a globalised world. Can explained further: ‘I think the reason for this is … that there are more and more countries now where English is the common language … used … for communication’. Can’s statements, reflecting his ardent views concerning the role of English as a global language, which are like those of Sarıçoban and Sarıçoban (2012, p.30): ‘With the effect of globalization, English has had an increasing status in Turkey because it has become the lingua franca of the world’.

Can, who was born in Australia but said that ‘I am as Turkish as my parents’, urged me to consider the role of English as a global language.

I want you to think not only about Turkey, because if you go to France as a German, Italian, or Turkish person, like me, you may find that the French may not speak your mother tongue. But, if you speak English, you may then be more likely to communicate freely with them in English. I see the role of English in the world as the bridge language, and it’s more and more a language, which you must know now. (Can, second interview, 20 December)
In following Can’s advice to think about English as the ‘bridge language’, I read other competing views on the perceived role of English as a global language. For example, according to House (1999), when two or more different people, none of whom have English as the mother tongue, choose English as a bridge for communication, the role of English becomes the *lingua franca*. Tabitha, who is from the United States, also expressed her view of the role of English as the global language when she remarked,

*I think that now the role of English as a global language has a lot to do with the tourism industry. I was just in the Netherlands and Tanzania, and I was surprised how all of the workers spoke English. But, maybe it's because of the British, who were so out in the world, I mean well… the British were the world power for such a long time… everywhere I visit, they don't ask if we're Americans. They ask if we're English.*

Tabitha’s comments, like Can’s, suggest her relationship to globalisation in two ways. First, she explained that she was able to use English as a lingua franca as she visited the Netherlands and Tanzania, where she was surprised at how many people spoke English. Similarly, MacDonald (2002, p.5) asserts that ‘…globalization leads to a direct, face-face connection; where the commodity chain of global tourism brings consumers (those who travel) directly into contact with the lowest rung on the commodity chain of travel (those who carry their bags)’. Second, her relationship to globalisation emerges when she refers to ‘the British, who were so out in the world’, and ‘the British [who] were the world power for such a long time’; she is alluding to the British imperialism that spread the English language throughout its colonies. Here we note that McLaren and Farahmandpur (2001) argue that ‘globalisation’ has effectively replaced ‘imperialism’ in the vocabulary of the privileged class. These comments are central to the argument made in this thesis, which may be summarized as ‘what was old is now new’.
Because I was continually returning to Can’s advice – ‘I want you to think not only about Turkey’ – I continued to read about how people in other countries view the role of English as a global language, and Al-Jarf’s (2008a) findings jarred my thinking. Al-Jarf, who researches and teaches in Saudi Arabia, showed that 96% of the participants in a study she conducted considered English superior to Arabic. In the context of that study, the participants felt it was imperative to learn English because the world has become a small village in which English is the dominant language.

This view of the role of English as dominant because it is the global language can be linked to Can’s assertion that English is a language that ‘you must know now’.

Similarly, a notion of the English language in a superior role was evident in Tabitha’s remark, ‘The British were the world power for such a long time’. Reflexively, from Can’s perception and advice, and Tabitha’s view, combined with Al-Jarf’s (2008a) findings, I am also obliged to consider the competitive role(s) of English as the global language in the ELT field in the Bourdieuan sense. Bourdieu argued that ‘the social structure of a given field is premised upon dominant and subordinate positions’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p.97). Incited to further thought, I began to consider that the consideration of English as ‘superior’ and/or ‘dominant’ may result from people’s perception of their positioning vis a vis their knowledge of English in this global village. Fields are vast, encompassing all social realities (Wacquant 1989), including those who view the role of English as dominant or dominating.

Tila, who is from Syria and whose mother tongue is Arabic, held views similar to Can’s regarding the role of English as a global language. Her views also pointed to her relationship with globalisation. When I spoke with Tila in her classroom, it still smelled of the cucumber and white cheese sandwiches that had been her students’ lunch. The
The US is politically the strongest country now, so you have an advantage. And as history has shown us, if a country’s language is politically strong, that country’s language will most probably prevail, and English is a perfect example. As we see, if the English-language speaking country is politically strong, the language also dominates. (Tila, first interview, 29 November 2013)

Tila’s comments during this first interview clearly reflect her perception of the role of English as a global language. Tila also hints at her relationship to globalisation when she says ‘as history has shown us’ and ‘if the English-language speaking country is politically strong, the language also dominates’. Robertson (1990) argues (as Tila implied) that globalisation is not merely a contemporary event; he recognizes that it has a long history. Tila’s mention of the political strength of English-speaking countries invokes Bourdieu’s notion that the ‘dominance of language forms is ultimately related to the power structure of a society’ (Finlayson 1999, p.58).

Selen echoed Tila’s view of the role of English as a global language. Selen’s mother tongue is German, although her parents are Turkish nationals. Unlike Tila, Selen showed hesitation in linking her political views with the English language (although she did). Selen explained, ‘Now, English has become the world’s language. I do not want to put in my political views, but obviously, it is imperialism as well, in that regard, in that while you spread your language, you spread your culture as well. Just look at IPRU; we nicknamed this place Little America’. Selen’s explanation demonstrated both affinity and resentment as she said, ‘Here in Turkey, you have to know English; it is a requirement if you want to be successful. …[A]ll of the research and technological advancements are from the West’. 
Both Selen’s and Tila’s perceptions of English as the global language reflect resentment similar to that expressed by the participants in Ozturk and Atay’s (2010) study of non-native EFL educators. This study revealed that all of the participants viewed native speakers (e.g. from the US or UK) as being ‘much more welcome’ in Turkey than Turkish EFL educators. Participants in that study made comments like ‘native speakers don’t need to be ELT graduates’ and ‘for them being native is enough’ (Ozturk and Atay 2010, p.137). All of the participants in that study had been rejected for employment at Turkish English medium private schools. Bourdieu (1993, p.72) defined fields as ‘arenas of struggle for control over valued resources or forms of capital’. Here we see, through Tila’s and Selen’s comments as well as those from the participants in Ozturk and Atay’s study, concrete examples of a struggle for valued resources, which is the struggle over economic capital.

During the second interview, Tila leaned forward, looked me square in the eye, and spoke with a rather sharp tone. I felt the sharpness was directed at me as her American colleague and an American researcher. Tila’s comments seemingly constituted something just short of catharsis rather than simple answers to the questions as she exclaimed, ‘…[E]ven technology-wise, English is the universal language now. Let’s say a product is invented in Japan; the labels are translated into English not only for US and the UK but also for many countries around the globe’ (Tila, second interview, 20 December 2013).

Tila’s comments on how she views the role of the English language directly related to Dexter’s, who said in his second interview, ‘Now, there are so many things that you can do with technology in terms of communication. With English, you can make an instant connection anywhere in the world that would take you maybe weeks or months a generation or two earlier’. In articulating his view this way, Dexter also clearly
revealed his relationship to globalisation. MacDonald (2002, p.1–2) similarly articulates, ‘…the technologies of globalization that annihilate socio-spatial distance insert us into webs of relationships with individuals and communities that are unknown to us in any corporeal way’. Tila’s and Dexter’s similar perceptions of the role of English as the global language suggested the compression of time and space that MacDonald refers to. However, Tila in her second interview (as she questioned my interest) did not reflect a ‘web of relationships’ with me as an individual:

OK, we have spoken about how I view the role of English as a global language. Let’s talk about how you see the role that the English language plays across the globe. English is the language of instruction here in Turkey and almost everywhere. I know that in Syria, Lebanon, and many other Arabic countries, you need to know English. But Spanish is also spoken all over the world, and we are not sitting here speaking about Spanish. My question for you is [this]: aren’t you only interested because of the economic and political power that English has? Isn’t that the reason that you are interested in the role that English plays as a global language? (Tila, second interview, 20 December 2013)

I responded to Tila’s questioning of my view of the role of English as a global language:

Well…I have become more interested in the role of English as a global language as I have progressed through my studies. I don’t know if I could or would, for that matter, separate the economic and political power a language has, partly because of my study and particularly because I have taught ESL in the US and EFL in Turkey and [am] studying International Education in the UK. Outside of education, I also lived in Greece and Japan for extended periods. In all of those, before I learned the local language, I was able to speak English as the global language that it is. Yes! That is the way I see it: English as the global language all has to do with its politics and the power it elicits globally. If you examine the history of different countries – and let’s take Turkey, for example – I mean the way it is now the most popular foreign language being learned and taught. But that’s now, and through my studies I have come to recognise how English in Turkey became the most sought after foreign language, replacing French in the beginning of the republic. It was French in the beginning of the Republic because of the founder’s [by this I mean Atatürk’s] associations with the leaders of France and the strength that the French language had globally in that time. We’re speaking of the early 1930s. Now we see a similar trend with a different language, although then it was French. After that, it was German during a time when thousands of Turkish people were asked to go Germany for work and brought their families with them. Now it is English.
My response to Tila clearly reflects my perception of the role of English as a global language. Tila’s pointed and accusatorial question, ‘[A]ren’t you only interested because of the economic and political power that English has?’ made me feel a bit uncomfortable. I responded as honestly as I could by explaining that I indeed did not see a separation of ‘the economic and political power a language has’ in becoming the ‘most sought after foreign language’ that English is today. I think this is what Pennycook (2007, p.112) meant when he wrote that EFL educators provide English education as the ‘global commodity’. Similarly, Bourdieu (1991) has discussed the commodification of language where ELT is referred to as a ‘linguistic market’. As in any market, there are ‘monopolies in the markets of linguistic goods’ (Bourdieu 1992, p.147). As an American EFL educator, I surmise that I represent that ‘monopoly’ to Tila, which is why her tone may have been so sharp and accusatory.

In what Bourdieu terms a ‘linguistic market’, the speakers themselves (in this case, the EFL educators) are assigned values. We may conceptualise ELT as a field (an arena of struggle) that has a linguistic market, wherein EFL educators are considered to possess different amounts of linguistic capital. The amounts of linguistic capital (i.e. accents and native or non-native varieties of English) determine the value EFL educators have, depending on the ideology of the country’s and school’s culture (Finlayson 1999). Finlayson’s (1999) description is what Bourdieu termed symbolic violence, ‘which is exercised upon a social agent with his or her complicity’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 2002, p.167). In this sense, EFL educators are complicit because there are other options for work. In sum, in the ELT field, specifically at IPRIS in Turkey, the role of English as a global language constructs an arena in which different linguistic representations (different forms of English) are used to compete for symbolic, social capital (i.e. recognition and praise for a job well done) as well as economic capital.
In sum, although all of the participants in this study clearly stated their perception of the role of English as a global language, the contrasting and sometimes contradictory views produce an arena of struggle that Bourdieu refers to as a field. In the ELT field at IPRIS in Turkey, English as the global language separates and binds us. It separates us in terms of how we are positioned as non-native or native EFL educators. It binds us in that our use of the English language in context is the shared tool that sustains us with relation to our social, cultural, political, and economic needs.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

6.1 Introduction

As a profession, EFL education has evolved away from its origins in the colonialist expansion that spread English across the globe: thus, some of the aims in the adoption of English have changed. Some of those aims within EFL education include using English as a bridging language, or ‘lingua franca’ (House 1999), enhancing ‘global tourism’ (MacDonald 2002), and serving ‘linguistic migration’ (Chew 2010). Our era places the globalisation of English at the centre of the role of EFL educators, whether the expectation arises from the country in which they work, the institution, or their own views of English as a global language. The purpose for employing a naturalistic, analytic, auto-ethnographic research methodology for this study was to describe, analyse, and interpret the three research questions that guided this study. Those questions are as follows: (1) How do I fit in/belong as an educator at IPRIS? (2) What do we as EFL educators perceive as our roles at the IPRIS? (3) What relationship as EFL educators do we have to globalisation?

Chapter 6 wraps up the thesis with a discussion of the findings in relation to each of the research questions. It presents the limitations of this research study, shows how this study may contribute to original knowledge, and addresses its implications. Finally, recommendations are provided for social institutions, such as schools.

6.2 Discussion

The ‘background to the fore’ theme emerged inductively as participants shared with me demographic information (some shared more than others). Those who provided additional information gave me insight into the sociological elements of race, class,
nationality, gender, and age with which the participants most identify. Tila, for example, chose to foreground religion as an element of her lineage and development; Dexter made a point of discussing the commonalities that he and I share in terms of our background, and Tabitha provided extra information about the socioeconomic status of her grandfather. This information, given without prompting, suggests that the highlighted background elements have strongly affected these participants’ current situations.

A connection between familial structure and occupational structure also emerged as I analysed the participants’ responses. The conscious decision that almost all of the participants made to come to Turkey to work as EFL educators was, in some way, informed by their familial role. The extra information that emerged from the data, provided mainly by Tila, Dexter, and Tabitha, encouraged me to consider the reasoning behind the way my habitus was formed prior to entering the field.

Before IPRIS, all of the participants in this study seemed to regard employment at the IPRIS as a second rather than a first choice, and in some cases, as ‘employment of the last resort’ (Bennell and Akyeampong 2007). In the final emergent theme, ‘At IPRIS’, all of the participants reported that they did not feel enabled in their roles as EFL educators, although the men in this study conceded that they were more enabled in their roles than their female counterparts. All of this background information on each participant illustrates how we have pulled from and/or developed our accumulated capitals as EFL educators prior to entering our fields. The push-pull factors described by the participants indicate the ways that we think, act, feel, and perceive as mutual inhabitants of the field presented in Chapter 4.
In Chapter 5, the secondary participants’ view of me as well as my perception of self in the context of IPRIS in Turkey in this globalised era (i.e. the field) responds to the first research question: How do I fit in/belong as an educator at IPRIS? I found my fit through the reciprocal influence between the setting of IPRIS and the secondary participants, which Anderson (2006a) and Davies (1999) label reflexivity. Part of the reciprocal effects between the setting, the secondary participants, and me became manifest during the final phase of data collection when Selen e-mailed me with a subject line that said ‘I will miss the interviews’. Selen further wrote, ‘It was the interviews that actually got us to know each other better’. I was thrilled to read this e-mail because I was able to understand better, what the interviewees had derived from the research process, especially since I had not been certain about the ways I would affect them and how they would affect me in this study. Reflexively, I discovered how I belonged at IPRIS by examining my role as a researcher and an EFL educator-turned-administrator. This examination allowed me to see the reciprocal influence between the secondary participants and the context, and between them and me. I was compelled to shift my perspective – from viewing myself as being of little worth to the IPRIS to regarding myself as an asset to the institution. This shift enabled me to understand not only how other EFL educators see themselves, but also how they see me, which again compelled me to view myself from a different angle. I chose to acknowledge that I continually built knowledge and skill while at this institution in my hybrid role, which shifted back and forth and included working as a prekindergarten through university educator, principal intern, and language coordinator, at IPRIS.

My perception of my own role at IPRIS, combined with the views of the secondary participants, collectively answer research question (2): ‘What do we as EFL educators perceive as our roles at the IPRIS?’ The EFL educator roles at IPRIS, although loosely
defined, position the EFL educators as transmitters of knowledge they have gained from their prior institutions and training. All of the participants expressed a deep commitment to the needs of the students at IPRIS. My own response to Dexter revealed a dual commitment, first to my students and second to the wider societal context of Turkey and globalisation.

The participants’ views suggest that the EFL educators in this study needed to bring information from their prior experiences, both as educators and from everyday life, to fulfil their primary role of teaching English to Turkish students. Thus, none of the participants felt that they were enabled in their role, as all reported that they needed to add old experiences with new in order to teach their assigned students and to navigate the terrain at IPRIS. Participants revealed a need also to draw not only from IPRIS but also from the wider societal context of Turkey and globalisation to perform their role.

This perception brings the discussion to research question (3): ‘What relationship as EFL educators do we have to globalisation?’ All of the secondary respondents frequently used the word ‘now’ as they described their views of the role of English as the global language; their comments revealed that their perception of the role of English as a global language relates strongly to both their local context and to the definition of globalisation in the literature. Can’s comment that ‘English is a given’ and Selen’s statement, ‘You must know English if you want to be successful in Turkey’, echo Sarıçoban and Sarıçoban’s (2012) sentiment that in Turkey, English is now regarded as the lingua franca of the world. Tabitha noted that on her visits to the Netherlands and Tanzania, even many of the workers knew English. Tabitha surmised this to be a symptom of the predominant and lengthy British influence in the world, revealing that her perception of globalisation was couched partly in terms of British
imperialism. Thus, my view on the role of the English language coincided with Tabitha’s comment and with Robertson’s (1990) perspective that the current globalised era can trace its beginnings to colonialism.

For Tila, also, the dominant role of English was heavily pronounced as she explained her perception of her relationship to globalisation. This was especially clear when she expressed her view (like my own) of the social structure in a given setting (ELT, specifically in Turkey at IPRIS) as being premised on dominant and subordinate positions, as Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) attest. We can see this in the social structure of globalisation, which has set a standard by which non-native EFL educators measure themselves against their native English speaker counterparts, thus perpetuating a hierarchy. The linguistic capital of non-native educators is easily mis-recognised, as they are most often seen as subordinate to the dominant native EFL educators’ linguistic capitals. One easily perceives these patterns of recognition or mis-recognition in social structures like IPRIS or elsewhere in Turkey.

Such inequities led me to recognise that my new role at IPRIS as Language Program Coordinator positions me as a ‘reflexivity winner’ (Hey 2005, p.864). Lash’s (2003, p.6) notion of reflexivity ‘winners and losers’ is determined by the extent to which the ‘resourcing of reflexive agency is structurally ordered’ (1994, p.6). Adams (2006, p.517) further observes, ‘Reflexivity is bounded in advance by the limits of social structure as embodied in one’s habitus’. Thus, individuals can be only as reflexive as their circumstances, cultures, and societies permit them to be. For example, Bourdieu (1977) noted in colonial Algeria that because of the practical need for Algerians to tend to the urgencies of their daily life, being reflexive was beyond their practical means. Because the Algerian peasants inhabited a turbulent world where the structure of the
world had turned into a contrasting mix of indigenous tradition and colonial imposition (Wacquant 2004), they were positioned as ‘reflexivity losers’ because of inhabiting a space in between tradition and modernity. They did not lose because of their lack of reflexivity, but as Adams (2006) contends, they were ‘reflexivity losers’ because they were marginalized by the social structure that colonialism had introduced, which empowered reflexivity in others. Thus, winning the game of reflexivity in the field is typically group-specific and context-dependent, and the people who win are typically from a dominant class in a given society.

The peasants of Algeria were then forced to employ their habitus as a stratagem for coping with the newly imposed way of life in their own land. Similarly, I have deployed my hybridised habitus (Adams 2006) as a stratagem to cope with my circumstances at the IPRIS. I perceive now that what Bourdieu (1992, p.131) refers to as a ‘class of circumstances’ and ‘arenas of struggle for control over valued resources (Bourdieu, 1993, p.72) may position non-native EFL educators as ‘reflexivity losers’ in the field of ELT. Thus, non-native EFL educators Selen’s and Tila’s expression of resentment towards me as a native EFL educator may stem from my perceived higher value in the linguistic marketplace of ELT. This is part of ‘the painful paradox induced by reflexive political self-awareness’ (Hey and George 2013, p.105). Institutionalised patterns of social recognition or mis-recognition also ‘generate justified demands on the way social actors treat each other’ (Honneth 2007, p.xiii). At IPRIS and in the field of ELT in general, the ‘realisation that one possesses the same qualities and abilities as those who have been recognised (institutionally), but without enjoying corresponding public recognition’ (Honneth, 2007, p.364) seems to engender resentment. I strove not to harbour resentment towards the IPRIS, even though I perceived their decision to hire me as the Language Program Coordinator as long overdue. I also continually grapple
with the way I (and, I think, my colleagues as well) am produced as a subject by the
ebb and flow of historical discourses that have shaped and continue to shape us EFL
educators who facilitate the spread of English as the ‘global commodity’ (Pennycook
2007, p. 112). As Bourdieu (1993) observed, all fields are a site of struggle, and the
actors in all fields, their habitus(es), and the capitals at stake can be understood only in
relation to each other. The reflexivity winners are those whose formed habitus enables
them to respond rapidly to the life circumstances and choices with which they are
presented. Therefore, reflexivity should be used not only as a methodological tool for
research but also for understanding the value of one’s role in relation to one’s
colleagues and context.

6.3 Limitations

Anderson (2006a, p.388) contends that an inherent limitation of an analytic auto-
ethnography is its dependence upon the ‘assessment of its merits by analytically
oriented qualitative researchers’. For Guba and Lincoln (1989), who suggest that the
integrity of interpretivist constructivist enquiry is necessarily measured differently from
that of the positivist paradigm, the concept of trustworthiness is paramount. Though
care was taken to promote the notion of trustworthiness, and although the integrity of
this research was established, my subjectivity as a critical theorist (specifically a
postcolonial critic) is the first and most notable limitation of this study.

Second, the purposive sampling, which has a non-probability basis, is arguably a
limitation. I heeded Anderson’s (2006a) suggestion that analytic auto-ethnography
requires dialogue with participants besides me, and I chose maximum variation
sampling for this naturalistic investigation because such enquiries are closely tied to
contextual factors (Lincoln and Guba 1985). I selected secondary participants as unlike
me as possible in terms of their gender, age, ethnicity, nationality, and years of teaching at IPRIS. Thus, this procedure, rather than being a limitation, greatly enriched the study. This sampling procedure, though not representing the entire population of EFL educators at the IPRIS, allowed patterns to emerge from the diverse participants and their responses (see Chapter 4) that were valuable in describing how EFL educators at IPRIS came to know and perceive their role. This dialogic and dialectical process in the interviews revealed a noteworthy limitation in Dexter’s and my closeness in terms of age and ethnicity. Despite this, my interaction with Dexter helped me achieve another aim of my research: it brought me closer to ontological authenticity.

A third limitation of this study is its findings, particularly because I depended primarily on data collected through interviews, though other means were used, such as e-mail correspondence. The member check is an excellent means of triangulating collected data (Lincoln and Guba 1985, 2005), but it has its limitations. For example, the use of English posed a hindrance to three of the five secondary participants when they were presented with the manuscripts containing the raw data. Thus, the member check process can be uncomfortable for both the researcher and the participant.

The fourth limitation is an inherent part of the social, historical, cultural, political, economic, organisational, and linguistic shifts have occurred and are continually occurring in Turkey, so my own perspective as a researcher, participant, and EFL-educator-turned-administrator has shifted and continues to do so. As I inhabit this space of limitations and uncertainty in these globalised times, my awareness has increased to recognise the ways that both I and the institution of which I am a part have shifted focus. IPRIS, for example, has gone from providing English medium education to about 1% of Turkish society, as it once did, to offering a great number of scholarships
to talented students who may otherwise not be able to pay the inflated school fees. In this way, by extension, I am able to see that the situations of these times also affect those around me, ironically enough providing me with a firmer foundation on which to stand.

6.4 Contribution

This section outlines how I have contributed to this field of education in four ways, as follows:

1. The positioning of both the EFL educator and the space that English occupies globally in which it has an opposing logic, making it more of a hybrid language.
2. The innovative use of theory and theory building, especially in terms of Bourdieu in Algeria and Bhabha’s notion of the third space, which is synchronistic with the postcolonial theory that formed my theoretical framework
4. The knowledge that I have built of myself in context and in relation to others.

6.4.1 EFL educators’ perceptions of their role

First, this study contributes to an original understanding of the ways the participants have come to know and perceive their roles as EFL educators in an era of globalisation. This understanding emerged as I formed a network with EFL colleagues at my institution, IPRIS. Through the knowledge we constructed in our relationships and our use of theory, we gained a different perspective of ourselves in our roles as EFL
educators. This shift in perception enabled us to adapt better to our institutional roles as well as to our roles in our culture and society. We may also be able to align or reposition ourselves relative to our colleagues by using reflexivity. Therefore, my research contributes to an understanding of how EFL educators’ perceptions of their roles affect their positions in the social structures that globalisation has created. The worldwide hunger for English generally arose as an inheritance from the British Empire and, subsequently, the US homogeny leading to this current era. Thus, the globalisation manifest in the ascendance of the English language is rooted in colonialism. People have learned and continue to learn English because it is in their best interest to do so. In other words, they now learn English because of their relationship with globalisation, not because of explicit coercion. As EFL educators, we simultaneously celebrate the successes of our students’ level of English proficiency while facilitating the multinational and homogenising effects of globalisation, of which we may well disapprove (Edge 2003).

Interestingly, most of the participants (Dexter, Selen, Can, Tila, and I) come from frequently undervalued positions in terms of race and nationhood. Our hybridity is forced as we navigate this in-between space of being products of our prior socialization (our religious, class, and linguistic capitals). We are simultaneously colonised and colonisers as we collectively work at a private institution ‘selling’ English in Turkey in a ‘linguistic market’ (Bourdieu 1991). Further, we are ‘border crossers’ (Howey and Zimpher 2006) in the ELT field. We are social agents whose very different habitus(es) forged by a wide range of capitals mediate our actions and interactions in this field and hybridise our roles as EFL educators. Hence, all of the participants in this study embody/represent hybridity – that is, the cross-cultural. English has become the language of the world, the linguistic capital that allows movement and flexibility; it
allows the opportunity to become someone different. The English language itself then presents an opposing logic, being both negative and positive because it enables both freedom and constraint.

**6.4.2 Theoretical framework**

Second, I have contributed to knowledge in terms of building on an original understanding of Bourdieu and his time in Algiers to develop an original use of postcolonialist theory. This use of postcolonial theory may help others to understand, first, how theorists come to develop their theories and, second, how it is possible to merge their personal backgrounds with theory to go beyond drawing simple comparisons. My theoretical framework, which illuminated Bhabha’s notion of the third space with Bourdieu’s notion of the cultural sabir, is new and may be helpful to others who resemble me and my position. In developing my theoretical framework, I had a practical need to make sense of how I gained my position as an EFL educator affected by multiple institutional, cultural, and political contexts.

**6.4.3 Development of a new approach**

Third, my thesis makes a substantial original contribution to developing a relatively new approach to qualitative research, which is analytic auto-ethnography (Anderson 2006a). Although Anderson (2006a) lists five components of analytic auto-ethnography (member researcher, analytic reflexivity, textual visibility of the researcher, informants beyond the self, and commitment to theoretical analysis), he includes almost no description of the procedures necessary to accomplish these components. To address this gap, I used Lincoln and Guba’s (1985, 1994, and 2005) research into what they called ‘naturalistic inquiry’.
Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested collecting data in three successive phases—orientation and overview, focused exploration, and member check and closure. For the first phase, I included the notion of ‘critical incident’, at the suggestion of my first supervisor, as a way to collect, analyse, and present auto-ethnographic data. The heightened reflexivity in the data analysis emerged with my second supervisor’s urging that I continually analyse myself in relation to others. These suggestions came at a time when I had begun to drift toward an evocative style of auto-ethnography, nearing the ‘self-absorbed digression’ that Anderson (2006a, p.385) derides. Incorporation of the critical incident helped me to realize that distinctive ‘cultures’, which I believe are created by people’s perceptions and actions in relation to extant social systems, work to produce circumstances that enable some and disable others. This realization helped me to understand that if I had not been hired as Language Coordinator, this thesis might have been very different because of the fragile ways that others and I are constructed by society and institutions.

In terms of focused exploration, I found that concentrating on certain key experiences from all the participants helped me to strike a balance when incorporating my own experiences ‘into the story and [considering the secondary participants] vital data for understanding’ (Anderson 2006a, p.384). What Dexter referred to as a ‘scenario’ (discussed in Chapter 5) also prompted me to read up on the different ways critical incidents can be used, and it was in these readings that I discovered that data could be collected by critical incidents and could be checked with the members who wrote them.

Using the member check was a practical way for me as a complete member researcher not only to fulfil Anderson’s (2006a) requirement of collecting data from ‘informants beyond the self’ and analysing my own experiences ‘in relation to others’ but also to
increase the validity and reliability of this research. I found that when I collected data using critical incidents, I needed to use the member check continuously in the process of analysing and reporting on the collected data (Koelsch 2013) in order to achieve fairness in representing the participants and to enhance trustworthiness and credibility.

The emergent design of this approach enabled me to reflect on my reflexive decision-making processes, leading to my new role as Language Program Coordinator at IPRIS. My methodological inventiveness became increasingly evident as I drew from a range of different theorists, and by doing so added to the depth of the original design as I built upon it. I also built upon my experience as a former dancer/choreographer in attempting to apply the precision I learned in classical ballet to my methodology. This aim created an inherent tension in my attempt to develop a new approach to enquiry because I simultaneously wanted to present a text wherein the reader’s perceptions would take precedence over my intent as the author—an approach that Derrida (1997) labelled ‘deconstruction’. Thus, continuing the dance analogy, I bent back on myself while leaping forward, and, paradoxically, this method has made my study largely successful, just as aiming for precision in classical ballet enabled me to perform modern dance. Thus, this thesis substantially contributes to Anderson’s (2006a) notion of analytic auto-ethnography as a method of enquiry by contributing a design and descriptions of the procedures necessary to carry it out.

6.4.4 Self + theory

Fourth, the research process for this thesis also contributed to a greater knowledge of self. Atkinson (2006) emphasises ethnographers’ recognizing their own experiences, and Anderson (2006a, p.384) believes that researchers need to incorporate their own experiences ‘into the story and [consider them] vital data for understanding’. My
experiences of thinking that I was not an important component of the IPRIS led me to feel undervalued by the institution. As a critical theorist, I worked toward greater ontological authenticity (Guba and Lincoln 2005), drawing from Bhabha’s (1994) notion of the ‘third space of enunciation’ that gives rise to postcolonial theory and undergirds my postcolonial ontology. Bhabha’s idea owes much to poststructuralism’s aim of deconstructing the prevailing ideologies that underpin positivism (Stockman 1984). Derrida (1997, p.6) contends that deconstruction is ‘the tension between memory, fidelity and the preservation of something that has been given to us’ whilst at the same time creating ‘something absolutely new’. In this third space, I deconstructed my own assumptions about myself as well as those of others. I combatted these assumptions by drawing from my embodied capitals, which consist of external wealth converted into habitus (Bourdieu 1986). My epistemological positioning arises from my habitus as it unconsciously facilitates the way I process information about the world around me, including the people. As I employed Bourdieu’s (1990) type of reflexivity, I pulled from the sociological conditions in which I exist and made them visible. In coming to know the globalised world better in my particular context, I have formed a ‘reflexive habitus’, which is becoming ‘increasingly common…due to various social and cultural shifts’ (Sweetman 2003, p.526). Between these shifts and in understanding ‘both self and others through examining [my] actions’ (Anderson 2006a, p.382), I constructed knowledge through interactions both interdependent and contextually based. My research approach enabled me to deflect the distorted representations of myself perpetuated in academic discourse while contributing to such discourse. From my hybrid status, this mixture of my fragmented, complementary, and contradictory self, reconstructed with others in context, became a stratagem for speaking to a wider community of educators, researchers, and academics.
6.5 Implications

Very little research has been done on how EFL educators actually perceive their roles. Even less research is available on how EFL educators can contribute to their respective institutionalised role expectations. In addition, not many (if any) analytic auto-ethnographic theses have been produced by other doctoral students.

Because I was able to share my perceptions of my role as an EFL educator with the participants, my thesis advisors, and others, I was able to confirm how my knowledge is contextually linked to the dialogical processes. Researching and writing an analytic auto-ethnography has raised my awareness of how other people inform my perceptions, my contexts, and my theories. This essential component of self-development is strongly linked to professional development.

To enable EFL educators at IPRIS to raise their own awareness of other people and of institutional and cultural contexts through reflexivity, I recommend the use of analytic auto-ethnography as a form of professional development and evaluation. The EFL educators at IPRIS should be able to represent themselves and learn from others in context. In K-12 education, using an analytic auto-ethnography may enable EFL educators to build their knowledge of themselves as they absorb the complexity of learning and teaching in the varied contexts in which they work.

In my new role as Language Programs Coordinator, I plan to encourage EFL educators to generate an analytic auto-ethnography by drawing from their own historical cultural contexts. Chang (2008, p.125) notes that ‘what makes auto-ethnography ethnographic is its intent of gaining cultural understanding’. In this light, it may be helpful for EFL educators to use auto-ethnography as a tool to investigate their own cultures in relation to the new cultures they encounter as they travel for work. In this way, EFL educators
may see their cultures ‘as a product of interactions between self and others in a community of practice’ (Chang 2008, p.23). Dunne and Johnston (2007, p.516) support this idea by asserting that ‘education informed by practical interest is concerned with “meaning making” through the construction of personal understandings, in alignment with the accepted interpretations of experts in the field.’

As another demonstration of this method, Afonso (2009), a trainer of science teachers in Mozambique, created an auto-ethnographic text to raise awareness in herself and in other teachers in the context. Afonso (2009, p.274) contends, ‘It is important to unveil hidden assumptions that may still be framing our practices and which may promote naive reproductive teaching which perpetuates myths that maintain and reinforce marginalization of some cultures’. In this way, auto-ethnographies may be used as a ‘research method that utilises the researcher’s autobiographical data to analyse and interpret their cultural assumptions’ (Chang 2008, p.9).

Obviously, not everyone can write a doctoral thesis, so to modify the principles for use in a setting such as IPRIS, I propose the following techniques for enabling EFL educators to create analytic auto-ethnography as a form of professional development and/or an evaluative tool.

- Draw consciously on their embodied selves as both EFL practitioners and participants.
- Document the skill sets and experience that they bring to the organisation.
- Research and summarize the history of the school/organization/research site to better understand and document how the institution came to be.
- Identify the most specific description of their role expectation from the institution.
• Collect critical incidents concerning themselves in the context of the school during the first 6 months of an academic year.

• Write approximately 100 words for each bulleted point and a final paragraph explaining how they perceive their role in relation to the institution’s expectations.

In sum, my research has helped to give me a number of insights into EFL education, which I hope can help me in my role as an educational leader among my colleagues. In my new role as the Language Programs Coordinator at IPRIS, I have facilitated professional development opportunities for my educator colleagues that allowed them to use their personal understandings to construct auto-ethnographic texts. These texts would initially aim to help them make meaning of their perceptions as EFL educators, in tandem with their occupational roles at IPRIS. When I explained the idea to the EFL educators that I supervise, I was excited by their response. One EFL educator (not in this study) urged me to expand my proposal so that her auto-ethnographic text could include an opportunity for her to write about how IPRIS could support her development as a professional in context. By creating auto-ethnographic texts, EFL educators at IPRIS are now enabled to use their lived experiences, in both the school and the cultural context, to consider the ways these experiences have affected their professional practice, excavating their own historical knowledge in order to influence the school in which they work and, in turn, the larger society.

6.6 Recommendations

I consider that the research in this thesis supports the use of analytical auto-ethnography in such social institutions as schools as a means of improving insider relations. Further research could be conducted to elicit meaningful events that highlight
and affect the participants’ and researchers’ perceptions of self. Such research would give necessary attention to the participants’ and researchers’ basic assumptions about themselves and about their cultural and institutional context.

Colleagues, school administrators, and language program coordinators can then use this information to set group norms for a network of teachers within a school, based on the information collected and interpreted. This type of research would aim to bring clarity to individuals and groups in the absence of clearly defined role expectations, guiding some toward an efficient way to think, feel, and act in new and unfamiliar contexts.

Many, including Coffey (1999) have charged researchers engaging with auto-ethnographies with being narcissistic. The word ‘narcissistic’ is derived from a Greek myth in which a female nymph, Echo, seeks the attention of Narcissus, a handsome son of a god. When Narcissus ignores her advances, the vindictive Nemesis casts a spell on him that makes him love only himself. Absorbed with himself, he eventually dies and lives again as a flower, an objectified symbol of beauty. My intent, though, has been to (re)assemble my collective experiences as dancer/choreographer/teacher/ESL/EFL/pre-kindergarten-through-university educator and researcher, not to stand on view as a flower, but to lay a fertile ground from which budding teachers and researchers may become reflexive and grow, ultimately advocating for themselves in relation to others in their fields.
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Appendix A: Consent form

PROJECT TITLE: The role of EFL teachers in Turkey in the era of globalisation: An analytical auto-ethnography of an EFL teacher at the IPRIS

Project Approval Reference:

I agree to take part in the above University of Sussex research project. The project has been explained to me and I have read and understood the Information Sheet, which I am aware I may keep for my records. I understand that agreeing to take part means that I am willing to be interviewed by the researcher, as well as audio taped and transcribed, or, if I do not agree to audio taping, that the researcher will take notes instead.

I agree to engage in a single interview with a maximum length of one hour, during which I may also interview the researcher, leading to the formation of an auto-ethnographic text. I understand that this auto-ethnographic text will be the central focus of this study and that, if I feel comfortable doing so, I may elect to ask the researcher questions that may, in turn, raise his consciousness of the role that he plays as an EFL educator here at the IPRIS.

I understand that any information I provide is confidential, and that no information that I disclose will lead to the identification of any individual in the reports of the project by the researcher or any other party. I also understand that the researcher will provide me with the transcribed interview data, which I may review and offer feedback on to ensure I am represented accurately in the text and in a way that I find agreeable, before the relevant data is included in the final draft of the research.

I understand that my participation is completely voluntary, that I can choose not to participate in this single interview to last a maximum length of one hour, and that I can withdraw at any stage of the project without being penalised or disadvantaged in any way. I also understand that, during the interview process, whether or not I ask questions is completely up to me. I also understand that after I review and give feedback on the transcripts, I may also choose the pseudonym under which I will appear in the final write-up.
By signing below, I give my permission to the researcher/ to use the data collected from me in this study for the purposes of analysis leading to his analytic auto-ethnographic text, which will form the basis of his thesis for the International Professional Doctorate in Education at the University of Sussex. If the whole or parts of the data that I provide are used in subsequent publication, I understand that the pseudonym I choose will be maintained.

Name: ____________________________________________

Signature: _________________________________________

Date: ____________________________________________
Appendix B.

An example of how I arrived at the inductively oriented themes.

Sample interview transcription.

1st interview with Dexter, 25th November 2013.

Emergent themes that arose from responses are those that went above and beyond answers to the questions posed. These are noted in red, and my researcher notes are in blue.

E: So, again this study is an auto-ethnographic study where I am also studying myself. With that in mind, I would just like to ask you a few demographic questions. So… would you tell me your age first; how old are you?

D: I am 38 years old, I will be 39 in November.

E: Okay, I just tuned 39 myself. [Rapport]

E: Right, right; okay, would you mind telling me, what is your nationality?

D: I am a Jamaican, Black Jamaican because you know there are you know there are Indian Jamaicans and Chinese Jamaicans too. [Extra background information]

E: Sure, sure right of course there are I really hadn’t thought of that because it’s very true and particularly in the Caribbean. I was actually just reading something about the coolies coming to Guyana and I didn’t realize until that time, which is about a week ago, that the word ‘coolie’ means worker. [Reflexive recall]

D: Right! All Jamaicans would know for example that the word ‘coolie’ means someone who is of Indian origin. Maybe that is another connection we have, Edmund, because I know that the coolies were the indentured workers bought to work in many parts of the Caribbean. [Extra background information]

E: Exactly, exactly that, so – when you said Black Jamaican it just made me think of that, yeah. The diversity in the Caribbean is great.

E: And your parents… can you tell me about them in terms of… [Interrupted]

N: All Jamaicans.

E: All Jamaican, I see...

N: Yeah. My parents and grandparents were all Black Jamaican. [Extra background information]

E: Okay, all right, all Black Jamaican okay all right. And also I would like to know how long have you been a teacher?
D: I have been teaching since 1996 within a year or so.

E: Okay.

D: About 17 years.

E: Thank you, okay.

Interview question leading to Research Question 1:

E: Right. Can you tell me how and why did you become a teacher?

D: Initially I didn’t want to become a teacher I wanted to [be involved] in business, become an entrepreneur or something. All my studies in high school were leading towards this and then once I graduated high school I applied for several colleges in Jamaica.

E: Okay.

D: One of them being a teachers college, the other two being more business oriented. The fees in terms of tuition and for their business colleges were too expensive [Economic capital] for my mother to [cover], because as I told you earlier around that my father had died so I am from a single-parent family. [Impacted by family]

So she had difficulties, difficulties paying the fees [economic capital] and it [was] much easier [Class implied] [Concerned son] [Reminds me of me] to go to a teachers college because they were offering a lot of stuff free, so that’s why I went to a teachers college. [Leading to present role]

E: Okay.

N: I have a bigger sister, a younger brother. [Impacted by family]

E: Okay all right yeah, so it would be difficult as a single parent. So then you said easier, so easier in terms of…

N: In terms of expenses, yeah. [Class]

E: Sure, yeah okay, so yeah tell me …

D: And then once I started at teachers college to me there was no better place, I gave up on the business totally. [Choice, agency]

E: Okay.
Appendix C: Request letter sent to gain access to IPRIS

Dear Rector,

Although we have communicated only via e-mail, I am now writing to you with a request. Last year I contacted you to seek the funding necessary to complete an Ed.D. at the University of Sussex. I am now writing to you to request permission to undertake research at Istanbul Private Research University, where I am currently employed as an instructor at the IPRU, working at the IPRIS. Since beginning my employment here on 15th August, 2010, I have actively sought ways to improve my practice and thus improve the learning of all students with whom I come into contact. My current research is no exception, in that I intend to analyse the lived experiences of myself and 5 other instructors in order to enable us to sharpen our practice.

At the IPRIS I plan to conduct five interviews in which I will ask – and the individuals involved will in turn ask me – how we may better use our lived histories to ensure effective learning is taking place in the face of unexpected challenges. Please know that all participants will be made aware that their involvement in the study is a completely voluntary process, and that their identities will not be disclosed in the final write-up, which will use pseudonyms.

Moreover, all information collected will be kept strictly confidential, private, and anonymous throughout the collection, storage, and publication of the research material. The results of the research will be used in my final thesis for the International Professional Doctorate of Education at the University of Sussex.

Upon completing this degree, I hope to continuously engage in teaching and research in IPRU, or work as an administrator in IPRIS, so that my knowledge base and skill set may be of service to this fine institution.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions that you may have. Thank you again.

Sincerely,
Edmund Melville
Appendix D:

If anything the line of questioning cemented by perceptions of my role and place within the questions served to discuss my past and document my path into education, the steps involved in pursuing this path, my views and educational beliefs, the impact of modernization on education and specific references to life at [redacted] and this region.