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Foreword by Drs. Ahmet Acar & Paul Robertson

Welcome to the fifth edition of the Journal of English as an International Language. This issue like the previous issues presents our readers many interesting research findings and opinion pieces within the study of English as an International Language.

In the first article, On EIL Competence, Acar critically examines the theoretical framework of communicative competence as developed by Canale (1983) from the perspective of English as an International Language with the claim that the traditional notion of communicative competence reflecting the native English speakers’ linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic norms is not appropriate as a pedagogic model for English as an international language pedagogy. The article examines both the recent studies towards reconceptualization of competence in relation to English as an international language and outlines the components of a new theoretical framework of EIL competence which is based on the features of post modern globalization as outlined by Canagarajah (2006). Such a theoretical framework is considered to be formed of linguistic, pragmatic, discourse, strategic and intercultural components which comprise both native speaker standard English norms and emerging English norms in diverse contexts (and hence it recognizes the international variability in English), cross-cultural awareness and negotiation strategies to cope with the variability in English. Ultimately it is suggested that teachers should develop EIL competence in learners to enable them to be effective communicators in international contexts.

The second article “English as an International Language: Where we are and where we need to go” is presented by Sandra Lee McKay. McKay reflects on ‘the developments of English as an International Language (EIL) during the past forty years and suggests where the field needs to go in the next forty years.’ McKay touches upon important issues within EIL as she argues ‘If we look back at the research that has accumulated in the last 40 years regarding EIL, it is clear that we have gained a fuller understanding of how the mystique surrounding English has resulted in many individuals holding an imagined view of the benefits of belonging to an English-speaking community. These individuals come to believe that speaking English will open many doors to them, which will lead to greater educational and economic benefits, as well as to a new identity that makes them cosmopolitan and global citizens…While research on topics such as imagined communities and identity has given us a fuller understanding of the role of English and language learners, there are three particular areas that I believe warrant...
reflection and new perspectives. These include a greater awareness of the manner in which English is becoming the language of the more affluent, leaving those without economic and educational assets to fall further behind in a globalized world. Another major concern that deserves attention is the manner in which a good deal of rhetoric in the ELT profession promotes an Othering of bilingual speakers of English in which these speakers are seen as less competent in critical thinking, verbalization and professional capability. Finally, we need to reconsider the issue of standards, realizing that because of the global spread of English there are bound to be pluricentric standards, each valid within its own context.

The third article “Comparing Teachers’ Method-in-Use Across Local Contexts is presented by Roger Nunn. Nunn’s article does not have a single focus, but the unifying central theme is ‘the description of the method actually being enacted in particular contexts (method-in-use) to help us compare unique experiences across contexts.’ Nunn argues that ‘for cross-cultural comparison to be possible at all, we have to assume that there is something in common between even the most divergent teaching contexts. I have therefore selected the two most different situations I could find from my own experience and from my research and then used the same model to compare them.’

In the fourth article, “EIL in an Actual Lesson”, Abdullah Coskun “aims to argue against two of the traditional assumptions that the goal of English learning is native speaker competence and that native speaker culture should inform instructional materials. By illustrating a lesson plan in which students are familiarized with English speakers from various backgrounds and cultures, the study tries to show how an EIL lesson looks like.”

The fifth article “Global English and World Culture: A study of Taiwanese university students’ worldviews and conceptions of English” is presented by I-Chung Ke. I-Chun Ke’s article “aims to understand nineteen Taiwanese university students’ worldviews and conceptions of English through in-depth interviews on their past experience of learning and using English, as well as their personal reflections on the experience. The findings suggest that most students saw English accents as resource: the more the better. Most participants also pointed out the communicative function of English and its role as a medium of learning knowledge, though most of them seem to assume native speakers as the persons they communicate with and the producers of the new knowledge they learn through English. While all participants perceived English as a surviving tool, one student, after spending several
months in Sweden and Turkey, changed her view to assert English as part of fundamental literacy. Intercultural experience, in particular NNS-NNS interactions in NNS contexts, affects how English learners conceive the role of English. As for world culture values, only diversity was widely accepted by the participants. Approximately half of the participants revealed inferior feelings toward Anglo-Americans or preference to their cultural products. The implications of the findings are discussed.”

In the sixth article, “Letter from Palestine: English shaped by occupation”, Michael Fennell “looks at how English taught as a foreign language in Palestinian Secondary School classes is coloured through occupation to include shades of English as an International Language.” The article “involves the telling of ‘his’ own personal experience as TEFL Practicum Supervisor at the Arab American University, Jenin, Palestine, a narrative that is presented using the epistolary style. After all, it is through the telling and hearing/reading of stories that we make sense of our own and others’ lives as well as the contexts in which we live (Clough 2002).”

The seventh article, “The Role of the Mother Tongue in Fostering Affective Factors in ELT Classrooms” is presented by Ayhan Kahraman. “In this study, it is aspired to compare the possible effects of the use and abuse of the mother tongue in the EFL classrooms…it seems statistically evident that the acceptance, valuing active, systematic and judicious use of the students’ mother tongue reduces anxiety, and enhances affective environment for learning a foreign language.”

In the eight article, “(Teaching) English as an International Language and Native Speaker Norms: Attitudes of Croatian Ma and Ba Students of English”, Branka Drljača Margić and Dorjana Širola “compared attitudes to English as an international language and to non-native varieties of English held by students who had just completed the English as a Global Language course in the English MA Programme at the University of Rijeka and by BA students from the same institution who had never been exposed to those concepts in the course of their formal education. They also investigated whether and to what extent the two groups believed they would rely on native speaker norms and teach their future EFL pupils about non-native varieties of English. The sample comprised 45 students, who were asked to fill in a questionnaire. MA students were, due to their exposure to EIL and to non-native English varieties, more open to the idea of international English as a separate variety of English based on features of various native and non-native English varieties; however,
they still thought that native features should predominate. BA students were, on the other hand, less open to the same idea and more likely to prepare their future pupils primarily for communication with native English speakers.”

The ninth article “How do non-native pre-service English language teachers perceive ELF?: A qualitative study” is presented by Hande Ozturk, Sevdeger Cecen, Derya Altinmakas. The authors argue that “It would not be a failure to note that empirical studies on non-native pre-service English language teachers’ knowledge, thoughts and beliefs about ELF have great potential for contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of the current English language teacher education. Bearing this in mind, this paper explores the discussion of the status of English, the question of ownership of English, what constitutes the Standard English, the definition of bilingualism and successful bilinguals, and pedagogical considerations from the perspective of ten senior non-native pre-service English language teachers.”

The tenth article “The Next Step for Global English Academic Literacy and Credentialing Open Course Ware” is presented by Stephen Carey. Carey argues that “there are few approaches that have been proposed as to how accreditation could be obtained by the large proportion of the world’s students and faculty in developing countries who have access to open course-ware but for economic, geographical or English academic literacy limitations cannot receive academic credit for such courses. The tested and replicated Pan University Open Model that I describe in this paper effectively advances and promotes English academic literacy for students and faculty in their chosen disciplines through a pan university electronic forum that provides both credit for participation in an English online course for each of the participants at their individual home universities, while also providing for the professional academic development in academic English for all participants. The replications of this model of pan university credit courses for diverse global audiences of students and faculty from universities in developed and developing countries has found impressive results for English as an Other Language (EOL) academic literacy as a result of the focus on intensive scholarly online collaboration and debate.”

The eleventh article “EIL and Intercultural Communicative Competence: Two Sides of a Coin?” is presented by Defne Erdem Mete. Erdem Mete argues that “It has become unquestionable that English is the ‘lingua franca’ today. Studies show that there are more non-native speakers of English than its native speakers. This fact has implications for the English
language teaching practices in the world. One of these is the emergence of EIL as a field of study. The studies in this area delve into issues such as the intelligibility, varieties and users of English. Thus, English language teachers are in a position to reconsider how to reflect the current status of English in their classrooms and which goals to achieve. In this respect, the model of Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) appears to offer suggestions. This paper argues that an inseparable part of teaching English as an International Language should be developing the Intercultural Communicative Competence of learners. Therefore, ICC should be thought of in the context of EIL and practices in the teaching of EIL foster ICC.”

The twelfth article, “Are Teachers Fully Prepared to Teach Different Varieties of English: A Case Study in Turkey” by Bahar Gün ‘aims to explore students’ and teachers’ level of vocabulary knowledge in the two main dialects of English… The main implication of the study is that one of the best ways to give students every opportunity to perform at their highest level is to ensure that all teachers, regardless of nationality, are fully aware of the differences between the two dialects.’

The thirteenth article “Globalization and English language policy at primary education in Turkey” is presented by Yasemin Kirkgöz. The article ‘gives an overview of the developments of Turkey’s foreign language policy in response to the global influence of English in Turkish primary education. After introducing the planning underlying the introduction of the early English language teaching in primary education, problems faced by the teachers in implementing the 1997 curriculum initiative are presented based on the findings of available studies. The findings suggest that although the English language, as the lingua franca, occupies an important role in Turkish education, the teachers encounter challenges in practice.’

In their article “Demystifying the notion of teacher code-switching for student comprehension.” David Chen-On and Su-Hie Ting ‘investigate English and Science teachers’ representations of different facets of comprehension that are enhanced by code-switching and their concern for the external ramifications of the code-switching… The study indicated that code-switching is used for solving comprehension problems rather than averting them, indicative of the teachers’ resolve to use the designated language of instruction, with student comprehension being the yardstick for deciding when code-switching is needed. The findings
suggest that in multilingual settings where the status of English as an international language is valued, code-switching in formal instruction is the norm rather than a marked choice.‘

The next article ‘English-only conferences: What did a non-native speaker expert note?’ is presented by Tahar Rabassi. It ‘examines the notes taken by a Tunisian professor of chemistry while attending an international conference. The communicative functions of the expressions selected by the attendee are identified and categorized. The findings could contribute to a more effective teaching of English for Conferencing. The aim is to shed further light on the particular linguistic and rhetorical needs of NNS professionals who wish to participate at English-only international conferences.’

The sixteenth article ‘Oral English Teacher-Inputs in ESL Context’ is presented by Taiwo Soneye. It ‘examines oral English teacher-inputs which have continued to impact adversely on the oral proficiency of learners of English in the light of a supposed decline in the standards of education in Nigeria. It further elucidates the circumstances that brought about the downward trend in learners’ performances debunking the constant reference to learners as mostly responsible for the situation. Findings from the study reveal the wide gap that exist between Teacher-talking–Time (TTT) and Learner-Talking-Time (LTT) and the significance of Teacher-Language Awareness (TLA) to Oral English pedagogy. The study calls for a re-examination of Teacher-talking–Time (TTT), and teacher language awareness since application and response to factors regarding TTT and TLA examined in this paper are important precursors of learners’ oral proficiency.’
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This article critically examines the theoretical framework of communicative competence as developed by Canale (1983) from the perspective of English as an International Language with the claim that the traditional notion of communicative competence reflecting the native English speakers’ linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic norms is not appropriate as a pedagogic model for English as an international language pedagogy. It examines both the recent studies towards reconceptualization of competence in relation to English as an international language and outlines the components of a new theoretical framework of EIL competence which is based on the features of post modern globalization as outlined by Canagarajah (2006). Such a theoretical framework is considered to be formed of linguistic, pragmatic, discourse, strategic and intercultural components which comprise both native speaker standard English norms and emerging English norms in diverse contexts (and hence it recognizes the international variability in English), cross-cultural awareness and negotiation strategies to cope with the variability in English. Ultimately it is suggested that teachers should develop EIL competence in learners to enable them to be effective communicators in international contexts.
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Introduction

The notion of communicative competence as put forward by Canale (1983) forms the basis of communicative language teaching tradition with its assumption that students should strive for native speaker communicative competence in English pedagogy and hence ELT syllabus design and classroom practice should be informed of native speaker norms. Such a trend is the characteristics of learning English as a foreign language which means learning it for interaction with native speakers, adopting native speaker communicative competence as a goal of learning English and learning the cultural conventions of the native speakers. In contexts where English is being used quite intensively and extensively in the daily lives of the people in many nonnative English contexts in today’s world, however, English has taken various forms reflecting the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the speakers. Thus English is not only learned as a foreign language to communicate with native speakers but is used more and more as an international language among both native and nonnative speakers and nonnative and nonnative speakers. This reality of cross-cultural communication in English in today’s world led some researchers (e.g. McKay, 2002, 2003; Alptekin, 2002; Nunn, 2005, 2007; Canagarajah, 2006) to question the appropriacy of the native speaker based notion of communicative competence as a goal in English as an international language pedagogy and led to different proposals as to what competency in EIL would entail. This paper aims to present different approaches to EIL competence framework and ultimately outlines the components of EIL competence based on the features of post modern globalization as outlined by Canagarajah (2006).

Communicative Competence

The theoretical framework for communicative competence as elaborated by Canale (1983) includes four competencies:

1. Linguistic competence refers to the native speakers’ knowledge of lexical and grammar rules such as “vocabulary, word formation, sentence formation, pronunciation, spelling and linguistic semantics” (Canale, 1983, p. 7).

2. Sociolinguistic competence refers to the sociocultural rules of use. Thus it “addresses the extent to which utterances are produced and understood appropriately in different sociolinguistic contexts depending on contextual factors such as status of participants, purposes of interaction, and norms or conventions of interaction” (Canale, 1983, p. 7).

3. Discourse competence refers to the knowledge of “how to combine grammatical forms and meaning to achieve a unified spoken or written text in different genres” (Canale, 1983, p. 9).
In other words, it refers to the knowledge of how to form cohesion in form and coherence in meaning.

4. Strategic competence refers to the knowledge of verbal and nonverbal communication strategies to be used for two main reasons:

   a) to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to limiting conditions in actual communication (e.g. momentary inability to recall an idea or grammatical form) or to insufficient competence in one or more of the other areas of communicative competence; and
   b) to enhance the effectiveness of communication (e.g. deliberately slow and soft speech for rhetorical effect). (Canale, 1983, p. 11)

The use of paraphrase as a compensation strategy when one can not remember a grammatical form or the meaning of a lexical item, “how to address strangers when unsure of their social status…and how to achieve coherence in a text when unsure of cohesion devices” (Canale, 1983, p. 11) are examples when and how strategic competence should be made use of.

The theoretical concept of communicative competence as outlined in this way by Canale (1983) reflects a monolithic view of the native speakers’ language and culture making NS standard English norms, NS authentic communication and NS culture the ultimate focus of curriculum design and classroom practice within the communicative approach. Thus learners are not only expected to acquire accurate forms of the target language, but also to learn how to use these forms in given social situations in the target language setting to convey appropriate, coherent and strategically affective meaning for the native speakers (Alptekin, 2002, p. 58).

The emerging reality of the legitimacy of multiple norms of English around the world, however, calls into question the validity of the native speaker based notion of communicative competence as the ultimate goal for language learners and necessitates a reconceptualization of communicative competence which would embrace such international variability in English.

**World Englishes and orientations towards competency in EIL**

Kachru (1985) presents the sociolinguistic profile of English in terms of three concentric circles “representing the types of spread, the patterns of acquisition and the functional domains in which English is used across cultures and languages” (p. 12). These are labelled as the inner circle, the outer circle and the expanding circle. The inner circle represents the
traditional basis of English in such countries as the USA, UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, where English is the primary language. The outer circle comprises the institutionalized non-native varieties of English in such countries as India, Nigeria and Singapore, where English is used quite intensively and extensively in the domestic daily lives of the people and has established new norms shaped by the new sociocultural and sociolinguistic contexts, and finally the expanding circle comprises such countries as Russia, Israel and China, where performance varieties are used.

The studies of institutionalized nonnative varieties of English (e.g., Kachru, 1985, 1990, 1992) have argued for the recognition and acceptance of these varieties in their own right, without comparison to the inner circle native speaker varieties and the term world Englishes is suggested to represent these varieties such as "Nigerian English", "Indian English", and "Singaporean English". Thus, the three concentric circle model brought to “the English language a unique cultural pluralism, a variety of speech fellowships...and linguistic diversity” (Kachru, 1990, p. 5). English is no longer the sole property of the native speakers but it is also the language of non-native speakers who adapt it to their own sociolinguistic and sociocultural contexts.

Communicative language teaching tradition, which is informed by native speaker models by its assumption that English language is associated with the native speakers and native speakers’ cultures, however, has often assumed that learners should acquire norms of English language use and usage appropriate to the users of the inner circle. Thus it is taken for granted that English pedagogy should judge the use of English by non-native speakers by how it approximates native language use while considering differences in non-native language use as "mistakes" or "errors" which should be corrected to avoid fossilization.

Kachru’s world Englishes perspective, which argues for the recognition of variations in the use of English in the outer circle from the native standard English as innovations rather than mistakes or errors and of outer circle Englishes as local standard Englishes rather than interlanguages, has seriously questioned the validity of the pedagogic model based on the inner circle native speakers’ English and argued for these local Englishes to be taken as pedagogical models in these local contexts.

Such a pluricentric view of English and hence English language norms at all levels of language has recently led some reserchers (e.g. McKay, 2002, 2003; Alptekin, 2002; Nunn, 2005, 2007; Canagarajah, 2006) to question the validity of the native speaker based notion of communicative competence in EIL pedagogy and to formulate different theoretical frameworks of competence in relation to English as an international language.
McKay (2002), for example, making use of Kachru’s three circles of world Englishes, draws the following conclusions regarding the relationship of an international language and culture:

1. As an international language, English is used both in a global sense for international communication between countries and in a local sense as a language of wider communication within multilingual societies.
2. As it is an international language, the use of English is no longer connected to the culture of Inner Circle countries.
3. As an international language in a local sense, English becomes imbedded in the culture of the country in which it is used.
4. As English is an international language in a global sense, one of its primary functions is to enable speakers to share with others their ideas and culture. (p. 12)

Based on these features of English as an international language, McKay (2002) concludes that an appropriate EIL pedagogy should no longer be informed by native speaker models. In terms of competency, MycKay (2002) argues that since“...the use of EIL will be predominantly among bilingual users of English, it is important to examine the various ways in which bilinguals make use of English within their linguistic repertoire rather than compare them to native speakers” (p. 31). Thus she contends that while for bilingual speakers of English in the outer circle the focus of attention should be on those bilinguals’ own linguistic, pragmatic and rhetorical competence rather than native speaker competence, for the use of EIL between individuals from different countries the focus of pragmatic competence should be on raising “the awareness of both native speakers and bilingual users of English that pragmatic rules can differ significantly cross-culturally” (McKay, 2002, p. 76), and the focus of rhetorical competence should be on “the need for readers of English to be willing to process English texts that conform to a variety of rhetorical patterns” (McKay, 2002, p. 79).

The other orientation to reconsideration of competence in relation to EIL is that of Alptekin (2002). Alptekin (2002) questions the validity of the pedagogic model based on the native speaker based notion of communicative competence on the assumption that it is utopian, unrealistic and constraining in relation to English as an international language. He argues that:
It is utopian not only because native speakership is a linguistic myth, but also because it portrays a monolithic perception of the native speaker’s language and culture, by referring chiefly to mainstream ways of thinking and behaving. It is unrealistic because it fails to reflect the lingua franca status of English. It is constraining in that it circumscribes both teacher and learner autonomy by associating the concept of authenticity with the social milieu of the native speaker. (Alptekin, 2002, p. 57)

In such a view it would be invalid to impose Inner circle native English speakers’ language norms and culture on the English users in Kachru’s outer and expanding circles. Thus Alptekin (2002) argues for the need of a new pedagogic model “which would accommodate the case of English as an international and intercultural communication” (p. 63), which he suggests should have the following criteria:

1. Successful bilinguals with intercultural insights and knowledge should serve as pedagogic models in English as an international language (EIL) rather than the monolingual native speaker.
2. Intercultural communicative competence should be developed among EIL learners by equipping them with linguistic and cultural behaviour which will enable them to communicate effectively with others, and also by equipping them with an awareness of difference, and with strategies for coping with such difference (Hyde 1998)
3. The EIL pedagogy should be one of global appropriacy and local appropriation, in that it should prepare learners ‘to be both global and local speakers of English and to feel at home in both international and national cultures.’ (Kramsch and Sullivan 1996: 211)
4. Instructional materials and activities should involve local and international contexts that are familiar and relevant to language learners’ lives.
5. Instructional materials and activities should have suitable discourse samples pertaining to native and nonnative speaker speaker interactions. Discourse displaying exclusive native speaker use should be kept to a minimum, as it is chiefly irrelevant for many learners in terms of potential use in authentic settings (Widdowson 1998). (Alptekin, 2002, p. 63)

The other orientation to reconceptualization of communicative competence in relation to EIL is Nunn (2005, 2007). Nunn (2007) considers the meaning of competence in relation to EIL and concludes with a global definition of competence as “a holistic, global and international concept encompassing various interlocking components of usable knowledge.
and skills and abilities needed to put these into practice within a variety of communities and types of community” (p. 43). Intercultural communicative competence that Nunn (2007) proposes includes five components:

Multiglossic: Bi-multi-lingual, di-multiglossic. Interlocutors need to be sensitive to different identities and to be skilled in communicating their own identity intelligibly.

Strategic: In EIL communication, strategies, such as avoidance strategies are not secondary. They are essential two-way components of intercultural communication.

Linguistic: In individuals and local communities linguistic competence in at least one variety of English is needed.

Pragmatic/Discourse: The ability to adjust language to context and to resolve differences of background knowledge is essential and requires training.

Intercultural: Intercultural competence for EIL is not based on the knowledge of one other culture for successful communication between two cultures. It means the ability to adjust to unpredictable multicultural situations. (p. 41)

**English as a family of languages and competency in EIL**

One orientation to the issue of English language norms and competency in EIL that go beyond Kachru’s world Englishes perspective is that of Canagarajah’s (2006) conceptualization of English as a family of languages.

Canagarajah (2006) lists some of the features of postmodern globalization as follows:

1. The interaction between communities is multilateral—that is, international involvement at diverse levels is needed in today’s economic and production enterprises.
2. National boundaries have become porous—people, goods, and ideas flow easily between boarders.
3. Languages, communities, and cultures have become hybrid, shaped by this fluid flow of social and economic relationships. (p. 231)

Based on these features of postmodern globalization, Canagarajah (2006) questions the relevance of the assumptions behind the Kachru’s world Englishes model and he puts forward a set of arguments in favor of a new orientation towards a notion of English as a family of languages.
Firstly, while Kachru (1985) argues for the legitimacy of outer circle Englishes in local contexts (e.g. Indian English is valid for India, Singaporean English for Singapore, Nigerian English for Nigeria) Canagarajah (2006) argues that “these varieties of English have started to leak outside their national borders in postmodern globalization” (p. 231). Thus Indian English is also relevant for Americans, American English is also necessary for Indians etc.

Secondly, to Canagarajah (2006), “speakers of English in the expanding circle do not use English solely for extracommunity relations” (p. 232) but they also use English for intranational purposes in such countries as China, Vietnam, Philippines, Brazil etc., which calls into question the ESL/ EFL distinction and “demand that we take into account of the increasing currency of English in expanding-circle countries” (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 232).

Thirdly, Canagarajah argues that the speech communities in the expanding circle would best be classified as norm developing as they use English as a lingua franca contrary to Kachru’s view of these speech communities as norm dependent, and finally, he maintains that while Kachru’s (1985) designation of speech communities as norm providing, norm developing and norm dependent leads to a core and periphery distinction specifying the inner circle as the core and the outer and expanding circle as the periphery, the current statistics of number of English users (e.g. Crystal, 1997; Graddol, 1999) questions the periphery status of the outer and expanding circles and places them in a central position in the development of English.

Thus, to Canagarajah (2006), “these developments demand a reconceptualization of the relationship between the diverse varieties of English” (p. 232). In such an orientation English should best be viewed as “a heterogeneous language with multiple norms and diverse grammars”, which would be a model of “English as a family of languages”, where the varieties of English in the world relate to each other on a single level rather than on three hierarchies as in Kachru’s three circle model of English.

Such a view of English as a family of languages presents a different conceptualization of competence in relation to EIL. Canagarajah (2006) argues that

Post modern globalization requires that students should strive for competence in a repertoire of English varieties as they shuttle between multilingual communities...The changing pedagogical priorities suggest that we have to move away from a reliance on discrete-item tests on formal grammatical competence and develop instruments that are sensitive to performance and pragmatics. In effect, assessment would focus on strategies of negotiation, situated performance, communicative repertoire, and language awareness. (p. 229)
Thus, in view such a view, “to be really proficient in English today one has to be multidialectical” (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 233). This does not mean, however, being proficient in all the varieties of English in the world. What Canagarajah (2006) suggests is raising the students’ Language awareness:

The need to engage with multiple English varieties, even other languages, is so great in postmodern globalization that it is unwise for a speaker to develop competence in only one dialect-or language system. It is more important to develop the cognitive abilities to negotiate multiple dialects as one shuttles between communities. Scholars of English as a lingua franca put it memorably when they say that the needs of international communication today imply that we have to move from “teaching languages” to “teaching language” (Seidlhofer, 2004, p. 227). I articulate this shift for English as an international language as moving from “teaching English” to “teaching Language.” One should be able to inductively process the underlying system in the varieties that one can encounter in social interactions. One should draw on intuitive skills to develop relative communicative competence in new varieties according to one’s needs. Tests should therefore examine a candidate’s ability to discern the structure, pattern and rules from the available data of a given language. (p. 237)

Having outlined these major orientations towards reconceptualization of competence in relation to EIL, I now move on to explain what could be the basic components of EIL competence.

**EIL competence**

Before attempting to develop a theoretical framework of EIL competence it is important to define English as an international language since this term is used by different researchers to denote different entities.

While Kachru (1991) makes a distinction between English as an intranational language (the use of English in countries traditionally referred to as ESL countries, where English is used for internal purposes) and English as an international language (the use of English across different nations traditionally referred to as EFL countries, where English is used for external purposes), McKay (2002) uses the term EIL to refer to the uses of English in both contexts.
Jenkins (2000, 2003) and Seidlhofer (2001, 2004), on the other hand, use the term EIL to refer to the use of English in the expanding circle though it is also important to note that more recently these researchers have begun to use the term English as a lingua franca (ELF) rather than the term EIL to refer to the same entity. Modiano (1999a, 1999b), on the other hand, uses the term “English as an International Language” to refer to a global standard for English which comprises the features of English which can be easily understood by both native and non-native speakers.

In my use of the term EIL, I refer to the use of English as a means of cross-cultural communication within and across Kachru’s circles. I also adopt the features of postmodern globalization as outlined by Canagarajah (2006) in my theoretical framework of EIL competence. Thus in such a conceptualization, EIL involves crosscultural interactions among the users of English from the inner circle, the outer circle and the expanding circle and hence these users of EIL are in constant touch with each others’ varieties of English. Thus the English norms of the speakers of English in each circle are relevant for each other as indicated by the features of post modern globalization as outlined by Canagarajah (2006).

In my conceptualization of EIL, however, unlike Jenkins (2005, 2006) and Seidlhofer (2001, 2004) I classify the expanding circle speech communities as norm dependent in terms of linguistic norms and norm developing in terms of pragmatic, and discourse norms for the reason that English has no intranational function within most of the speech communities in the expanding circle and hence it is far from establishing local linguistic norms. These speech communities, on the other hand, are considered to be norm developing in terms of pragmatic and discourse norms since these levels of language are strongly shaped by the cultural factors and the use of English by the expanding circle speech communities will naturally be affected by their local cultural contexts.

I now move on to explain the basic components of EIL competence which include linguistic competence, pragmatic competence, discourse competence, strategic competence and intercultural competence.

**Linguistic competence:** In today’s society, English language is no longer viewed as a homogenous language involving inner circle native speaker linguistic norms but is viewed as a heterogenous language with multiple norms and diverse grammars (e.g. Canagarajah 2006). Furthermore as the features of post modern globalization indicates the speakers of English from inner circle, outer circle and expanding circle are involving in crosscultural communication with each other and hence the linguistic norms of the inner and outer circle
speakers are relevant for each other. Thus linguistic competence in EIL competence includes both inner circle native speaker linguistic norms and outer circle linguistic norms.

While Expanding circle speakers, having lacked a localized variety of English is dependent on the linguistic norms of the inner circle countries they also need to develop an awareness of the linguistic norms of the outer circle speakers (passive competence to understand outer circle linguistic norms). Inner circle and outer circle speakers, on the other hand, need to develop an awareness of the linguistic norms of each other’s varieties of English (passive competence in understanding each others’ linguistic norms) while they should develop active competence in their local varieties.

**Pragmatic competence:** Inner circle English speakers’ rules of English use (how English is used appropriately in appropriate contexts) is no longer the only appropriate use of English in today’s reality of English as an international language. In outer circle contexts, for example, “there are pragmatic rules that inform appropriate language use for particular contexts, and these are often not in keeping with so-called native speaker rules” (McKay, 2002, p. 74) and since the rules of English use is strongly shaped by the cultures of English speakers in different contexts there is valid reason to assume that the English speakers in the expanding circle will make use of their own rules of appropriateness.

Given the assumptions of post modern globalization, in today’s world, the speakers of English from the inner circle, the outer circle and the expanding circle are constantly involving in cross-cultural communication with each other and hence the pragmatic norms of the inner circle, outer circle and expanding circle speakers are relevant for each other. Thus pragmatic competence in EIL competence framework includes inner circle, outer circle and expanding circle pragmatic norms.

Inner circle native English speakers should develop an awareness of the pragmatic norms of the outer and expanding circle English speakers (passive or receptive competence to understand these speakers’ pragmatic norms) while they should develop active (productive) competence in their own pragmatic norms. Outer circle speakers should develop an awareness of the inner and expanding circle speakers’ norms of English use (passive competence to understand these speakers’ pragmatic norms) while they should develop active competence in their own pragmatic norms. Expanding circle speakers should develop an awareness of the pragmatic norms of the inner and outer circle speakers (passive competence to understand these speakers’ pragmatic norms) while they should develop active competence in their own pragmatic norms.
Discourse competence: Discourse competence as it relates to “mastery of how to combine grammatical forms and meanings to achieve a unified spoken or written text in different genres” (Canale, 1983, p. 9) also needs close scrutiny in relation to EIL. McKay (2002) mentions some of the research findings of contrastive rhetoric which show how textual development can differ cross-culturally and that the writers from particular cultures have certain culturally influenced relationship with their readers:

Hinds (1987), for example, posits that written texts in many western cultures can be characterized as ‘writer responsible’ since it is the writer’s responsibility to ensure that effective communication takes place by directly stating their intentions. In other cultures, however, it is the reader who is responsible for determining the writer’s primary intent. This distinction has reinforced the notion, first described by Kaplan (1966), that western writing tends to be direct, whereas a good deal of writing in eastern countries is indirect in that the main point is often never stated and hence, must be inferred by the reader. (McKay, 2002, p. 77).

Thus McKay (2002) argues that while in the outer circle contexts rhetorical patterns used within the outer circle culture are the best ones to teach, for the use of EIL between individuals from different countries the focus of rhetorical competence should be on “the need for readers of English to be willing to process English texts that conform to a variety of rhetorical patterns” (McKay, 2002, p. 79).

In post modern globalization in which the “varieties of English have started to leak outside their national borders” (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 231) the discourse norms of inner circle, outer circle and expanding circle speakers should be relevant for each other. Thus discourse competence within EIL competence framework includes both inner circle, outer circle and expanding circle discourse norms.

Inner circle English speakers should develop an awareness of the discourse norms of the outer and expanding circle English speakers (passive or receptive competence to understand these speakers’ discourse patterns) while they should develop active (productive) competence in their discourse norms. Outer circle speakers should develop an awareness of the discourse norms of the inner and expanding circle speakers (passive competence to understand these speakers’ discourse patterns) while they should develop active competence in their own discourse norms. Expanding circle speakers should develop an awareness of the discourse
norms of the inner and outer circle speakers (passive competence to understand these speakers’ discourse patterns) while they should develop active competence in their own discourse norms.

The importance of the recognition of diverse discourse norms of English has begun to be recognized and adopted in the policy of some internationally referred journals. The Asian EFL Journal, in its submission guidelines, states that

The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly Issue is a fully peer-reviewed section of the journal, reviewed by a team of experts in EFL from all over the world. The Asian EFL Journal welcomes submissions written in different varieties of world Englishes. The reviewers and Associate Editors come from a wide variety of cultural and academic backgrounds and no distinction is made between native and non-native authors. As a basic principle, the Asian EFL Journal does not define competence in terms of native ability, but we are a strictly reviewed journal and all our reviewers expect a high level of academic and written competence in whatever variety of English is used by the author. Every effort will be made to accept different rhetorical styles of writing.


Strategic competence: The English speakers from the inner circle, the outer circle and the expanding circle who involve in crosscultural communication with each other need to negotiate the variability in their Englishes. The traditional one way accommodation to understand the inner circle native speakers and to be understood by them is certainly not appropriate in English as an international language orientation as Kubota (2001) argues that

In a community that promotes monoculturalism and monolingualism, the dominant group forces the dominated group to accommodate and acquire the dominant way of life. However, a multicultural society affirms cultural and linguistic differences and rejects one-way accommodation. In communication between inner circle mainstream English speakers and other WE speakers, the accommodation should be mutual with both parties exploring ways to establish effective communication. (p. 50)

Thus the speakers of English from the inner circle, the outer circle and the expanding circle should adjust their speech to be intelligible to each other when they involve in crosscultural communication and they should “use interpersonal strategies such as repair, rephrasing,
clarification gestures, topic change, and other consensus-oriented and mutually supportive practices” (Firth, 1996: Grumperz, 1982, in Canagarajah, 2006, p. 238).

**Intercultural competence:** While the traditional notion of communicative competence requires learners to learn the cultures of the inner circle native speakers, such an orientation to culture teaching would not be adequate when teaching English as an international language, which involves cross-cultural communication among speakers from different cultural backgrounds. McKay (2002) argues that “it cannot be assumed that the culture of any one particular country, especially an inner circle country should provide the basis for cultural content when teaching EIL…and…that if one of the goals of using culture in EIL teaching is to help individuals interact in cross-cultural encounters, then merely knowing about a culture will not be sufficient to gain insight into how to interact in these encounters” (p. 82). In post modern globalization where English speakers from the inner circle, the outer circle and the expanding circle are involving in cross-cultural communication with each other they need to be sensitive to the cultural differences of each other and they need to develop cross-cultural awareness. Thus cultures of the inner circle, the outer circle and the expanding circle speakers are relevant for each other. Rather than teaching the students all the cultures in the world, which would certainly be impossible, the best way would be raising the students’ cross-cultural awareness, which requires learners to gain knowledge about their own culture and also about how their own culture differs from other cultures. McKay (2002) convincingly argues that

Since…one of the major reasons for using EIL is to enable speakers to share their ideas and culture with others in cross-cultural encounters, it is beneficial for leaners to be asked to reflect on their own culture in relation to others, or, as Kramsch puts it, to establish a sphere of interculturality. This requires two essential steps. First, learners need to acquire knowledge about another culture and then they need to reflect on how their own culture contrasts with it. (p. 83)

Thus, competency in EIL requires teachers to develop in their learners active competence in the students’ local varieties and passive competence to understand multiple norms of English through raising the students’ awareness of the diversity in English in linguistic, pragmatic and discourse competences. The teachers should also raise the students’ cross-cultural awareness by making the students aware of how their own culture differs from other
cultures, and also they should equip their students with necessary accommodation skills and negotiation strategies for them be effective communicators in international contexts. In such an orientation, native English speakers also need special training to be competent in English as an international language. The same is true of outer circle and expanding circle English speakers. Thus such a conceptualization of EIL competence requires a different aim for English language learners than native speaker based notion of communicative competence which does not reflect the reality of English as an international language.

**Conclusion**

In today’s world English is no longer viewed as a homogeneous language but as a heterogenous language with multiple norms and diverse grammars. Thus, the traditional notion of communicative competence reflecting the native English speakers’ linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic norms is not appropriate as an aim for English learners. The features of post modern globalization indicates that English speakers from the inner circle, the outer circle and the expanding circle are constantly involving in cross-cultural communication with each other and hence their different English norms are relevant for each other. Thus a new framework of EIL competence which would enable the students to be effective communicators in international contexts is needed. Such a theoretical framework is considered to be formed of linguistic, pragmatic, discourse, strategic and intercultural components which comprise both native speaker standard English norms and emerging English norms in diverse contexts (and hence it recognizes the international variability in English), cross-cultural awareness and negotiation strategies to cope with the variability in English. Ultimately it is suggested that teachers should develop EIL competence in learners to enable them to be effective communicators in international contexts.
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At the celebration of its fortieth year, it is quite fitting that SEAMEO RELC reflects on what has been accomplished during its 40 years of service and what it would like to accomplish in the next 40 years. In a similar vein, today I wish to reflect on the developments of English as an International Language (EIL) during the past forty years and suggest where the field needs to go in the next forty years. Given the theme of the conference, Language Teaching in a Multilingual World: Challenges and Opportunities, it is particularly fitting that a reflection on the developments of EIL take place since, by most estimates, English is the most widely taught language in the world today and, in general, this learning is taking place in bilingual and multilingual contexts.

If we turn the clock back to 1968, the year SEAMEO RELC was established, and consider the role of English at that time it is clear that English was not widely viewed as an international language. As Crystal (2003) points out, in the 1950s any idea of English “as a true world language was but a dim, shadowy, theoretical possibility, surrounded by the political uncertainties of the Cold War, and lacking any clear definition or sense of direction” (p. xii). But all of that changed due to what many refer to as globalization. Globalization is a difficult term to define; in fact the first documented use of the term in a dictionary was not until 1961 (Canagarajah, 2005). In some ways, globalization, in the sense of international exchange, has been going on for a long time; however, what is new in the current use of the
term is a change in social space, such that space is no longer mapped in terms of territorial places, distances or borders (Scholte, 2006). We have instead a new sense of social space brought about by high-speed methods of communication and travel. English, by being at the right place at the right time, became the language of choice in this new globalization. I agree with Pennycook (2003) that the ultimate effect of this new social space is what he terms hybridity, that is, “a fluid mixture of cultural heritage…and popular culture…, of change and tradition, of border crossing and ethnic affiliation, of global appropriation and local contextualization” (p. 10).

With English being considered by more and more individuals as a global language, individuals around the world are striving to learn English, leading to a large English teaching/learning industry. What I intend to do today is to reflect on what we have learned during the past forty years about the learning and teaching of English; I also intend to examine what challenges face the profession in the next 40 years. In reference to what we have learned, I see three areas in which I believe we have gained important insights into the teaching and learning of English. These have to do with

- imagined communities as incentives for English learning
- the role of identity in English language learning; and
- the value of technology as a learning tool.

**Imagined Communities as Incentives for English learning**

Back in 1986, in a book entitled, *The Alchemy of English*, Kachru (1986) argued that “knowing English is like possessing the fabled Aladdin’s lamp, which permits one to open, as it were, the linguistic gates to international business, technology, science and travel. In short, English provides linguistic power” (p. 1). This belief in the power of English has resulted in many language learners imagining the various benefits that can develop if they learn English. Often these imagined communities are depicted in the narratives of language learners. Such narratives reinforce the belief of many English learners that if they invest in English learning, they will reap the benefits of social and intellectual mobility.

Recent research on English learning has documented some of these narratives of imagined communities. Norton and Kamal (2003), for example, report on a study they conducted with middle-school children in Karachi, Pakistan in which young learners of English were asked to reflect on what they would like to do to help Afghan refugee children
in Pakistan thrive. Many of the young Pakistani children believed that it was important for the Afghan refugees to develop literacy and to learn some English. The reasons they gave for wanting the Afghan refugee children to learn English illustrate the kind of narrations that can idealize the benefits of joining an imagined community of English speakers. The following statements, written by young Pakistani students, are representative of such narrations.

English is the language spoken commonly. This language is understood throughout the world. If the Afghan children learn English, know English, speak English they will be able to discuss their problems with the people of the world.

The English language is an international language spoken all over the world and it is the language of science. Therefore to promote their education and awareness with modern technologies, it is important to teach them English. (p. 309)

Niño-Murcia (2003) cites Peruvian narratives that recount other benefits of joining an imagined community of English speakers. Niño-Murcia examined the beliefs of English learners in Tupichocha, an agro-pastoral village of 1,543 inhabitants that is losing its population from emigration. While people over 40 generally do not express an interest in learning English, this is not true for the younger generation. Many of these young people want to learn English so that they can take distance-learning courses on the Internet; others want to learn English so that they can go to an English-speaking country and earn more money. For example, one respondent, Luz (age 25), when asked why she was studying English, responded that she wanted to learn English so she could go to the United States and earn a good salary. In her mind English proficiency was the key to both immigration and making money. Yet as Niño-Murcia points out,

For the participants, the United States is not only an imagined geographical site, but also the land where their needs will be fulfilled. The irony is that the rhetoric of free trade, global market and capital flow comes together with tightening frontiers to prevent human flow. Luz’s illusions aside, English is in reality a very minimal factor in whether people are able to surmount the barrier. While the popular media contain vast amounts of false information about both English and the countries where it prevails, they give little or no accurate information about how in fact the immigration/illegal migration system works. It is the financial requirements of the embassy, not the language factor at all, which actually sets limits
Park and Abelmann (2004) offer a poignant account of the imagined communities Korean mothers want their children to belong to. Arguing that presently in South Korea there is “a veritable English language mania” (p. 646) brought on largely by the implementation of English learning in the elementary school in South Korea, Park and Abelmann investigated the aspirations of English learning of South Korean women of various economic classes. Regardless of economic class, all of the mothers yearned for their children to acquire English so that they would become cosmopolitan, living at home yet part of the world. While many of the upper class women could afford to help their children become part of this world by giving them private English lessons or sending them abroad for their elementary education, this was not the case for less affluent families. Park and Ablemann (2004), based on their ethnographic study of South Korean mothers, describe how less affluent mothers still imagine their children as part of this cosmopolitan world. As one less affluent mother put it, she “still dreams that her children might someday live abroad in a ‘bigger world’—‘even if they have to live abroad as beggars (koij).’” (p. 654). Like many less affluent mothers around the world, this mother imagines “her children on a broader stage, despite their likely lower status abroad” (p. 654).

The concept of an imagined community is one that has not gone unnoticed by ELT private schools. One clear evidence of this fact is the establishment of theme villages that depict an imagined environment. Seargeant (2005), for example, describes British Hill, a leisure language-learning complex that seeks to simulate an “authentic” English-speaking environment. In fact, the sales slogan “boasts that the complex is ‘More English than England itself.’” (p. 327). The village is staffed by native speakers recruited from Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. In their job description, they describe some of the duties of the staff as follows:

- Meeting buses arriving at British Hills with a friendly hello and lots of waving
- Being on the steps to wave goodbye to groups leaving British Hills
- Taking the time to stop in the passages/in your department to CHAT to the guests
- Being sociable and friendly to all guests: whether on or off duty
• Offering to take and star in hundreds of photographs
• Basically just going the extra mile to make that personal connection with as many guests as possible. (p. 340)

By hiring only native speakers and promoting native speaker competency, the village promotes a reality that is far different from the multilingual/multicultural Britain of today. By doing so,

The overall effect is to create an environment which is not necessarily truthful to the original upon which it is purportedly based but is instead an imagined idea with its own logic and reality. The authenticity upon which British Hills prides itself is not a representation of Britishness as it is currently constructed and enacted in mainstream British society. Instead, it is an image drawn from aspects of the popular imagination in Japan, from a tourist industry template…and also from local protocol for foreign language education. (Seargeant, 2005, p. 341)

In this context, authenticity becomes not the genuine item but a fake representation of a different reality. As Seargent (2005) puts it, “simulation replaces reality, becomes its own reality. A place like British Hills is not merely representing Britishness but reconstructing it, thus presenting itself as a detailed realistic image of something that actually exists only within its own depiction. The use of the concept of authenticity is almost an irony of the process…” (p. 341)

The theory underlying such villages is that learning can be enhanced by students actually imagining themselves in the role of a fluent speaker in an “authentic” environment. During the past 40 years then we have learned much about how imagined communities can further reinforce Kachru’s idea of English competency as a kind of Aladdin’s lamp. We have also seen how these imagined communities can be a powerful force in commercial aspects of language learning. Linked closely to language learners’ imagined community of English speakers is the new identity that may potentially come from belonging to this community, either as an aspiration or as a reality. Indeed another area in which we have learned a great deal in the past 40 years is the role of identity in language learning.

The Role of Identity in Language Learning
Examining the identity of second-language learners is a relatively recent interest in second language acquisition research. In the past, major attention was devoted to interlanguage analysis, with little recognition given to learning processes, individual variables, or the social context in which a second language is learned. However, recent work, informed by poststructuralist approaches and critical theory (e.g., McKay & Wong, 1996; Norton, 1997; Peirce, 1995; Rampton, 1995), has begun to examine how educational institutions can position students in particular ways. Work that is especially relevant to our discussion examines how school discourses can position second language learners within the educational context, and hence, give them a particular identity.

Harklau’s (2000) ethnographic study of 3 ELs transitioning from a U.S. high school to a community college is particularly insightful on the relationship between educational institutions and learner identity. Within the high school context investigated by Harklau, the three target students tended to be “affiliated with and the responsibility of the ESOL program and teacher” (p. 45). Harklau found that in the high school, the students and teachers “collaboratively regenerated and perpetuated” (p. 46) a representation of English learners (ELs) as highly motivated students who provide an inspiration for everyone by their heroic struggles during their immigration to the U.S. and their acquisition of a second language.

At the same time, the teachers in the school often expressed doubts about the students’ academic and cognitive ability. Given prevalent negative social attitudes in the United States toward bilingualism and an educational context in which English is the exclusive medium of instruction, Harklau didn’t find it surprising that “teachers cast these students’ ability to communicate in two languages not as a special talent or strength but rather as a disability, emphasizing what immigrant students could not do relative to monolingual, standard English speakers. One teacher, for example, commented, ‘It must be like somebody who’s very bright and has a stroke. And can’t express themselves’” (p. 50). In our study of Chinese junior high school students (McKay & Wong, 1996), we too found that in general teachers, by refusing to recognize any knowledge that students might have brought with them (including native-language literacy and school experiences), tended to see the ELs as linguistically and cognitively deficient. In this way, the social and educational context often positions English learners in particular ways, frequently as deficient learners.

Encouragingly a good deal more work on learner identities in relationship to the educational context is currently underway. Zuengler (2004), for example, examines how in a
sheltered U.S. high school class, the teacher and teacher aide use popular cultural icons like McDonalds, Michael Jordan and Jackie Chan to clarify the principles and content of the American constitution. While the teacher and the teacher aide use these cultural icons to position students as consumers who are easily attracted to consumption, the comments of the students suggest that they are far more product-savvy and critical than the teachers assume. In addition, the use of popular icons seemed to allow the less-proficient students to participate in class discussions because of their familiarity with the topics. Ultimately, Zuengler (2004) concludes that the use of popular icons can be beneficial for language learning, but that clearly more research is needed in this area. As she puts it,

Considering that in North America and no doubt elsewhere, classrooms are becoming increasingly heterogeneous in language and culture, it is important to know the dynamics, the potential, and the implication of popular culture in such classrooms, not only for the students’ language and subject matter learning, but for their identities as individuals in societies which are new to many of them. (p. 300)

Whereas the choice of topic in classrooms is highly relevant to issues of personal identity, Duff’s (2002) study is helpful in examining the manner in which peer dynamics is also influential in matters of identity. Duff’s study focuses on language use and socialization in a Canadian Social Studies class composed of local students of various ethnic backgrounds and non-local second language speakers, many of whom were Mandarin and Cantonese speakers. Class discussions were quite common, as were topics dealing with Chinese culture. In examining several class discussion excerpts, Duff found that the contributions of ELs tended to be “short, muted, tentative, and inaccessible to others. As a result, they forfeited—or resisted—opportunities to convey aspects of themselves, their knowledge, interests, and opinions to others, or to make the personal connections for others” (p. 305). When asked in an interview context about their participation, non-local students said that they were afraid of being laughed at or criticized by their peers for their comments. This presented them with a significant dilemma.

Silence protected them from humiliation. However, interactional withdrawal attracted disdain from local students (who confirmed this), for whom silence represented a lack of initiative, agency, or desire to improve one’s English or to offer interesting material for the sake of the class. The NNES students were therefore caught between what appeared to be two unfavorable options: silence or mockery and hostility. (p. 312)
Gee (2004) argues that teaching and learning language and literacy is not just about teaching and learning English but also about teaching and learning specific social languages. He maintains that what students need to get right is not just the language but what he calls Discourse, that is, “multiple ways of acting-interacting-speaking-writing-listening-reading-thinking-believing-valuing-feeling with others at the ‘right’ times and in the ‘right’ places so as to be recognized as enacting an ‘appropriate socially-situated identity’” (p. 25). Although there is little doubt that the non-local students referred to in Duff’s (2004) study needed to adopt the “right” way of acting in order to be accepted members of the social studies class, the question is whether or not the non-local students had the desire or language ability to do this. As Duff (2002) points out, what is clearly needed is more investigation of the extent to which students actually want to display their identities and personal knowledge in class or to conform to the dominant, normative local sociolinguistic behaviors—that is, whether they consider those behaviors and disclosures as signs of competence or incompetence, of strength or weakness—a community standard and ideology toward which they choose to become socialized, or rather something they just endure, resist, or circumvent by demonstrating their capabilities in other ways. [emphasis in the original] (p. 313)

One area which allows English learners to assume a new identity, challenging the identity often given to them as “deficient” learners, is cyber space. In fact recent research is documenting the many ways in which the internet opens new opportunities for English learners.

**Technology and language learning**

Lam’s (2000) study documents how computer-mediated communication (CMC), allows language learners to assume a new identity, one that can enhance literacy skills. Lam’s study was a case study of a Chinese immigrant teenager to the United States, named Almon. When Lam first began studying Almon, he had little confidence in writing in English, which he contended was always his worst subject. However, after designing his own home page and joining an electronic community interested in Japanese pop culture, he gained confidence in his literacy through his on-line exchanges with pen pals. Lam contends that the community Almon joined on the web allowed him to develop a new identity, one that gave him self-confidence. She concludes that
Whereas classroom English appeared to contribute to Almon’s sense of exclusion or marginalization (his inability to speak like a native), which paradoxically contradicts the school’s mandate to prepare students for the workplace and civic involvement, the English he controlled on the Internet enabled him to develop a sense of belongingness and connectedness to a global English-speaking community. Almon was learning not only more English but also more relevant and appropriate English for the World Wide Web community he sought to become a part of. (p. 476)

Whereas before Almon joined the electronic community on Japanese pop culture he viewed English as his biggest problem believing that even in 10 years his English wouldn’t be that good. However, his experience in the chat room and the friends he made changed his outlook. As he puts it,

I’ve changed a lot in the last 2 months, actually. I have kind of changed my determination. I’m not as fearful, or afraid of the future, that I won’t have a future. I’m not as afraid now…When I was feeling negative, I felt the world doesn’t belong to me, and it’s hard to survive here. And I felt not many people understand me, or would. I didn’t feel like I belong to this world…But now I feel there’s nothing much to be afraid of. It really depends on how you go about it. It’s not like the world always has power over you. It was [names of a few chat mates and e-mail pen pals] who helped me to change and encouraged me. If I hadn’t known them, perhaps I wouldn’t have changed so much…Yes maybe the Internet has changed me. (interview, October 5, 1997) (p. 468)

Black (2006) finds similar benefits with the use of fanfiction by L2 learners. Fanfiction “is writing in which fans use media narratives and pop cultural icons as inspiration for creating their own texts” (p. 172). While the majority of the fiction is in English there is a good deal of incorporation of other languages and culture. Based on a year of focused participant observation of one fanfiction website, Black (2005) found that many fan authors created linguistically hybrid texts in which they would ask other participants to help them incorporate aspects of the other participants’ cultures into their texts. In so doing they often constructed a hybridized identity in their texts. Black also found that their was a great deal of peer review and proofreading that went on through the participants’ interaction with one another. The occurred because frequently participants included an author’s note in which they identified themselves as an English language learner who was trying to improve their composition skills. In light of the positive effect that pop culture and the World Wide Web can engender in
One obstacle to the use of technology and pop culture in the classroom may be teachers themselves. Rymes (2004), for example, argues that pop culture can make teachers very uncomfortable since its use can displace teachers from a position of expertise. In her study of a second-grade phonics class, Rymes cites an example of when recognizing Chansey as a Pokemon was key to understanding what was happening in an ESOL peer group. In this case, in a phonics game, one of the students, Rene, pulled a card with the word *chancy* written on it and the teacher is helping him sound it out.

**CHANCY/CHANSEY**

Teacher:  
-c-h[- says.

Student:  
[(ca:n)

Rene:  
a:n (.) (cha:n)

Teacher  
Cha:n (.) –c—y-.

(2.0)

Rene:  
Chances

Teacher:  
Cha:n::e:y

Rene:  
Chancy

Rene  
Ohp! ((looking at Dante and smiling)) [Pokemon.

David:  
[It’s a Pokemon.

Teacher:  
And you have to tell me why the –a- is sho:rt.

David:  
[Chancy. (.) I got it
As Rymes points out, while the teacher is comfortable carrying out the routine of “little known-answers initiation questions” (p. 330), she ignores the reference to the popular game, scolding David for his recognition and reminding him he needs to listen. In the end, Rymes concedes that it can be disconcerting for anyone to forgo their expertise status, but much could be gained if teachers would let learners be the experts in areas of popular culture that the teachers are unfamiliar with.

A second obstacle to the use of technology in the L2 classroom is documented by Turbill (2001) who began his research by trying to investigate how teachers of young children are incorporating technology into their early literacy classes. However, after finding very little use of technology in early literacy classes, he changed his focus to studying why teachers find it difficult to incorporate technology into their literacy classrooms. Working with one Kindergarten classroom in Sydney, he and the classroom teacher tried to incorporate the use of technology into the students’ two-hour Literacy Block. In the process he encountered a variety of obstacles including long wait periods for web pages to download unto the computer, old computers needing to be rebooted to work properly, about half of the children not having computers at home and hence, being unfamiliar with how to operate a computer, insufficient number of computers, and a large number of students in classes.

While such practical concerns are disconcerting, when he and the classroom teacher did finally manage to get children to use the computer for the reading programs, he found some significant advantages to the use of technology. For example, he regularly saw how as children become more familiar with the storyline and visual texts of stories they were reading, they were “talking more about the characters, predicting what is going to happen in the
storyline and in the animations” (p. 269). He also found that as the children gain familiarity with the text and the format of the activities, the teacher could leave them alone to work in groups reading their favorite books. In the end, he concludes that for technology to be effectively used in the classroom, certain factors have to exist. Teachers need the time and training to consider how to incorporate technology into their language learning activities. Teachers need to reconceptualize their concept of literacy and move beyond a “focus on learning to ‘break-the-code’ of print” (p. 274) and to see literacy in a broader framework. Finally, up-to-date hardware is needed along with more innovative software. While it is clear we have gained many insights in the role of imagined communities, identity and technology in language learning, it is important to consider some of the challenges that current research is posing for the profession.

**Inequality of Access in English learning**

As was pointed out in the case of the South Korean mothers, often less affluent families cannot afford special programs to support their children’s English learning. Unfortunately, this economic divide in access to English is often reinforced by Ministries of Education themselves. China is a case in point. In 1976 Deng Xiaoping launched a national modernization program in which English education was seen as a key component: “English was recognized as an important tool for engaging in economic, commercial, technological and cultural exchange with the rest of the world and hence for facilitating the modernization process” (Hu, 2005, p. 8).

In 1978 the Ministry of Education issued the first unified primary and secondary curriculum for the era of modernization. This curriculum introduced foreign language learning at Primary 3. The directive also mandated that efforts in promoting English language proficiency were to be aimed at strengthening English language teaching in elite schools, which were expected to produce the English-proficient personnel needed to successfully undertake national modernization. In fact, in 1985 the Ministry of Education exempted poorly resourced schools from providing English instruction. In addition, the Ministry of Education gave several economically developed provinces and municipalities the autonomy to develop their own English curricula, syllabi and textbooks for primary and secondary education (Hu, 2005). These materials tended to be more innovative, learner-centered and communicative than earlier classroom texts and materials.
The directives summarized above illustrate the dangers that can arise from state mandated guidelines for language teaching. First, such mandates can determine when foreign language learning begins in the public school system. The Chinese Ministry of Education, like many other Asian countries, is formally promoting the early learning of English, even though the issue of early exposure to foreign language learning is still being debated. Second, state mandates can determine who has access to English language learning. In China, recent policies have tended to support English learning among Chinese elite, in this way exacerbating educational inequality.

An economic divide in English learning is also evident in the current English education policies in Hong Kong where, in 1997, the Department of Education in Hong Kong announced a sweeping change in the medium of instruction in Hong Kong schools so that most schools were asked to adopt Chinese as the medium of instruction. At the same time, the government made an exemption for a minority of schools which had been operating successfully in English to continue using English as the medium of instruction (Choi, 2003). According to Choi (2003), the policy, “which provided for the selection of the best primary school graduates for monolingual education, was designed to be a cost-effective way of training in English skills for those who had the economic and cultural capital to benefit from it. Meanwhile, the majority of students were barred from sufficient exposure to English, the language of power and wealth” (p. 673). Choi contends that the policy was basically engineered by business interests right before the change over in 1997 and that its ultimate effect was to “perpetuate a form of linguistic imperialism” (p. 673).

In order to justify the policy, the government extolled the benefits of mother-tongue education; however, many parents believed that what would be best for their children was for them to go to English-medium schools and potentially gain the economic capital they believed, rightly or wrongly, would come from proficiency in English. Many parents strove to get their children into the small number of English-medium schools or enroll them in expensive international schools and even send their children overseas to Anglophone countries to study, options that were available only to a small proportion of economically elite families. The Hong Kong language policy then had several negative effects brought on by globalization and the spread of English: first it encouraged an economic divide in the learning of English; second, it minimized the value of using the mother tongue in education with its
implicit suggestion that this option was in some ways less desirable; and finally, it promoted the idea of the desirability of an English-only classroom in the acquisition of English.

An economic divide in the teaching of English is also evident in South Korea where Park and Abelman (2004) argue that “English has long been a class marker in South Korea: namely knowledge of and comfort with English has been a sign of educational opportunity, and for some of the experience of travel or study abroad and contact with foreigners in South Korea” (p. 646 The size of the English language market in South Korea is estimated to be about $3,333 million dollars a year with another $833 million spent on study abroad programs. The private after-school education market is also booming, particularly after it was announced in 1995 that English would become an elementary school subject. Many Korean parents are sending their children to English-language kindergartens, even though such schools are typically three times more expensive than ordinary kindergartens (Park, 2006). In addition, the number of Korean students studying abroad in English-speaking countries has increased more than 10-fold in the past six years. In fact, the number of elementary students alone has increased from 212 in 1998 to 6,276 in 2004, marking a 30-fold increase (Chung, 2006).

Leibowitz’s (2005) case study of black students at the Western Cape in South Africa, an institution that caters to predominately black students, demonstrates how English in higher education is a key to academic success. However, young people from less affluent backgrounds often face special obstacles in partaking in this success. In the 1990s the language of instruction at the University on the Western Cape shifted mainly from Afrikaans to English. Many of the black students attending Western Cape went to township schools under apartheid where little English was heard with a reliance on mother-tongue instruction and where the content emphasis was on domestic and agricultural work rather than intellectual or professional work.

In her case study, Leibowitz (2005) documents the disadvantages that students face coming to the University with less developed English skills. Students reported that their lack of proficiency in English affected their ability to follow lectures, their interpersonal communication with teachers and classmates, and their essay writing. Reading in English was also a far-more time-consuming task than reading in the students’ first language. But perhaps most importantly Leibowitz found that many of the black students had not been exposed to the kind of academic discourse that was necessary to succeed in a university setting. Several
students reported that in their previous education, they had not been asked to employ the kind of critical evaluation that was asked for at the University. All of these factors made it far more difficult for these students to succeed in a university setting than for students from a middle-class background with high levels of English proficiency.

Leibowitz (2005) concludes that access to English in South Africa is a necessary but not sufficient condition for academic success. Students need exposure to both English and to the discourse of schools in order to succeed, both of which are far more likely to occur in the more privileged schools in South Africa. The situation in South Africa is far from unique. Ramanathan (1999), for example, reports on the difficulties that the lower caste groups in India have in succeeding in India’s institutions of higher education.

The current state of English education raises several critical issues. The first is how to convince parents and students of the value of having a bilingual/biliterate population. At the present time in many Outer Circle countries, parents, school administrators and teachers support an English-only agenda in the schools in the belief that this is best for their children. As in many Inner Circle countries, a child’s first language is viewed as a problem rather than a resource. The second issue is how to provide less advantaged children in the society with equal access to English so they can succeed in institutions of higher education.

A Tendency of Othering in EIL Pedagogy
A second area that presents a challenge for the ELT profession is the tendency toward Othering in EIL pedagogy. By Othering I am referring to the ways in which the “discourse of a particular group defines other groups in opposition to itself; an Us and Them view that constructs an identity for the Other and, implicitly for the Self” (Palfreyman, 2005, p.213-214). In EIL pedagogy this discourse often positions English learners and bilingual teachers as deficient in comparison to native speakers. This discourse has led to the idealization of the so-called native speaker, as well as to a lack of recognition of the benefits of local bilingual teachers. It has also resulted in an unwillingness to recognize the right of English speakers outside Inner Circle countries to nativize the language for the local cultural context. Finally, the Self-Other discourse has at times positioned certain groups as incapable of participating in “modern” methods of language learning that typically involve group participation and “critical thinking.”
Often in discussions of the implementation of communicative language teaching (CLT) in Outer and Expanding Circle countries, there is a suggestion that the culture of learning in these countries is not conducive to CLT. Educators like Ballard and Clanchy (1991) go so far as to argue that different cultures have different attitudes regarding the nature of knowledge and its function in society. They contend that there is a continuum of attitudes toward knowledge ranging from what they term a *conserving* attitude toward knowledge to an *extending* attitude toward knowledge. In the case of the former, the learning approach is highly reproductive and learning strategies involve memorization and imitation. Activities often involve summarizing and applying formulae and information in order to achieve correctness. On the other hand, as the continuum moves to an extending attitude, the learning approach is analytic and speculative involving critical thinking and a search for new possibilities. Activities entail questioning, judging, speculating and hypothesizing with the aim of creativity and originality. Ballard and Clancy go on to argue that although there are individual differences within a culture, a conserving attitude toward knowledge is prevalent in many Asian societies.

...it remains true that the reproductive approach to learning, favoring strategies of memorization and rote learning and positively discouraging critical questioning of either the teacher or the text, is the dominant tendency in formal education in much of Southeast Asia and other Asian countries. And it is the case that in the Australian system, even at the primary level, the dominant tendency is to urge students toward an ultimately speculative approach to learning, to encourage them to question, to search for new ways of looking at the world around them. (p. 23)

Such Othering discourse regarding approaches to knowledge and learning styles is evident in a good deal of the discourse surrounding the implementation of CLT. Flowerdew (1998), for example, discusses the use of group work and students’ oral participation, central components of CLT, in reference to Chinese learners. She begins by asking,

Why is it that when one poses a question to a group of Arab students the whole class is clamouring to answer, while a question addressed to a class of Chinese learners may elicit no response, followed by a stony silence or, as the Chinese say, “dead air”? Even if one nominates a particular student to reply in a class of Chinese learners, the question may still be met with a muffled reply and averted eyes. The answer lies, to some extent, in certain cultural and psychological factors deriving from Confucian philosophy. (p. 323)
Flowerdew goes on to discuss the use of group work with Chinese learners and argues that group work can be implemented with Chinese students if the group is viewed as a collective body which offers suggestions to one another not as individuals but as a group. Underlying her argument are the assumptions that group work in a classroom is admirable and conducive to language learning and that a particular group of learners, in this case Chinese students, are not open to group work and oral participation.

An Othering discourse is also evident in some discussions of critical thinking, a key component of an extending view of knowledge that is promoted in CLT. Atkinson (1997), for example, argues that critical thinking, while extremely difficult to define, is clearly a social practice and that some cultures promote such learning while others do not. He then goes on to compare “critical thinking and nonnative thinkers” (a powerful Othering discourse) arguing that “cross-cultural research into the early socialization and educational practices of non-European peoples” suggests that there are “three areas of potential discontinuity between cultural assumptions that may underlie critical thinking and modes of thought and expression prevalent among non-Western cultural groups” (p. 79). These involve notions of relations between individuals and society, differing norms of self-expression, and different perspective on the use of language as a means for learning. Underlying the discussion is a clear Othering between Westerners who engage in critical thinking and non-Westerners or “nonnative thinkers” whose social practice may not encourage critical thinking. At issue is exactly what is meant by critical thinking and if it is necessary for “nonnative thinkers” to engage in Western concepts of critical thinking in order to learn English.

Othering is not limited to depiction by Western scholars of Asian cultures of learning. Such rhetoric is evident in the discourse of some Asian scholars themselves who characterize an entire culture of learning with broad generalizations. Le (2004), for example, in discussing how to mediate what he refers to as Asian and Western values in ELT practice, makes the following generalization regarding learning in the West and East:

The most outstanding differences between Western classical humanism and Asian educational philosophy is that the former places greater emphasis on the cultivation of intellectual skills to foster the next generations’ leaders while the latter is primarily concerned with the development of moral virtue to promote a static social order. (p. 169)
In his rhetoric then the West is linked with “the cultivation of intellectual skills” while the East is linked with a “static social order.” He continues this Othering in his characterization of the role of teachers in the two cultures when he states,

The confrontation between Asian and western educational ideologies lies in opposing views of the teacher’s role. If Asian teachers are expected to be transmitters of culture who are to maintain the status quo in schools and transmit prevailing culture, western teachers are considered to be the transformers of culture. (p. 171)

Once again, the West in depicted in positive terms as “transformers of culture” while the East “maintains the status quo in schools” and transmits “prevailing culture.”

Notions of Othering is also evident in many of the classroom materials used in ELT pedagogy, particularly in terms of what characters say and do in the textbooks. In many countries where Western characters are introduced in textbooks, it is often in the context of presenting differences between Western culture and local cultures, frequently accompanied by a subtle emulation of Western culture and traditions. A very vivid example of the promotion of Western values appears in the following dialogue from a Japanese Ministry approved textbook.

*Example Two:*

**Rye:** Jim?

**Jim:** What.

**Rye:** Is your father always doing the dishes like that?

**Jim:** Yes. My parents take turns cooking and doing the dishes.

**Rye:** My father never helps with the housework.

He’s too tired after a long day’s work.

**Jim:** I think the Japanese work too much and too long.
What do you think?

Rye: I think so too. But people are taking more holidays than before.

My father stays home longer.

Jim: What does he do on holidays?

Rye: Usually, he just relaxes. But you know what?

He started to learn cooking.

Jim: Does he cook well?

Rye: Yes, he cooks very well.

Everything is very very well-done.


The dialogue is a clear example of what Suzuki (1999) refers to as auto-colonization, in which Japanese are depicted as emulating and accepting Western values. In the dialogue, Rye not only appears to apologize for aspects of his own culture, agreeing with Jim that Japanese “work too much and too long,” but he quickly points out that his father is emulating Western traditions by learning to cook. As if this is not sufficient evidence of a type of auto-colonization, he goes on to say that his father, however, has not managed to undertake this Western pattern very effectively since everything he cooks is “very very well-done.”

**The Question of Standards**

A final concern that needs more attention is the notion of standards in reference to an international language. The spread of English has brought with it the development of many new varieties of English, which has led to much discussion regarding what standards should be promoted in the teaching of English. Implicit in discussions of variation are the notion of standards, a standard language, and issues of power and identity that are built into such concepts. *Standard language* is the term generally used to refer to that variety of a language that is considered the norm. It is the variety regarded as the ideal for educational purposes, and usually used as a yardstick by which to measure other varieties. The related notion of
Language standards has to do with the language rules which inform the standard, and which are then taught in the schools.

While this simple introduction may seem straightforward, definitions that have circulated in discussions about Standard English suggest it is in fact a much more contentious issue:

- A particular dialect of English, being the only non-localized dialect, of global currency without significant variation, universally accepted as the appropriate educational target in teaching English; which may be spoken with an unrestricted choice of accent. (Strevens, 1983, p. 88)
- The variety of the English language which is normally employed in writing and normally spoken by ‘educated’ speakers of the language. It is also, of course, the variety of the language that students of English as a Foreign or Second Language (EFL/ESL) are taught when receiving formal instruction. The term Standard English refers to grammar and vocabulary (dialect) but not to pronunciation (accent). (Trudgill & Hannah, 2002, p. 1)
- We may define the Standard English of an English-speaking country as a minority variety (identified chiefly by its vocabulary, grammar and orthography) which carries most prestige and is most widely understood. (Crystal, 1995, p. 110)

For Strevens (1983), there is no standardized accent associated with Standard English. Others, such as Trudgill and Hanna (2002) and Crystal (1995) associate Standard English more directly with the written form of the language, and by extension, with the language used by “educated” speakers of English. The “educated” speakers of the language are defined by McArthur (1998) as the “more or less middle-class range throughout the English-speaking world… essentially those who have completed their secondary-school education [and] may have gone on to college-university” (p. 117).

The challenge that World Englishes presents to the Standard English ideology is one of plurality - that there should be different standards for different contexts of use; that the definition of each Standard English should be endonormative (determined locally) rather than exonormative (determined by outside its context of use). However, if there are different forms of Standard English, the concern of mutual intelligibility emerges. The fact that some speakers of English use a variety of English that is quite different from a standard variety of English has led some to argue that the use of these varieties of English will lead to a lack of
intelligibility among speakers of English. It is this fear that has led to a widespread debate over standards in the use of English.

One of the early debates over standards occurred at a 1984 conference to celebrate the 50\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the British Council. At this conference, Randolph Quirk and Braj Kachru, two key figures in the growing debate over standards in international English, expressed conflicting views on the issue of standards in relation to international English. Quirk argued for the need to uphold standards in the use of English in both countries where English is spoken as a native language and in countries where English is used as a second or foreign language. He maintained that tolerance for variation in language use was educationally damaging in Anglophone countries and that “the relatively narrow range of purposes for which the non-native needs to use English...is arguably well catered for by a single monochrome standard form that looks as good on paper as it sounds in speech” (Quirk, 1985, p. 6). For Quirk, a common standard of use was warranted in all contexts of English language use.

Kachru (1985), on the other hand, argued that the spread of English had brought with it a need to re-examine traditional notions of codification and standardization. As he put it,

In my view, the global diffusion of English has taken an interesting turn: the native speakers of this language seem to have lost the exclusive prerogative to control its standardization; in fact, if current statistics are any indication, they have become a minority. This sociolinguistic fact must be accepted and its implication recognized. What we need now are new paradigms and perspective for linguistic and pedagogical research and for understanding the linguistic creativity in multilingual situations across cultures. (p. 30)

Kachru maintained that allowing for a variety of linguistic norms would not lead to a lack of intelligibility among varieties of English; rather what would emerge from this situation would be an educated variety of English that would be intelligible across the many varieties of English.

The debate regarding the teaching of standards continues today with some arguing for the promotion of a monolithic model of English while others support a pluricenter model. Those like Quirk who argue for a monolithic model contend that native-speaker models should be promoted because they have been codified and have a degree of historical authority.
The monolithic model is in keeping with one of the central tenets that Phillipson’s (1992) argues has traditionally informed English language teaching, namely, that the ideal teacher of English is a native-speaker. This perspective also lends support to the notion of the insider and outsider, the Self and the Other, since it is native speakers who are seen as the guardians of standard English. On the other hand, those like Kachru who support a pluricentric model of English contend that language contact necessarily leads to language change. They argue that the development of new varieties of English is a natural result of the spread of English. In many ways the debate reflects the tension between the global and the local brought about by the new social space of globalization. Whereas global space has brought exposure to English, local space has taken the language and modified it for the local context.

At the core of the debate is the question of intelligibility. Those who support a monolithic model argue that if localized standards are allowed to develop, English speakers will no longer be able to understand one another. In examining this concern, it is important to recognize that the question of intelligibility involves the extent to which two speakers understand one another rather than to abstract features of the language. Bamgbose (1998) emphasizes this fact when he notes, “Preoccupation with intelligibility has often taken an abstract form characterized by decontextualized comparison of varieties. The point is often missed that it is people, not language codes, that understand one another, and people use the varieties they speak for specific functions” (p. 11).

The fact that many bilingual users of English acquire English in an educational context in which particular standards of use are emphasized will likely insure some unifying standards. Furthermore, unifying norms are needed if English is to serve purposes of wider communication. As Widdowson (1994) notes,

As soon as you accept that English serves the communicative and communal needs of different communities, it follows logically that it must be diverse. An international language has to be an independent language. It does not follow logically, however, that the language will disperse into mutually unintelligible varieties. For it will naturally stabilize into standard form to the extent required to meet the needs of the communities concerned. Thus it is clearly vital to the interests of the international community...that they should preserve a common standard of English in order to keep up standards of communicative effectiveness. (p. 385)
Finally, it is worth noting that the global spread of English only naturally gives rise to many varieties, each with its own norms. However, as “many bilingual users of English acquire the language in an educational context in which particular standards of use are emphasized” (McKay, 2002, p. 53), there will likely always be some unifying norms. Thus, it is highly unlikely that Quirk’s prediction of English dispersing into mutually unintelligible varieties would ever come true.

What all of these interpretations attempt to do is to develop a model that describes and legitimises a pluricentric view of English, and one that moves away from any view of there being just one standard form against which all others are measured. As argued by Kachru (1983, 1992), English has “blended itself with the cultural and social complex” (1983, p. 139) of the country and has thereby become “culture-bound” (1983, p. 140) in it. Therefore, he argues, new Englishes cannot be characterized in terms of acquisitional inadequacy, or be judged by the norms of English in Inner Circle countries. Rather, the form and function of new Englishes must be considered according to “the context of situation which is appropriate to the variety, its uses and users” (1983, p. 215).

It is perhaps in the question of standards that many of the issues we have discussed in this paper come together. The fact that new varieties of English have developed is closely associated with issues of identity. These new varieties are a factor of cultural and linguistic contact; they reflect individuals desire to signal their unique identity while speaking a global language. The new varieties also become a basis for Othering in which those with more power assert that their variety is in fact the “standard.” Finally, what is considered by many to be the standard is that variety promoted in educational institutions, places to which those with less affluences often have less access.

Conclusion
If we look back at the research that has accumulated in the last 40 years regarding EIL, it is clear that we have gained a fuller understanding of how the mystique surrounding English has resulted in many individuals holding an imagined view of the benefits of belonging to an English-speaking community. These individuals come to believe that speaking English will open many doors to them, which will lead to greater educational and economic benefits, as well as to a new identity that makes them cosmopolitan and global citizens. Whereas in some cases speaking English results in an imagined view of the self as a global citizen, in other instances the identity of being an English learner can lead to marginalization. This is
especially true in English-speaking countries where English language learners are sometimes seen as cognitively deficient, particularly in contexts in which they are isolated in ESL classes. Sometimes learners can avoid this identity by becoming part of an Internet community where hybridity is valued and anonymity protects them from being marginalized.

While research on topics such as imagined communities and identity has given us a fuller understanding of the role of English and language learners, there are three particular areas that I believe warrant reflection and new perspectives. These include a greater awareness of the manner in which English is becoming the language of the more affluent, leaving those without economic and educational assets to fall further behind in a globalized world. Another major concern that deserves attention is the manner in which a good deal of rhetoric in the ELT profession promotes an Othering of bilingual speakers of English in which these speakers are seen as less competent in critical thinking, verbalization and professional capability. Finally, we need to reconsider the issue of standards, realizing that because of the global spread of English there are bound to be pluricentric standards, each valid within its own context.
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A highlight of the EIL Journal 2009 conference in Izmir was a very moving concurrent presentation at the end of the conference, “English Shaped by Occupation”. The presenter, Michael Fennell, (this edition pp101-106) simply read a narrative letter aloud. Through the narrative, he managed to raise many useful issues about EIL in a very memorable way. Fennell’s letter described the pressing need of his Palestinian students to communicate their situation to the outside world, a need that clearly situates their classes in the EIL domain. The original voice and the deliberate disregard for the typical generic structure of a ‘conference paper’ underlined for the audience the uniqueness of this EIL situation. It also made us consider and discuss the needs of any group of students to express their international voice differently.

In our recently published book on ‘Accepting Alternative Voices in EFL Journal Articles’ (Adamson and Nunn, 2009), John Adamson and I proposed the fuller integration of a first-person voice into academic writing. One thing we discussed was the need to make sense of the narration of personal experience in real contexts. This might easily be dismissed as unscientific, self-indulgent subjectivity but we prefer to call narrative reflection on relevant experience the legitimate validation of subjectivity. This approach draws on Sivasubramaniam’s (2009) views of constructivism. Sivasubramaniam underlines the sterility of standardization by highlighting the importance of spontaneity, flexibility and diversity and the centrality of voice, agency and response in EFL classrooms.

My paper will not have a single focus, but the unifying central theme will be the description of the method actually being enacted in particular contexts (method-in-use) to help us compare unique experiences across contexts. For cross-cultural comparison to be possible at all, we have to assume that there is something in common between even the most divergent
teaching contexts. I have therefore selected the two most different situations I could find from my own experience and from my research and then used the same model to compare them. By comparing experiences of unique teaching situations across diverse contexts, we attempt to learn from the local experience of others, help to make sense of local experience for ourselves and help others to make sense of their own experience.

After briefly summarizing my model of method-in-use developed and modified from my earlier PhD study (Nunn 1996), I will narrate some of the episodes that could not be included in an examined study or in standard journal articles, but which help support the perception of the need to describe real local experience and to look below the surface of polished academic study. Anecdotal narrated experience would not normally be included in standard academic writing. I use this partly as a counterbalance to more formal writing I have already published on this same subject, but partly because I have come to believe that formal academic writing can take the life and energy out of what is a very dynamic, lived profession and can exclude some highly relevant local data. I do not believe it is possible to understand the context I describe without the anecdotal narrative.

It is also interesting to stand back and ask ourselves why we are presenting at international conferences. We travel thousands of miles from a different context and yet we assume that this is a useful activity for the audience within that context, an audience which is often an interesting combination of international participants and local teachers and students. When briefly introducing a timed presentation, it is easy to forget to address the importance of what we are communicating and its relevance. Only if a study is perceived as important and relevant can we assume that some members of the audience will decide to change something in their beliefs and behaviour. I will therefore also attempt to address the issue of relevance (See Nunn, 2006) in relation to context.

Method-in-Use as a Context-Sensitive Concept

When it is declared that the method concept is obsolete or even dead (Kumaravadivelu, 2002 is just one example), it is normally ‘named methods’ that are referred to (Richards and Rogers, 1986). While we might dispute this claim, as named methods are still commonly referred to, and have been at all recent international conferences I have attended, one possible reason for this apparent demise is that named methods are defined independently of particular teaching contexts.

Over the last fifteen years, I have used the description of method-in-use for three different purposes: research, classroom observation for training and self-improvement as a classroom
teacher. I will refer to all of these in this paper but will not attempt a clear distinction between them here or limit the focus to just one area. Figure one below illustrates the proposed relationship between method, learning principles and improvement in context. My discussion in this paper will briefly consider method-in-use in relation to learning principles, but will mainly consider it in relation to context.

Figure 1 The Method-in-Use Pyramid

In the domain of research, it is difficult to know exactly what is put into operation in the research context in the name of a particular method. Studies of “method” are difficult to use for curriculum improvement because what teachers and students do when apparently enacting ‘audio-lingual’ or ‘communicative’ approaches is never described. Two teachers in different contexts cannot be said to be doing the same thing when apparently claiming to enact the same method or approach and neither of them may be doing something that you or I would recognize as the ‘named’ method they are apparently following. My doctoral research for example, using a detailed classroom study of method-in-use in Qatari secondary schools, found that a so-called communicative approach supported by a massive text-book and teacher-training program over a ten-year period was never enacted in the innovation context. When it was concluded locally that the communicative approach had not worked, the conclusion had no real meaning because it had never been enacted. Whatever it was that was not functioning within the system, nothing in it was remotely describable as a communicative approach.
I cannot claim that method-in-use is a neutral concept, but it does focus on what is enacted in a particular context before any suggestions are made about what might be improved. What might be developed to improve learning essentially takes the context into account and it is assumed that the participants themselves are an essential part of that context. Only they can bring about improvement. As often happens at presentations and workshops, recent questions have focused on how what I am proposing can be applied to the questioner’s context. For teachers, important aspects of their institutional context mentioned in questions have included:

- class size (especially large class size)
- age of students (especially young learners)
- behaviour of students

Discussions of named methods do not normally include such essentials but I will argue that we cannot ignore institutional constraints.

**Context**

My coined term ‘method-in-use’ deliberately sets out to be sensitive to different contexts, if not any context. (See Van Lier’s ecological approach (2004) for an informed discussion of the importance of context in educational inquiry.) Context sensitivity is essential to being relevant. Relevance theory (Sperber and Wilson 1995, p.108) affirms that ‘new’ information or assumptions have to combine with known information or assumptions to produce “contextual effects”. To change behaviour we assume that we need to consider assumptions that are acted out rather than avowed assumptions. Sperber and Wilson (1995, p.15) define context as “a psychological construct, a subset of the hearer’s assumptions about the world”, emphasizing that at the very centre of the notion of context are the people who are interacting in it.
New information that is perceived as relevant is only effective when it leads teachers to modify or even abandon old assumptions that underlie aspects of behaviour. It may also allow teachers to become more confident to support and therefore strengthen the validity of assumptions that the teacher already has. Traditional descriptions of method on the other hand, if they are handled prescriptively, tend to make teachers feel guilty as they are inevitably deviating within their particular setting from the prescribed norms.

The “degree of confidence” we have in someone else’s assumptions influences our learning behaviour. My international experience warns me not to take a deterministic attitude to culture or to make facile assumptions about normal or representative behaviour. Culture is an integral part of any local context and cultural assumptions are in some way reflected in the observable norms that underlie classroom practice. Assumptions for Sperber and Wilson (1995, p. 2) are “thoughts treated by the individual as representations of the actual world”. Perception cannot be directly connected to an objectively determined state of the teaching world but only to assumptions about this world. Conference presentations and journal articles have the obvious aim of developing and improving these assumptions. As Sperber and Wilson (1995, p.76) suggest:

Improvements in our representation of the world can be achieved not only by adding justified new assumptions to it, but also by appropriately raising or lowering our degree of confidence in them, the degree to which we take them to be confirmed.

Halliday’s view of social context provides another potent means of relating context directly to observable interactive classroom roles.
Knowledge is transmitted in social contexts, through relationships, like those of parent and child, or teacher and pupil, or classmates, that are defined in the value systems and ideologies of the culture and the words that are exchanged in these contexts get their meaning from activities in which they are embedded, which again are social activities with social agencies and goals. (Halliday, 1985, p.5)

The need to view classrooms as social contexts in their own right, with their own regularities of linguistic norms of interaction observable in particular settings and structured in terms of contextual features must therefore be acknowledged as a basic assumption underlying method-in-use. In my doctoral study (Nunn, 1996), Halliday’s “context of situation” was used as a superordinate term for three closely related areas outlined and very briefly exemplified in figures 3a – 3c below.

**Figure 3a Context of Situation: Field and Setting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Classroom language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>place (site)</td>
<td>Classrooms in Qatari Boys Secondary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>45-minute periods on weekday mornings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features of the physical environment</td>
<td>Individual desks potentially movable but always arranged formally in rows, chalk boards, textbooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “field” of activity is only generally defined here as classroom language teaching. The setting refers to the location of the interaction in time and place. An institutional classroom setting can often be distinguished by its regular and routine nature, both the times and place of the activity being predetermined for periods of time such as terms, semesters, academic years. The provision and arrangement of equipment and furniture are taken for granted as normal features of the classroom setting. The way the screens, computers, desks and chairs are organized and the equipment each student is supplied with are all relatively stable features of the setting.

Participation in the activity (figure 3b below) takes place for a period laid down by the institution. The same teacher interacted with the same students in the same setting. It may then be assumed that there will be some stability in the developing relationships between participants.
The relationship between the participants engaged in the interaction is referred to as the tenor of the interaction after Halliday (1986). In my adaptation (Nunn 1996), the tenor of interaction is defined in terms of three interlocking features of this relationship: the permanent and temporary roles adopted by participants in their interaction, their relative status during the interaction, and their ability to control the behaviour of the other participants. “Role” can be defined as the behaviour associated with the broadly identified social position of the participants as teachers and students. Certain expectations may be attached to these roles. For my doctoral thesis, which reports a descriptive classroom study, “role” was defined as “the actual behaviour of the holders of the positions of teacher or student when participating in the activity recorded in its setting.” During the interaction, a participant has to adjust his/her own behaviour to the behaviour of the other participant(s), so the roles of teachers and students are defined in relation to each other. Teacher-fronted interaction was the norm in the research context.

I defined “status” in terms of choices made which would in theory have been available to participants equally had they been of equal status. In all classes I recorded and observed in the research context, both the right to initiate a new topic and the right to self-select were not
available to students. The right to choose a non-textbook topic was not even available to teachers. The third aspect, “control”, is defined as the extent to which a participant is able to direct the interactive behaviour of other participants. In the classroom setting, this normally comes to mean the extent to which teachers determined the nature and quantity of students’ contributions to the interaction and the rules of participation.

Classroom interaction also reflects the different purposes of the participants. If the intention of any contribution at a particular point of a developing interaction is not directly available to an analyst, it becomes indispensable for the analyst to search for a holistic, accumulative purpose through the regular effect of the contributions in longer stretches of interaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 3c  Context of Situation: Norms of Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular patterns of interactive structure and their holistic outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative degree of code structuring Levels of formality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwritten rules of participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Norms are the means of interpreting aspects of the socio-cultural context as they are more or less regular features of interaction that participants almost invariably conform to. In Qatari high schools for example, students were always observed to conform to the norm of throwing their hands in the air and calling out “teacher, teacher” to bid for nomination. The shared cultural norms of interaction are revealed through the description of the cumulative effect of the regular patterns of interaction. This is the window through which we may describe the actual method that is in use. Text reconstruction was the predominant outcome in this context.

**Describing Method- in-Use**

Method-in-use is an attempt to describe holistically over time what is being accomplished through interaction in a particular context prior to considering development or improvement. My model considers four categories that are all related to classroom discourse. The input and output are observed, holistic transactions in relation to the output are characterized (such as a text reconstruction or a decision making discussion), detailed features of the interaction are recorded (such as turn-taking and exchange structure) and finally the focus and outcomes of the interaction are characterized in terms of whether the interaction leads to the creation of an
original text by each student (divergent outcome) or the same text or a similar text by all students (convergent).

Figure 4 Method-in-use as a Holistic Concept

I would like to illustrate this diagrammatic representation with semi-narrated examples from two contexts in which I have worked. In 1984 I started teaching in Qatari high schools on a British Council sponsored contract. I went on to do teacher training and test development in the same context and finally did extensive classroom research in the same Qatari high schools. I will use a lesson analysis in which I was asked to support a Palestinian teacher who was preparing an RSA diploma (the former version of DELTA) but was failing the practical sessions because he was practicing what the external examiner and teacher trainer considered to be poor practice, an exclusively teacher-fronted lesson. My second example will relate a lesson I taught at the Petroleum Institute last year (2009) when teaching a class of 10 students who were doing a project based course. I have selected these lessons from many others I could recount after 33 years of classroom experience because I do not believe there could be two lessons that are more different although they both took place in Arab Gulf States so the non-institutional context had very strong similarities.
Input and Output: Text and Topic

Context 1 – a teacher-fronted high school lesson

The input came exclusively from the course book as did the topic. It was almost entirely delivered in English. The outcome was always product focused and was convergent in that all the students reproduced the same text as a measure of a successful outcome. In subsequent tests the same texts were used (and often even the same questions) as those in the textbook so students were encouraged to memorize verbatim. In this sense the input and output were almost identical.

Context 2 – a devolved university project-based lesson

In this context the input came from student-selected texts on their team’s chosen research topic and from the students’ own written work on the texts. The choice of the topic was also their own. Each student brought a text that they had read and an evaluation of that text. One evaluation criterion was relevance to their project. Each student reported the relevant information and citations from their text that could be used to contribute to a collectively written synthesis for their literature review. The synthesis was organized in class and produced out of class.

Holistic types of pedagogical activities

Context 1 In the high-school context, the main holistic activity was the verbatim reconstruction of a text in teacher-fronted whole class session. The activity suggested in the textbook was a devolved activity in which students were supposed to discuss the text in a small group and prepare their opinion to report to the class. The British teacher trainer suggested this activity but the teacher preferred not to use it. Furthermore syllabus timing was determined exclusively with reference to the textbook, so theoretically it would have been possible to see exactly the same activity and page being studied in every classroom in the country on the same day. The main authority over the teachers were the local expatriate Arab inspectors, who tacitly approved the reconstructive approach and banned group work. Course writers supported by teacher trainers had only persuasion as a poor tool to suggest other approaches.

Context 2 In the university context the holistic activity was a discussion and co-planning of the literature review of a group-written research proposal. It was student led and totally devolved with no intervention after the first five minutes. I intended to share my time between
the two teams. One was a relatively shy team of local students who were inhibited by my presence and asked to work alone first before showing me what they were doing. We did have a very full discussion at a later stage but not during this lesson. The other was a team of extrovert expatriate Arab students who were normally very happy to interact with me as an extra team member but on this particular occasion were keen to finish in class as they had a busy day ahead and very directly told me that discussing with me would delay them. As a result I didn’t really intervene myself during the whole lesson.

Classroom Interaction

Context 1
As in the eleven recorded and transcribed lessons, recorded in local schools, and more than double this number of observed lessons for confirmation, there was not a single self-selection observed by students in this lesson. There was no devolved interaction between students, all discourse being enacted in teacher-fronted sessions. The teacher negotiated the responses and then moved on to continue reconstructing the text. Teacher-whole group drilling of new vocabulary was also used. This does not mean that the atmosphere was dull. Energetic bidding, often calling “teacher, teacher” invariably accompanied this process. A three-part IRF structure (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975) was difficult to identify, as student responses were negotiated and this exchange central move did not resemble what is normally described as a ‘follow up’ move. ‘Negotiation’ by the teacher included repair and recasting at act level. (See Nunn 2001 for a fuller discussion of Sinclair and Coulthard.) Exchanges however were frequently rather ritualistically terminated by a verbatim repetition of the students response with falling intonation, whether this response was grammatically correct or not. All teachers were observed to do this, but some more than others. This does not mean that the teacher’s personality was suppressed or that teachers did not have their own idiosyncratic characteristics but in this respect their behaviour was almost identical. This current lesson under discussion was actually delivered with great energy and pace by both the teacher and students in lock-step.

Context 2
In my project-based session I didn’t initiate at all, or correct any language. All initiation, response and negotiation of responses were conducted by the students themselves. In the ‘shy’ team this was done through a designated team leader who acted as a meeting chair. The discussion was ordered and well-organized with little interruption but with extensive
discussion and debate of opinions through self-selection or nomination. In the ‘extrovert’ team there was no apparent leader. They had a lively, noisy and productive interaction with frequent interruption and negotiated debate.

Focus and outcomes

Context 1
The high-school lesson was entirely product focused, the product being the pre-written text from the textbook. The outcome was totally convergent as there was no creation of texts by the students. The aim was to reproduce the text very closely to the original. The purpose of this activity appeared to be rote-learning for the exams, in which the comprehension texts and often the questions were literally reiterated in the examinations. As divergent outcomes such as text creation were not required they were not practiced. The teacher observed typically started his lessons with revision that involves reproduction of previous textbook discourse (sample 1 below). This lesson was recorded more than a semester in advance of school leaving exams.
The sayings referred to in sample 1 above were memorized from a previous lesson in the textbook. The apparently random reiteration of previously studied texts, was, in fact, explained by the teacher as a means of encouraging and checking on memorization of future exam responses. A typical, frequently recycled, written exam question would then be: “How do you know that Arab people are hospitable?” Exam revision booklets containing this kind of commonly recycled “important” questions based on rehearsed extracts of known texts were commonly made available to students in secondary schools. This situation was further complicated by the fact that alternative non-rote learnt answers might not be accepted in exams. Model answers provided by the examiner are not normally negotiable during exam correction (a fact not always made clear to the examiner). In other words, a student who
provides a different non-rote learnt answer, however acceptable it might be, may not have been awarded any marks for an answer structured in his own words.

**Context 2**

In my university class, the activity was process and product based, involving the creative construction of the students’ own text. While students conformed to norms of generic structure, the outcome was divergent, each team producing an entirely different text on a different topic, but in a similar taught genre (the literature review of a research proposal).

**Learning Principles and Improved Practice in Context**

Within an international community of practice, a presentation should make some effort to establish relevance to practice but should also provide some useful theoretical support of practice. In the triangular model proposed in figure 1 above, I proposed that the method cannot be seen as independent of context revealed through interaction. So far, my argument might appear to suggest that we are rather helpless observers of contextual constraints and culture-dominated practice, we can describe them but we cannot improve them. This situation is exacerbated because many practitioners, even those who attend conferences like this one, are deeply suspicious of so-called “theory”. One problem is that we do not work in a domain that provides proof of the effectiveness of theories. SLA research is often conveniently accused of providing little of practical use because there is little universal agreement about what results mean. What constitutes evidence is important here. “Proof” and “objectivity” are inappropriate criteria for SLA research. Results need careful sifting to arrive at a usable interpretation. In this respect the ten SLA principles extracted by Ellis (2005) – the subject of his keynote presentation in the first Asian EFL international conference in Pusan in 2005 - can be seen as a major achievement because they can be employed as a provisional checklist against which we ourselves as teachers or observers work out how changes in our behaviour might improve acquisition.

In a recent issue of the Asian EFL Journal, Howard and Miller (2009) provide an interesting discussion of the applicability of these principles so I will not emphasize these further here to avoid duplication with my own and Howard and Miller’s work. It must be pointed out, in response to a question at the EIL conference presentation that preceded this paper that no attempt is made to suggest that these principles can fully represent a field as broad as SLA or that SLA research is the only important source of language learning principles and beliefs. However, I do argue that SLA is a difficult field for busy practitioners to apply to their
classrooms so there is no point taking an ivory tower approach to SLA theory. Ellis’s principles have practical value in a holistic sense in a way that is not common in SLA in that they are written to support practice.

**Local Context Sensitivity Versus External SLA Principles**

In the context briefly described above, there was no interaction between students in small groups as recommended by the teachers’ book. This reflected teachers’ beliefs as they all stated that small group communication could not work in their context. It also reflected students’ beliefs in that they appeared to perceive small-group activity as exotic and not really what they expected to happen in a classroom. This was also influenced by institutional factors as illustrated in the narrative incident described below. However, this context did not correspond to RSA diploma expectations of more devolved interaction.

**Narrative incident**

There was a tacit agreement in this context that small-group work was noisy and difficult to control. It would also attract the potentially hostile attention of the headmaster who patrolled the corridor with a cane with potentially painful consequences for the students in the class and embarrassment for the teacher. On one occasion from my own experience when teaching in the same school, a student sitting near the outside window warned me via expressive gesture of the presence of the headmaster in the bushes. He also warned the class and we managed to construct together ten minutes of orderly teacher-fronted textbook-related discourse of the kind preferred by the headmaster until the same student gave the all clear. We then had a much more natural discussion in English about the incident. The students told me that this was common practice by the headmaster, who was normally well-liked as a colourful local character by both students and colleagues. The students explained that they commonly warned and cooperated with some teachers when they knew the headmaster was outside, but would be deliberately disruptive if the headmaster was spying on a teacher they did not like, knowing this would have consequences for the teacher.

SLA principles however, raise some doubts about the effectiveness of this method-in-use. Ellis’s eighth principle (“The opportunity to interact in the L2 is central to developing L2 proficiency.” Ellis 2005, p.9) could be taken to imply that the very restricted range of interaction will limit SLA. Principle ten (Ellis, 2005, p.10) indicates that we need to test free production as well as controlled production. In post-lesson interviews, the majority of teachers considered that their context prevented them from teaching the way they might like
to. Comments made in confidence when the microphone was switched off and personal experience of working in the same schools all add to the picture of the realities of the local context, the kind of contextual realities that do not often figure in academic research. Fear of inspectors or membership of so-called ‘private tuition’ mafias run by powerful inspectors, the main function of which seems to have been to ensure success in exams for their private students by fair means of foul, the need to have quiet classrooms when headmasters patrolled the corridors, the intense pressure on teachers and students to achieve high grades on rote-learnt exams and the difficulty of controlling large classes of local students when the teachers were expatriate Arabs were all strong forces of motivation to teachers. Expatriate teachers had the perception of being under considerable job pressure and teachers who stood out were easily singled out for dismissal from jobs which earned them ten times their salaries in their home countries. Citing SLA principles is not often effective in such contexts as the following narrative illustrates.

In post-lesson interviews teachers were often more forthcoming when the microphone was switched off. Several informants in a variety of schools I visited told me that there was a lucrative private tuition market run by local inspectors which involved fixing results for students who took private tuition with members of what the teachers called ‘mafias’. One teacher explained how he tried to get round this practice by pretending to go along with it, while privately ignoring a request to alter marks for certain students. The interview extract below (on tape this time) illustrates how pressure was finally successfully applied to alter exam results. 

He [a colleague] says, "No, there must be results and you must give the remedy for this." I said, "OK. It's not a problem." The advisor [inspector] came, he said that, "Why is this?" And he said that you have to do something to change it. I said that I know. I know this. So even if you want to follow yourself or to follow the best way for the exam, you have to expect problems.

The teacher used this as an example of the institutional pressure to conform to a certain type of teaching in which verbatim text reconstruction dominated.

Conclusion

I have tried to demonstrate that the model I propose is capable of describing and comparing method-in-use in very different contexts and for different purposes. (See Nunn 2004 for examples from further contexts.) The purposes described briefly here in the two examples were research analysis and self-analysis. An additional factor in context one was the teacher’s
need to be examined for an RSA diploma exam in his normal teaching context in which he had to demonstrate the ability to foster interaction between students. Clearly this typical lesson that I recorded did not fulfil this need. It was therefore necessary for instrumental purposes to construct an atypical lesson for the examination and to prepare the students for this type of lesson. This was successfully achieved.

I also concluded that the RSA-style lesson also recommended by the textbook and the expatriate teacher trainers was unlikely to be practised in this context. I am also aware that my own lesson described here would have been equally unsuccessful as an examined lesson. A greater proportion of teacher-fronted discourse with more controlled devolution would have been a safer approach. While we could suggest that the context should be taken into account (something which is done in more recent versions of the examination), it is clear that teaching a normal lesson is never likely to satisfy external observers in either of these contexts.

The purpose of this paper was to suggest an approach to describing method-in-use in context in a way that could support improvement, not to suggest improvements in particular contexts. However, suggestions in the first setting based on the contextually sensitive research were to improve the reconstruction of text approach in the school system to make it less verbatim and more divergent rather than to replace it completely. Naturally the ethical issues referred to in this context also needed to be addressed and the unethical private tuition business was ultimately stopped in that context. Suggestions for improvement need to be feasible. If innovation is too distant from current practice, it is not normally feasible.

Conclusions drawn from purely theoretical study remain theoretical. Description needs to include the unique non-theoretical institutional constraints that exist in each context but should not encourage complacency or blind acceptance of the status quo. This is why a focus on theoretical learning principles, which has not been emphasized in this paper, is an important aspect of the model. As different contexts will have their own unique constraints, it is important to listen to and work closely with those who work in the context if feasible suggestions are to be made in relation to our knowledge of generalized principles. Sensitivity to context should also be seen as an important principle.

Starting with a sound description of what is actually being enacted (method-in-use) is not proposed here as an end in itself but as the first necessary step to improvement in local contexts. Providing a means of comparing method across cultures was proposed here at our international EIL conference as an approach to sharing experience with, and learning from, colleagues who practise the same profession in very different contexts. If we cannot do this,
there is little point in organizing or attending such conferences or publishing in international journals.
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Abstract
The English as an International Language (EIL) research movement that has appeared due to the increasing number of non-native speakers outnumbering the native English speakers seems to challenge some of the traditional assumptions in ELT. Within the scope of ELT curriculum development, this study aims to argue against two of the traditional assumptions that the goal of English learning is native speaker competence and that native speaker culture should inform instructional materials. By illustrating a lesson plan in which students are familiarized with English speakers from various backgrounds and cultures, the study tries to show how an EIL lesson looks like.
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Background to the Study
The status of English as an International Language (EIL) which can be descibed as “a vehicular language spoken by people who do not share a native language” (Mauranen 2003,
513) has appeared as a result of the number of non-native speakers in the world outnumbering the native-speakers. Graddol (1999) claims that the balance between native and non-native speakers of English will shift dramatically in the coming 50 years and the the number of people using English as their second language will grow from 235 million to around 462 million. Looking at the statistics, one can suggest that in today’s world, most of the English communications are carried out in non-native contexts by non-native speakers of English and English has become the property of all the English speakers, not only the native-speakers.

The increasing number of non-native speakers has made EIL researchers question some of the traditional assumptions as put forward by McKay(2003):

1. ELT pedagogy should be informed by native speaker models.
2. The cultural content for ELT should be derived from the cultures of native English speakers.

This study has the main objective to review the theoretical background of EIL and to relate McKay’s concerns about the model to follow for teaching pronunciation and culture with an EIL lesson plan exemplifying an alternative approach to the native-speaker model. In the lesson about, instructional materials that represent the international culture and different varieties of English has been used so that students can get an awareness about the importance of intercultural communication and the changing status of EIL.

The Native-speaker Model

The appearance of so many different varieties of English has led a number of linguists to question the use of native speaker pronunciation models in the teaching of English and to call for an alternative to the native-speaker model by approaching critically the traditional assumptions that ELT pedagogy should be informed by native speaker models. Monroy (2008), for example, claims that EIL involve the de-prioritization of the classic British-American models and the idea of language ownership, the incorporation of other varieties and standards of English, and the non-rejection of other non-English accents as long as they do not interfere with intelligibility. As an alternative model to the so-called British or American models, Jenkins (2000) argues that a way of speaking English reflecting the linguistic and cultural identities of non-native speakers of English should be adopted. Considering the arguments against the native-speaker model, there seems to be a need to rethink the goals of teaching pronunciation within Jenkins’ model. According to the EIL research movement, the goal is to ensure mutual intelligibility among non-native speakers of English, not to help learners to have a native-like accent or to ensure intelligibility to native speakers. Therefore,
the term intelligibility and a model describing basic phonological features for EIL intelligibility in designing should be elaborated here.

Intelligibility that is described by Smith and Rafiqzad (1983:61) as “capacity for understanding a word or words when spoken/read in the context of a sentence being spoken/read at natural speed” seems to be an alternative to the native-speaker model. Jenkins’ work seems to be the first attempt to describe a much more achievable model in teaching and learning English. These phonological features focus on maintenance of local identity by speakers and mutual intelligibility, especially among non-native speakers, rather than the so-called native speaker models. She argues that certain phonological items have to be kept if non-native speakers wish to remain intelligible among each other. She has two lists of features as lingua franca core (necessary for intelligibility) and non-core (not necessary for intelligibility). For instance, all the consonants except for ‘th’ sounds as in ‘thin’ and ‘this’ and the contrast between long and short vowels (sit, seat) are under the heading of her lingua franca core while weak forms such as the words ‘to’, ‘of’ and ‘from’, word stress and pitch movement are in the non-core list.

The implications of Jenkins’ model challenging the traditional goal of pronunciation teaching as native-like accent is that students should be given plenty of exposure in their pronunciation classrooms to other non-native accents of English so that they can understand them easily even if a speaker has not yet managed to acquire the core features. Also, students should be provided with chances to acquire the pronunciation that is more relevant to their linguistic and cultural identities. In the lesson plan at the end of the study, students will listen to how a Japanese, a Spanish and a German speaker of English speak the language.

Cultures of Native-speakers

Teaching culture has always been an important point of discussion among researchers. Deciding on the cultural content of materials and course books has been a much more important area among experts within the framework of EIL. Smith (1976) was one of the first experts who pointed out that if English is an international language used as a tool in cross-cultural situations, there is no reason why the learners of the language should internalize the cultural norms of the native speakers of that language. Similar reflections about the key question of whose culture to teach can also be heard from today’s researchers like Alptekin (2002). He points out that in a world where English is taught as a lingua franca whose culture becomes the world itself, students should be exposed to the international culture, not just the native-speaker or the home culture.
Despite most EFL learners’ instrumental motivation to learn English as a tool in cross-cultural communication, English course books insists on bombarding the ELT world with culturally-loaded native-speaker themes, such as actors in Hollywood, the history of Coca-Cola, the life of Lady Diana, and what American do on Halloween. Researchers like Prodromou (1988) underlines the issue that most course books include cultural situations that most students will never come across, such as “finding a flat in London, talking to landladies in Bristol, rowing on the river in Cambridge” (p.80). In her book “Teaching English as an International Language”, McKay (2002) argues against the idea of teaching the native-speaker culture by claiming that the goal of teaching culture in EIL should be to “help learners develop strategies to achieve friendly relations when English is used with speakers from other cultures” (p.127) and EIL speakers do not need to “acquire the pragmatic rules of another culture but rather to mutually seek ways to accommodate to diversity” (p.128).

If most of ELT materials and course books still depend mostly on the native-speaker culture and it seems to be a long time for course book writers to develop an EIL-conscious attitude towards cultural content in their books, Seidlhofer (1999) points out that it is the teacher who can adapt texts and books to students’ needs. If most students are likely to communicate with non-native speakers and if knowing about one culture will not be enough to interact in cross-cultural encounters, then students should be encouraged to get an awareness of the international culture. This can best be done by encouraging students to reflect on their own culture in relation to others, that is, “establish a sphere of interculturality” (Kramsch, 2001). By giving them the chance to compare cultures, teachers can create students that are more tolerant of the cultural diversity in the world. The activity in the lesson at the end was linked with students’ home cultures to establish Kramsch’s sphere of interculturality.

Also, the lesson at the end illustrates the incorporation of different cultural patterns focusing on how the Japanese, Spanish, and German entertain their guests. Their cultural patterns regarding the kind of invitation, the time of day, the preparations that the host or hostess makes, the presents that people take and the food&drinks served make up the main focus of the lesson.

Conclusion

It is suggested in the literature above that the native-speaker has lost the battle against the increasing number of non-native speakers and it has become a denationalized language effecting ELT, especially teaching culture and pronunciation. The following lesson plan
adapted from New Headway Intermediate (Liz and John Soars, 1996, p.42) has the main objective to familiarize students with non-native accents and cultures of non-native speakers of English. Since EIL still seems to be on the theoretical level, it is high time to carry it to our classrooms where English is learned as a tool for intercultural communication mostly with non-native speakers.

Lesson Plan

*Topic*: Entertaining guests in different cultures    *Level*: Intermediate

*Duration*: 40 minutes    *Materials*: Tape, whiteboard

*Objective*: By the end of the lesson the students will be able to speak about how people entertain their guests in different countries including their own.

*Enabling Objectives*: By the end of the lesson, students will be able to ….
1. list cultural characters of the Japanese, Spanish and German about entertaining guests
2. listen and identify information in listening extracts recorded by a Japanese, a Spanish and a German speaker of English
3. present cultural information describing how guests are entertained in their cultures.

**ACTIVITIES**

*Pre-listening Activities*: The teacher asks pairs to brainstorm what they know about Japanese, Spanish and German culture by wiring nouns, phrases, adjectives or even sentences in 5 minutes.

*During Listening Activities*: The teacher asks students to fill in the chart below while listening. They listen to each speech twice and check their information with their partners at the end by discussing what information they could catch while listening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The kind of invitation</th>
<th>Sumie(Japan)</th>
<th>Rosa(Spain)</th>
<th>Eric(German)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The time of day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The preparations before guests arrive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presents people take</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food and drink served</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post-listening Activities: The teacher asks students to compare the information in the chart with similar information about their own cultures by discussing with their partners.

Assignment: Prepare an oral presentation about how you entertain guests in your country. Use a similar format to the ones about Japan, Spain or Germany.
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Transcript
1 Sumie
In my country, Japan, usually we invite guests home at the weekend, in the early evening, about seven o’clock. Before they come, we must tidy the front garden and clean the entrance hall. Then we must spray it all with water to show that we welcome guests with cleanliness. The guests usually bring presents and when they give you the present they say, ‘I’m sorry this is such a small present’, but in fact they have chosen the present very carefully. When the
meal is ready the hostess says, ‘We have nothing special for you today but you are welcome to come this way.’ You can see that in Japan you should try to be modest and you should not show off too much. If you don’t understand our culture you will think this is very strange.

When we have foreign guests we try to serve traditional Japanese meals like *sushi*, *tempura*, or *sukiyaki* but when we have Japanese guests, we serve all kinds of food such as spaghetti, Chinese food, or steaks. When guests leave, the host and hostess see them out of the house and wait until their car turns the corner of the street; they wait until they can’t see them any more.

2. Rosa
I come from Spain. At home what we love most is going out to eat in bars and restaurants. There is a big choice and we can go from one bar to another trying different things and having a few drinks, usually wine or beer. But sometimes we also like to invite people to our home.

I usually invite my friends for an informal meal. I cook Spanish omelette, which is made with potatoes, onions and eggs, fried in olive oil. Then we have things like cheese, ham – Spanish ham is very different from English ham, and if you buy the best, one called *Jabugo* is something delicious, worth trying. And then things like olives, anchovies, mussels. We drink wine or beer. Some people may bring a bottle of wine or something for pudding. We usually meet late in the evening, about eight thirty or nine. Of course we dress casually; we just want to be relaxed and comfortable and talk and laugh together.

3. Eric
I am from Germany. We like eating together with our family but sometimes we eat out in restaurants. Our meals at home include lots of fresh fruits and vegetables and also exotic dishes from the Mediterranean area. We usually invite our guests to restaurants for an informal dinner or sometimes to our home. When we invite guests, we expect them to stay for the whole evening. Before the guests arrive, we clean the sidewalks, pavements, corridors and steps in the apartment. When they arrive, we escort them to their seats. We serve some of the traditional German food like “wiener schnitzel”. It consists of a thin slice of veal coated in breadcrumbs and fried. We do not begin eating until the host starts or someone says “guten appetit”. We mostly drink beer and the host raises his glass first so that everybody can start drinking. Guests always bring a small gift such as give books, bourbon, whiskey or classical music. American-made gifts are very valuable. Sometimes, yellow roses or tea roses are also given as presents. We usually dress formally but it really depends who your guest is. Guests send a handwritten thank you note or call the host to thank for the hospitality.
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1. Introduction

In the past few centuries the world has witnessed dramatic changes to human societies. New technologies and ways of thinking constantly alter how we live our everyday life. Most youngsters nowadays can expect to spend their childhood in school and gain access to global knowledge and ideas. Increasingly these youngsters are also learning English, in school and via other channels such as tutoring, private class (cram school), and self-study. After World War II, mass schooling became the norm as the land in the world was territorized by modern nation-states. Mass schooling is regarded as facilitating the construction of world culture, a particular worldview based on scientific rationality (Drori & Meyer, 2006). And now if English is to be learned by every school child in the world, what worldviews would these children develop? This question may be premature because it remains uncertain whether in the near future English will be learned by every school child in the world, and even if English is included in the curriculum, what proficiency level most children can achieve is questionable. However, this issue deserves duly attention since in most places children are starting to learn English earlier and with more time and effort (See Nunan, 2003).

In 2001 a new curriculum framework was implemented in Taiwan, and English became a required course in the fifth grade. Before the new curriculum, English instruction began at the seventh grade, the first year of junior high school. In 2005 the official beginning of English instruction was lowered to the third grade, while in many urban areas such as Taipei, Taichung, and Kaohsiung, public schools start offering English lessons in the first grade. Private institutions such as kindergarten and buxiban (cram school) are also prospering in Taiwan. In the past decade, English education policy has undergone dramatic changes as teachers, students, and parents alike juggle with the chaotic situation concerning English teaching and learning (Chang, 2006).
Generally speaking, children today spend more time in school (in the world culture environment) and on English. It is thus interesting to understand how the students growing up in such an environment conceive the world and English. This study intended to investigate how university students in Taiwan conceive the English language and their perceptions of the world in the current globalization era. Such subjective understandings are then juxtaposed with theoretical ideas in world culture and global English to illuminate important issues. In what follows a brief introduction of the theoretical background on global English and world culture is presented. The methodology section provides details on data collection and analysis, which is followed by the findings and a conceptual discussion on emerging issues from the interviews.

2. Global English
Language plays an extremely significant role in the development of culture at local, national, and global levels. The ideas associated with global English may be dated back to English as an international language (EIL) in the 1970s (Smith, 1976), and it has gained more support in recent years as the globalized world provides a fertile ground. The reason the term global English (Graddol, 2006) is used here, instead of EIL, or English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (Kuo, 2006; Seidlhofer, 2001), lies in the word ‘global’, which implies beyond nation-state framework. In a lot of countries English is taught in private institutions, and it is the individual, more than the government, that makes the decision to learn English. Of course, more and more governments are putting English into their official curriculum at earlier age in the name of national competitiveness. If the trend continues, in the near future we may witness a world in which a majority of human kind are able to communicate with each other using English. This has never happened in human history, so the implication of a truly global language would be immense.

As a neutral communication medium, global English evolves with the users around the world, whose number increases exponentially in recent years and the trend probably will continue in the near future. And for most users English would not be their mother tongue. The fiercely challenged concept of ‘nativeness’ (Butcher, 2005; Cook, 1999) would be a peripheral issue in global English with the de-terrorization of societies (Brutt-Griffler, 2005) that alters how people conceive the idea of being native. User-oriented language changes are expected to further diversify and expand the landscape of global English.
The emergence of global English calls for a reexamination of the connection between what language(s) we speak and who we are (Brutt-Griffler, 2005). While critical leftists may warn of possible harmful consequences for national and local identity (e.g., Skutnabb-Kangas, 1998), relevant studies concerning global English’s influence on identity construction indicate contextual and individual differences: English may contribute to building local, national, and global identities (Norton, 2000; Erling, 2007).

Language is commonly assumed to express, embody, and symbolize cultural reality (Kramsch, 1998). “Since language and culture are inseparable, we cannot be teachers of language without being teachers of culture— or vice versa” (Byram and Morgan, 1994: vii). But what culture do we teach when teaching global English? Global English could be ‘cultural free’ or ‘the most culture-rich language’ (Medgyes, 1999: p.187-188) because culture may be decoupled from English, or on the other hand, various local cultures may enrich English as it takes on a global language role. These changes effected by the process in which English gradually becomes a global language have immense implications on its pedagogy. The teaching and learning goal of achieving native fluency is seriously challenged (see Holliday (2005) on ‘native speakerism’). Communication, comprehensibility, and intercultural intelligibility are valued over linguistic norms and standards that used to occupy the center of English learning and teaching (Alptekin, 2002; Sifakis, 2004).

Though EFL and ESL teaching materials still dominate the global ELT market, more studies and efforts start to spring up. In the Asia-Pacific the idea of global English has considerable impact on educational policies and practices (Nunan, 2003), though seemingly only at the rhetoric level. School as a conservative institution is renowned for its slow adaptation to social changes (Cuban, 1992), so most studies on how teachers (e.g., Timmis, 2002; Jenkins, 2007) and students (e.g., Matsuda, 2003; Adolphs, 2005; Sari & Yusuf, 2009) perceive the roles of English in terms of GE ideas show that to liberate English from native speakers is still a long and winding road.

3. World Culture
World culture theory, advocated by neo-institutionalists in sociology (Baker & LaTendre, 2005; Lechner & Boli, 2005), suggests that science, as a world institution, provides a cultural authority and common ontology (Drori et al., 2003), and constitutes the basis of world culture.
The reasoning starts with the increasingly standardizing wider environment, particularly modern institutions, organizations, and systems, such as hospital (in which one is born), school (where one’s childhood and adolescence is spent), company (which most people devote their adult life to), and most importantly, nation-state (which governs people's daily life). Of particular interest and relevance here is the role education plays in shaping one’s worldviews. According to world culture theory, individuals are empowered in the schooling process and acquire certain norms implicitly from simply being in school.

The educational system has evolved from a knowledge/skill-transmitting institution that allocates individuals to different positions in the society toward an abstract cultural model that emphasizes proper attitudes and orientation. This cultural model, with progress and justice as its ultimate goals, stresses the growth of individual capacity and universal participation. The principles and norms of this cultural model, while becoming global, are perceived to drive the educational and curricular changes throughout the world in the last few decades of the twentieth century (Baker & LaTendre, 2005). The ‘norms’ behind this shift are empowerment and equality. By shifting the major function of schooling from allocation to construction of a universal citizenry, mass schooling replaces elite schooling. Students in mass schooling are increasingly given ‘choices’ as to what courses to take and what career they wish to pursue as they are provided with resources and assistance to make decisions about their own lives. The hidden values behind this assumption about education lie in the ideals of individual empowerment and human rights, that every human being has the potential capacity to achieve whatever she/he is motivated to, and the right to be given equal opportunities, resources, and assistance to exert her/his potential. In such world culture norms, children are awarded their individual agency at a younger age. Students are to become modern citizens after schooling, and modern citizens means autonomous social agents “carry the capacity for effective and responsible voluntary actions” (McEneaney & Meyer, 2000, p.195).

The ideals of mass school are founded on the growth of individual capacity and universal participation. Individual empowerment, as one of the key norms, implies self-responsibility, independence, and self-actualization. These are the proper attitudes that school is to develop in individuals. Equality is another key norm in education. Fairness based on the idea of human rights, that everyone has an equal right to live and get education, is the foundation of universal participation. On the other side of the same coin, equal and universal participation also suggests the desirability of diversity because difference is respected under the equality
principle. In this study, in order to link world culture ideas with the participants’ subjective worlds, a naturalistic approach named ‘portraiture’ that focuses on understanding each participant as individual human being is used to explore their values and fundamental beliefs related to the three main values in world culture, namely, empowerment, equality, and diversity.

4. Methodology
This study aims to understand university students’ conceptions of English and their views of the world through interviews on their past experiences and personal reflections. Two fundamental questions not directly asked to the participants dictate the flow of the interviews and serve as the core research questions:

1. What are the participants’ conceptions of English? To what extent do the concepts of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), a Second Language (ESL), and global language apply to the participants? What roles of English do they perceive in their life and in society?
2. What are the participants’ views of the world in terms of empowerment, equality, and diversity, and how do the views relate to their conceptions of English?

Both research questions involve studying subjective perceptions and conceptions. As a result, qualitative methods are a better choice to explore the unfathomable human mind and provide the nuances and complexity of real life. In-depth interviews based on the methodology of ‘Portraiture’ (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997; Witz, 2006) and ‘grounded theory’ (Charmaz, 1988; Corbin & Strauss, 1990) serve as the tool to investigate the subjective worlds of the participants. The spirit of portraiture, namely going with the mind flow of the participants to achieve holistic understanding and paying attention to topics and issues that the participants care the most, was adopted to alleviate the problem of elicited responses that may decrease the validity of the study. Most quantitative studies and structured interviews are more researcher-centered, i.e., the researcher lays out the agenda and the participants follow the agenda to produce the data. In this study, the participants were allowed to elaborate on the topics that they deemed important, which gave the researcher ideas about their priorities in life and their worldviews. Such a holistic understanding then served as the foundation on which interpretations of their conceptions of English were developed.
Each participant was interviewed twice during the period when the study was conducted between October 2008 and June 2009. The first interview, lasting from twenty minutes to over an hour, was semi-structure; all participants were asked to share their experience of learning and using English, related impressive events or incidents, the proficiency level they wish to achieve in the future and the reasons why, their ideas about English’s role in their life and in society, and attitude toward other cultures, emigration, and intercultural marriage. The purpose was to engage the participants in a conversation with their own experience and bring out the reflection upon these experiences. Follow-up questions based on what the participants shared, such as their experience with (native-speaking) English teachers and changes in their attitude toward learning English were also aimed at helping the researcher achieve deeper understanding of the participant’s subjective world. The second interview, scheduled at least two weeks after the first one to allow transcription and detailed analysis, varied greatly with different participants because of the unique experiences from each individual participant. The researcher identified significant passages in the first interview and connected related ideas in an attempt to form a holistic understanding. In the process numerous questions would arise as the participant’s subjective thinking was interpreted. These questions were posed in the second interview to confirm the researcher’s correct interpretation or refute unsuccessful conjectures.

The interview data was first analyzed individually by constructing short portraits for each participant after the second interview. Individual timeline on which significant events and incidents for the participant were juxtaposed with important events in their context (for example, new curriculum in 2001) served as a basic framework for portrait construction. Then grounded theory was applied to spot meaningful patterns and ideas. Firstly, emerging concepts were identified in the preliminary coding process, and these concepts were compared and revised as the researcher went through all the identified concepts. Related concepts were synthesized into major themes, which were examined for their significance in a contextualized way.

Participants were recruited in the university where the researcher worked as a faculty. When recruiting, the researcher tried to include students from different departments, ages, and years of learning English. The nineteen participants include ten females and nine males; four freshmen, five sophomores, four juniors, and five seniors, and one in his fifth year; seven were from the applied linguistics department, four from College of Management, five from
Electric Engineering department, two from Telecommunication department, and one from Art department. There were no significant differences in terms of learning experiences and attitude toward English between English majors (participants from the applied linguistics department) and non-English majors, though the comparison was designed into the study when recruiting. It turned out that their English learning time and traveling abroad experience seemed to be more relevant to their conceptions of English and views of the world than which department they majored in. Table 1 presents the participants’ pseudo names, years of study, the beginning year of English learning, and the traveling abroad experience.

Table 1 Participants background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>English learning began at..</th>
<th>Travel abroad experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bilingual kindergarten</td>
<td>U.S., 1-month summer camp at 5th grade, &amp;NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All English kindergarten</td>
<td>U.K. one month at 9th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5th grade in school, plus at home</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5th grade in school, plus cram school</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trotter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bilingual kindergarten and at home</td>
<td>U.S., Canada, EU on tour group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bilingual kindergarten</td>
<td>NZ one month at 8th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dud</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3rd grade, cram school</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3rd grade, cram school</td>
<td>Korea, Thailand, Indonesia on tour group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5th grade in school, plus cram school</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1st grade, cram school</td>
<td>Atlanta for 2 months at 11th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bilingual kindergarten</td>
<td>U.K. language school before freshman, &amp; NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All-English kindergarten</td>
<td>Thailand as volunteer, Japan, Korea,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bilingual kindergarten</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1st grade cram school</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mom taught her in toddler years</td>
<td>Japan with tour group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6th grade, cram school</td>
<td>Hong Kong on exchange program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4th grade, cram school</td>
<td>U.K. to visit brother, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4th grade, cram school</td>
<td>Sweden for conference, Turkey as volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>First language, born in the U.S.</td>
<td>Lived in the U.S. until age 6; Korea, India, Southeast Asia for missionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Findings
5.1 Conception of the English Language

One pattern emerged that the early beginners tended to have more opportunities in using English in their life such as going abroad and talking with their native-speaking teachers, while those who began later at 3rd, 5th or 7th grade, the official age (depending on their age and areas of residence), seemed to have less chance to use English in their life. For the regular beginners who started to learn English in school instead of bilingual kindergartens or private cram schools, not only did they have less opportunity to learn English, they also used English less in their life. This was reflected in the so-called ‘twin peak/bipolar distribution’ phenomenon in students’ achievement tests, a phenomenon known for decades in Taiwan (Chang, 2006). But overall speaking, in their student life, still English was seldom used in their real life. Except for Helen, who use English with her Portuguese friends via MSN (instant messages), most students’ experience using English was temporary and situational, not a common scene in their daily life.

The majority of the participants learned English as a school subject, and later started to see it as a communication and learning tool.

In high school I felt it was just a tool for exams, English was one of the exam subjects, so I had to pay some attention…Now, after I started to write graduation paper in English in my junior year, I found it rather important. (K)

In the past I was interested in English because I could finish preparing it very quickly and obtain high scores easily. Later I knew, in a more realistic way, it (English) is really a useful tool; you’d lose to other without this skill. (Wendy)

In this era, English is listed as an international language, a language everyone needs to learn, so I would feel, I had to force myself to learn it. (Hu)

This attitude was prevalent among students without much experience in using English in real-life setting. The media and public discourse keeps instilling this concept that English is an international language and very important; you have to learn it to succeed in this world. External persuasions usually fail to produce desirable results as students remain in the guilty cycle (I should learn English, though I don’t know why, and I feel I am not doing enough to achieve the intended proficiency level- I could have learned English better had I spent more time and effort).
For those who have had real experiences using English in daily life, they seemed to have more internal motivation to learn English. When asked about her motivation to learn English, Helen explained:

You get to know other cultures through it (English), make more friends. I feel it (making friends) a big appeal (for me to learn English). (Helen)

She spent one month attending a language school in the United Kingdom during the summer before she was enrolled in the university. She was the only Taiwanese in the program and made friends there. They kept in touch using instant messages, so English became a tool for Helen to make new friends. Not many youngsters nowadays have such luxury to attend expensive summer camps abroad to make foreign friends, but the number of students having such experience is expected to increase as more families around the world become able to afford it.

Tian, a senior student who participated in a student conference in Sweden for a week and volunteered in Turkey for a month, presented a view similar to the global English idea after extensively using her self-described poor English in Sweden and Turkey:

I don’t think making money is the reason why we learn English. I feel English is a basic tool, a tool to make a living for...Students in Taiwan still have to learn English even if they are not going abroad. I think it’s a fundamental attitude, just like we learn basic math, basic Mandarin...In the past I felt learning English was to have a better job, but now, after my trips abroad, I feel learning English is a basic attitude, just like we need to learn addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. It’s basic. (Tian)

Tian used English as a lingua franca in Sweden and Turkey, and this experience helped her realize that to be a world citizen, English is a basic tool. Before industrialization, most children did not have the need to learn math and literacy because they would be just farmers. But modern society requires its citizens to have basic knowledge in math, science, and national language so that they can function well. Perhaps we are on the brink of another revolution, which is transforming modern national societies into a postmodern global community constructed on networks of information. In such a perspective, English as the global language naturally should become part of basic literacy taught in compulsory education worldwide. Probably in a few years or decades, that everyone needs to have a certain level of English will not seem so radical as it is now.
Jolin also volunteered abroad, in Thailand and Mongolia, where she used English to communicate. She did not express the similar idea of English as basic like Tian, but her perceptions of the role of English also resonated with GE. For Jolin, the purpose of learning English is to communicate with the world, so grammar and standard are secondary. “Foreigners they don’t have perfect grammar” as she explained her ideas on English. Whether you are a native speaker of English or not does not matter in communication in English, since to achieve successful communication, the responsibility falls equally on both sides.

Only Tian and Jolin were able to conceptualize English beyond simply a practical instrument, and their common experience was volunteering in a non-English speaking country. Quite a few participants went to the U.S., the U.K. Canada, or New Zealand (so-called inner-circle countries) for vacation or English-learning camp, but their conceptions of English seemed more similar to EFL, seeing English as a dominant language, looking up to native-speaker norms. Their conception of English conforms to the mainstream opinion, but for the two students who had volunteered in non-English-speaking countries, their views were different. They could appreciate the lingua franca role of English and see it as a basic literacy.

5.2 Accent
Most students see accent as resource; they hope to be able to speak English in various accents. Of course, standard or American accent is one of the accents they should have, but their view of accent is beyond the EFL learning goal, to have a native-like accent. They hold such a view for practical reasons: to win recognition and an in-group feeling for potential trade partners.

When others listen to you with eyes closed, and they don’t feel that you are a foreigner, from a different culture, speaking a different accent, they would feel close, familiar, and bonded with you. (Helen)

I hope I can imitate any accents, somewhat close to it, --British, American, Canadian, but Aussie may be harder — because in the future, we’ll have more interactions in trade. If I can imitate their accent, I’ll be able to understand them better, without linguistic barrier, and I can express myself well; they may feel a sense of familiarity, close to them. It’s more special with a little of their accent (in my English). (Jenny)

Though Jenny seems to recognize only the inner-circle accents, her ideas about accent resemble Helen’s. Jenny has never traveled abroad, and this may be one of the reasons why she is not aware of accents from outer and expanding circle countries. The more intercultural
experiences one has, the better s/he is aware of the fact that English is widely used by people worldwide. The perceptions on English change with their experience using English.

This should be related to the collectivist culture in East Asia; making oneself an in-group instead of an outsider is critical to making deals in business (Hofsted, 2001). Speaking standard American or British accent may not be helpful when the potential trade partner is not an American or British. The participants did not wish to have a Taiwanese accent to distinguish themselves as Taiwanese. To use accent for identity purpose is an individualist thinking, and in a collectivist culture, showing that you are different is not desired. Also, accent for these Taiwanese students is not related to identity, because English is not their (native) language; this contrasts sharply to the bilingual student who cared about sounding ‘Asian’ in his accent. He saw himself as both an American and a Taiwanese, and English as his first language. As a result, he hoped that his accent sounds like American, like a native speaker, not an Asian-American accent.

Actually I don’t mind having an American accent in my Mandarin. I think it’s natural cause, I was born in the States. But I sort of do mind that my English has an Asian accent. ‘Cause, um, that’s my mother tongue. It should be good enough to be native. (Ford)

The ‘ownership’ issue in English (Widdowson, 1994) matters for the bilinguals/‘bi-nationals’ who share part of ‘native speaker’ identity like Ford. For ordinary English learners in expanding-circle countries, ownership is not a relevant issue. Based on the interview data, it seems quite implausible that these students would intend to ‘own’ English even when English becomes part of national literacy. English definitely is not my participants’ language, in accordance with Matsuda’s (2003) finding.

For those with more (NNS-NNS) intercultural experience, accent is a minor issue. They acknowledged that everyone has an accent, and as long as it is not a communication barrier, we need not care too much about it. It is not something to be ashamed of.

I have not any feelings about accent, because accent is not important. You listen to those famous persons speaking in English, Wang Yung-ching (late president of Formosa Plastic Group), Douglas Hsu (the president of Fareast group); their English is not standard, but they can speak fluently. It is just a language, so I don’t care about accent. Everyone has their own accent. It’s inevitable, but not a problem for communication. (Tian)
The Thais had their heavy accents, but probably we Taiwanese have, too. It’s the same for every country. The French student also talked that way; when she’s speaking, it feels like she’s speaking French, with all the ‘f’ sounds. But I feel this is not a barrier. I have not met any serious barrier unless they don’t know English. If they speak okay English, communication is not a problem. (Jolin on her using English in Thailand and with her French classmate)

But for those without intercultural experiences, they worry the disadvantage from an accent or poor pronunciation in their future career.

Accent gives the first impression, whether you are professional or not. (Jane on her poor pronunciation)

Your pronunciation is extremely important in formal occasions, like interview. If you hear a foreigner speaking standard Mandarin, you’d feel that she made great effort to learn it, and admire her. (Wade)

Both had little chance using English in real life. Their pronunciation and fluency may have caused their lack of confidence in using English in daily life, and indeed, accent is more important for those with lower proficiency level. When we become more able to use English to express ourselves, it usually means that we improve in most aspects such as more vocabulary and knowledge of grammar; accent then plays a less influential role in communication because we can use different words to communicate with others, unlike when we have limited vocabulary, we can only repeat the same word or sentence. This is only a conjecture based on this qualitative study; hopefully in the near future this claim of the relationship between proficiency level and conceptions of accent will be supported by large-scale quantitative studies.

In general, if the participants are asked whether they would like to speak with a British or American accent, almost everyone would say yes, but this does not mean that their learning target is to achieve a native-speaker accent. A British or American accent is only one (for many, a critical one) of the accents they wish to be able to speak. So in a survey study, the result would indicate preference for native accents (e.g., Sifakis & Sugari, 2005; Zacharias, 2005), but if we look deeper, this ‘accent-as-resource’ perspective should also be popular among youngsters growing up in a globalized world.

5.3 Worldviews
In this section the participants’ worldviews are compared with the three major values in world culture, namely diversity, equality, and empowerment. Since the participants were not elicited to respond to the three values, the interpretations were constructed based on my holistic understanding of some critical incidents and experiences of the participants.

5.3.1 Diversity
Most participants showed a positive attitude toward the idea of diversity, reflected in their openness to foreign cultures and intercultural marriage, and their desire to go abroad to experience difference/diversity. Many participants took the value of diversity for granted, believing that contacts with various cultures are desirable.

I have a special feeling for Singapore, where many races live…In Taiwan there’s only Chinese culture, but over there, more than Chinese culture, English, European, Southeastern Asian cultures, when combined together, produce an interesting culture…I want to visit it very much. (Hu)

The main reason I want to go abroad is (to get) an international perspective. You’ll get into contact with many people with different ideas, and I must work harder to learn their ways of thinking, logic…because you cannot learn it staying in Taiwan. (K)

Of the nineteen participants, only two clearly rejected the possibility of intercultural marriage in their future. Two participants were open to it, but assumed that their parents would not agree to it, and thus the possibility would be slim. The rest expressed positive attitudes toward intercultural marriage. However, those with more real intercultural experience were more concerned with realistic issues such as cultural conflicts and communication; thus unlike those without real experience who treated the question about intercultural marriage as a conceptual issue, those who had interpersonal relationships with foreigners did not aspire to it. Though they still saw diversity as a good thing, they are aware of the realistic problems living with a person from a different cultural background. It may be argued that the preference to diversity seemed to exist only in public sphere, not in private arena.

To borrow Jenkins’s (2007) term, this ‘abstract/concrete’ divide seems comparable to people’s attitudes toward NS accents in Jenkins’ study. Most people deny their preference to NS accents when asked in a conceptual manner, but when they are shown concrete examples of different accents without being informed of which are NS accents, the result indicated that they indeed prefer NS accents. Similarly, most participants agreed with the principle of diversity in a conceptual sense, but when personal decisions are involved, perhaps differences
are not desirable. This suggests that the root for the value of diversity remains shallow; diversity as desirable is constructed by mass media and public discourse, not yet stable into youngsters’ mind.

5.3.2 Equality, Inferior feelings
Most participants, as youngsters, were greatly influenced by the U.S. movies. The discourse constructed by mass media and biased images accumulated historically had an impact on the participants’ worldviews. Another possible source of influence was their parents, who hold a more traditional view on foreigners. Half of the participants revealed inferior feelings toward Anglo-Americans or preference for their cultural products. These participants looked up to the West (Europe and America).

(On European’s English) I would feel that their English is better than mine…probably because when you see their Western face, you wonder why they do not speak English. (Helen)

Sometimes I feel that I’m indeed ‘chuong-yang mei-wai’ (admire the West and rub foreigners in the right way). I extremely hate to watch local movies and novels. I like to read foreign literature since my childhood. (Jane)

My mom would say, ‘you are watching such unsubstantial films!’ when seeing me watching local films. So gradually I only watch American movies. (S)

My parents feel that it’s good (I marry a foreigner), having a foreign baby is the best, it’s cuter. Preferably Caucasian, though this may sound racism, but it’s purely the look; it might be influenced by TV. My parents also think foreign in-laws would be liberal and do not mind your business, unlike Taiwanese in-laws. (Vita-female)

Most participants treated foreigners in an unequal manner; they were usually submissive. One American graduate student once complained to me, “why do most Taiwanese treat me so well? I’m a little scared!” The unequal political-cum-economic situation at the global level is reflected at the individual level. The hierarchy in culture and language permeates the surroundings of the participants, so this inferior feeling toward Anglo-American (and European as well) should persist for several generations unless the global power shifts away from America and Europe toward East Asia. The biggest enemy to equality becoming a true world value is the unequal past in which Europe and subsequently America dominated the rest of the world.

5.3.3 Empowerment
Empowerment is an issue that those with more intercultural experience cared about; students looked up to ‘Western’ environment in which youngsters have the agency to pursue their goals. Feeling lack of agency was a common theme for those who had been to more individualistic countries such as America and the United Kingdom. For students with less intercultural experience, they showed less awareness of this issue.

I feel that Taiwanese students are given too few opportunities to make choices. You must study in high school, then university. (Wendy)

I feel there’s much confinement in Taiwan…Taiwan’s parents would definitely not let you volunteer in Africa, feeding elephants, but parents in Europe and America would. I really envy it…Parents tell you what a good life is, but I still wonder, why does my life have to be so rush? (Helen)

School as a universal institution by design may be embedded with an empowering function, giving students the capacity to live a better life, but when school operates as concrete educational systems by real people, cultural beliefs often exert more power. The empowerment value in world culture finds less resonance in Taiwan probably because of its root in individualism, which opposes the value of collectivism. School as a social institution in Taiwan (and probably in East Asia) did not succeed in promoting the value of independence and self-actualization as illustrated by terms describing social phenomena such as NEET (Not in Employment, Education, and Training) and parachute single. In some cases, school not only fails to empower students, but dis-empowers students. But intercultural experience helped some participants to re-empower themselves by raising the awareness. This provides another reason for teachers to promote intercultural activities.

6. Discussions
An interesting phenomenon emerged after examining the participants’ experiences and worldviews. Students’ attitude toward, preference to, or proficiency level in English did not seem to relate to their conceptions of English. Intercultural experience affects both their worldviews (moving towards world culture ideas) and concepts of English (toward global English ideas for those with intercultural experience in non-English speaking countries).

Factors such the participant’s major, year of study, gender, the beginning age of learning English, and their English proficiency did not produce a discernible pattern in terms of their conceptions of English and worldviews. The most significant indicator was the participants’ real intercultural experience. That those who had been to the US, the UK, Canada, Australia,
or New Zealand (Anglo-American countries) showed more preference to or awareness of world culture values (diversity, equality, and empowerment) may be related with their attitudes toward Anglo-American cultures before they went abroad. One reason that they decided to visit these countries in addition to learning English was probably the appeal of Anglo-American cultures, which share many world cultural ideas. The intercultural experience reinforced their awareness of world culture values, and perhaps their conception of English as an Anglo-American language in the meantime. From such a perspective, world culture is disseminated along with the global spread of English. English learners around the world absorb Anglo-American cultures when their teachers teach English using Anglo-American cultural contents.

Quite a few participants had experience visiting Inner-circle countries where English is the first language, and since the role of English in these countries is a local native language, Taiwanese students still saw English as a foreign language after their visit to these countries. So their conceptions of English remain similar, seeing English as a foreigner language belonging to Anglo-Americans. Only students who had used English in lingua franca situations showed some awareness of global English ideas. Jolin and Tian, two participants who volunteered in non-English speaking countries, held conceptions closest to the ideas in global English. Group tours or study trips abroad in which students have little contact with people of different cultural background do not affect their worldviews and conceptions of English. Real intercultural experiences such as volunteering, self-tour, and short-term study program were the critical events that made impacts on the participants.

7. Concluding Remarks
In light of the findings, it becomes even more important for English educators to promote using English in lingua franca settings. Students would have inferior feelings using English to communicate with native speakers, and this unequal linguistic power relationship does not help their developing a cosmopolitan worldview or views of an equal world. In contrast, when communicating in English with other nonnative speakers, both sides are on equal footings. Also such NNS-NNS situations are the occasions in which the majority of our students will use English in the future. English as a global language is used by both natives and nonnatives. In our environment we have had more than sufficient materials and input from Anglo-American cultures (their cultural products fill our shelves), so providing global English materials and pedagogies should better prepare our students for their future life.
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This paper looks at how English taught as a foreign language in Palestinian Secondary School classes is coloured through occupation to include shades of English as an International Language.

It involves the telling of my own personal experience as TEFL Practicum Supervisor at the Arab American University, Jenin, Palestine, a narrative that is presented using the epistolary style. After all, it is through the telling and hearing/reading of stories that we make sense of our own and others’ lives as well as the contexts in which we live (Clough 2002).

Dear Liz,
It has been some time since last I wrote; in fact it was the final letter of the final chapter of my PhD thesis. It may surprise you to learn that in all 67,000 words there was not one definition of ‘English as a Foreign Language’ or EFL though the thesis was on Nicaraguan Secondary School English language teachers.

EFL to use Ceranic’s (2009) definition means “teaching English to people who are learning the language for pleasure, work or educational reasons” and as Bloomer et al (2005) points out, as it is a foreign language, it is not used “for any internal communications”. In Palestine too, my work has been concerned with EFL but presenting at a conference on English as an International Language (EIL) what can I say when EIL is as Widdowson (2003) sees it: “a
register – a form of English developed for the specific purpose of international or intra
national communication”

The new ‘English for Palestine’ Curriculum while its name and themed content – such as
Climate Change, The Aral Sea, The Islamic Conquest of Spain, and the Holy Land - suggest
EIL, it remains a curriculum subject to be allocated three 45 minute periods a week from the
start of primary school through to the end of secondary school, with the focus on knowledge
gained to pass exams rather than to communicate with others outside of the classroom.

My TEFL track students talked of their Secondary School Experience as being teacher
centred, grammar focused, and with more memorisation than use. A reflection of this was
seen in my classroom observations. Having taught the lesson communicatively, my students
would step aside, turning the last few minutes of the lesson over to the students for them to
ask me questions. With the boys classes in particular there would be a heavy silence of
apathy and reluctance and if a question did come the teacher would first have to act as a
translator. Indeed, one afternoon after three such encounters I exclaimed in exasperation –
“No, questions? Then English must truly be a dead language. Show me it is not!”

With the class teachers themselves during a 10 week in-service training course on
communicative teaching a constant refrain was “We have to cover the curriculum, there is too
much material and too little time. The students have to get good grades and so we cannot
teach like this.” I recall engaging these teachers in communicative activities which were
timed to fit within a forty minute lesson for a large class of mixed ability students and with
few resources. Yet, one teacher’s comment on completion of such a demonstration: “You
were lucky” highlighted his and others scepticism.

There were, though, also examples of English being used as an International Language in the
sense of communicating culturally sympathetic meaning. For example, the girls always
asked “Are you married?” and “How old are you?” These questions were not just restricted to
the classroom. Attending the International Palestinian Literature Festival in Ramallah, during
the interval a large, local male member of the audience on being introduced to an American
woman was heard to ask in a voice that boomed out across the open courtyard “How old are
you?” and “Are you married?”.
Then there were the lessons I received in the political and educational situation of Palestine – my limited Arabic meant the mode of communication was English. These lessons were admittedly in snippets of minutes rather than blocks of 45 – though it was blocks, or more specifically road blocks and checkpoints that featured largely in these sessions of learning.

“Sorry I am late, teacher. There was a road block and the bus was held up for an hour.”
“Sorry, Dr. Fennell that I missed the class we were ordered off the service and told to stand in the sun for two hours.” “Doctor Fennell, I couldn’t reach the university as our village was under siege.”

English was used to communicate the other interruptions in a Palestinian Education. A male student came up to me breathless with excitement. “I have been allowed to visit my brother in prison for the first time in eight years so I won’t be coming to your class.” Another older male student wondered if he could have extra tutorial support as his university studies had been interrupted by two years of administrative detention. A girl asked whether it would be possible to reschedule the mid-term exams as the date coincided with her monthly prison visit to see her brother, on a permit valid only for that day. Later, three female students sat in my office discussing the rescheduling of their oral exams as student strike action had effectively closed down the university. “No, I can’t make that day”, said one, “as I have to visit my father in prison. It is only an hour away but I have to leave at four in the morning and do not get back to eight or nine at night.” I remembered seeing a TV documentary where a student exhausted by a similar journey had had to sit her end of year exams the next day – emotionally and physically drained she had fared badly. I offered my sympathies but the girls looked at me askance – “Oh, don’t worry Doctor Fennell; this is our life here in Palestine. Everyone has a brother, or an uncle, or a father or a cousin in prison.” What was less common were the coloured poster size photographs of students killed by the military. When this happened the student council always closed down the university for 48 hours as a mark of respect. Make up days were scheduled for the weekends (though attendance would be notable low) and the semester extended to accommodate the pushing back of exam dates.

It was not only my university students who used EIL to help keep me informed on the Palestinian situation, but also the Head teachers, the school teachers, the school supervisors and the school students themselves. One morning, my assistant supervisor on the Practicum rang in to say that he had had to cancel all his classroom observations for that day because of
an ongoing military operation. My taxi driver arriving an hour late, explained that he had had to go all round the hills and across fields to avoid the soldiers. Later it was I who had to cancel classroom observations when the university was under ‘lock down’.

Another morning, setting out in the mini-van of subject supervisors and school inspectors we received an and direct urgent radio message from the Directorate – “Return at once! It is too dangerous to travel.” The following day, the min-van had to weave its way through waves of pupils pouring out of school gates. The pupils had called a strike in sympathy with the family of a local teenager who in the early hours of the morning had been shot and killed in his home. The English supervisor and fellow researcher told me that their Government did not sanction such strikes because it meant that pupils lost even more days of their education, yet they could not stop the pupils, and simply had to further hurriedly cram through the missed material.

Returning from the villages in the early afternoon, we saw the mourners – all male – gathered in the hill top cemetery. The driver said: “Look Doctor. They are burying the martyr.” Another time, drinking sweet tea with the Headmistress in her office, our conversation was interrupted by a phone call. A class teacher jolly in her size was called to take a message. As she listened her joviality slipped suddenly away stilling all those around her – then in an anguish that stunned, she fled the office and the school: Another raid, another shooting, another son, another death, another day of cancelled classes and lost education.

So hardly surprising then that immersed in such a context, English taught as a foreign language took on the use of English as an International Language. Questions put to me by the secondary school students and indeed my university students now sought my opinion on the occupation and corrected my mistakes and misunderstandings. “How do you find life in Palestine? Do you agree with the war in Gaza? What do you think about the occupation? Have you learnt any Hebrew? The soldiers will always speak to you first in Hebrew. Do you feel safe here? The Foreign media sees us all as terrorists which is wrong. We want to live in peace.” In a demonstration lesson using a geographic text, I remarked that Palestine is without rivers or a sea. I was firmly reminded that the River Jordan and the Dead Sea, though both in a military exclusion zone controlled by Israel, were indeed part of Palestine. In feedback on the uses of English one always high on the list was the need to “communicate to the rest of the world of our situation.” Sometimes I would be asked: “Have you been to the
Dome of the Rock, the Nativity Church in Bethlehem, Jerusalem?” which would be quickly followed by: “Tell us about them.” There was the student who was acting as a guide and a translator for university students from Holland. “They are helping us in community building”, he explained. “One invited me to Holland. I said yes, but my mother said no. We must not leave our land because the Arab states are weak and have forgotten the Palestinian people. This land is our life.”

To demonstrate the influence of such colouring of the TEFL curriculum with EIL, I should tell you about my trip to Batha when allowed through the checkpoint I was denied permission to return. Batha is a town stuck in no man’s land between the 1967 border and the fence of today. Having observed my student teach two lessons (one prepared and one unprepared) I was taken as usual to talk in the Headmistress’ office this time over a Turkish coffee and wafer biscuit. I told her of my surprise and excitement that of all the 120 classroom observations I had made in the past two years, her girls’ English was the best. She, though, wasn’t surprised. She explained that when crossing the checkpoint to visit their families and later to go to university, the girls would resolutely refuse to speak Hebrew “We always speak English with the border guards”. Moreover, as the town was cut off from the rest of Palestine, the school received many visits from Non Governmental Organisations, and the United Nations, so the girls were used to meeting and speaking to Internationals – and the common language? English.

Thus, English taught in the schools as a foreign language served too as a tool with which to resist the occupation, to express the students’ frustrations and to lay out their hopes for the future and their stake in a two state solution. As a Headmaster said “Education is our weapon against the occupation, it is our capital, to invest in our future state.”

The message of EIL to convey in this paper is then, that Teaching English as a foreign language has strands of EIL as international communication, if not explicit and official then at least implicit in its circumspectness, and it breaks down ignorance and misunderstanding, bolstering hope, and perhaps as a conduit of inter nation communication, will help to bring about a Palestinian State.
I certainly hope so,

Michael
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Abstract
The debate on whether English language classrooms should include or exclude students’ native language is a contentious issue in the ELT world and in Turkey as well. As far as the literature of ELT is concerned it is not convincing in either way and what is more important is: there is no sufficient empirical research on this issue. The literature has usually focused on the reasons and occasions for L1 use and questioned the beliefs, perceptions or attitudes of learners and teachers without searching empirical correlation among all these. Thus, in this study, it is aspire to compare the possible effects of the use and abuse of the mother tongue in the EFL classrooms. The study is conducted in the fall semester 2008-2009, at the English Language Teaching (ELT) Division at the Faculty of Education of Hacettepe University, Ankara by participation of 42 freshman students. There were two intact groups, one experimental and one control group, each consisting of 21 participants; 4 males and 17 females. The data collection procedure was twofold; descriptive and experimental. The descriptive part consisted of an adopted version of the foreign language classroom anxiety
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scale by Horwitz, et al. (1986) to ensure comparability of the participant groups prior and after treatment as a pre-/post-tests to measure the effects of treatment. In the experimental part, the data from pre-/post-tests were analyzed statistically using SPSS version 11.5 and a significant negative correlation is found ($r = .772; p=.000$). Overall, it seems statistically evident that the acceptance, valuing active, systematic and judicious use of the students’ mother tongue reduces anxiety, and enhances affective environment for learning a foreign language.
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Introduction

In the development of English Language Teaching the place of the mother-tongue (L1) has been heavily criticized. This highly challenging issue was whether or not to use the learners’ mother tongue in the English language classrooms especially where learners and teachers share the same L1. While trends in language teaching ebbed and flowed during the twentieth century, some false assumptions remained deeply ingrained in the beliefs of most language teachers such as English should be taught monolingually and the ideal teacher of English is a native teacher. These beliefs take its base from the ‘Great Reform’ of the late nineteenth century and the Makarere Report. (The Makarere Report is put down on paper in a conference at Makarere University in Uganda in 1961.) The late nineteenth century reform movement is unique in language teaching history since this movement accelerated the shift from a structure based language teaching to a more communicative one.

Though these assumptions mentioned above have affected many generations of students and teachers, they are rarely discussed or presented to new teachers but are taken for granted as the foundation of language teaching. Among them are the ideas that spoken language is more basic than written, explicit discussion of grammar should be avoided, and language should be practiced as a whole, rather than as separate parts. To generalize a specific remark from Polio and Duff (1994), “teachers have some sense, then, that using the TL as much as possible is important. However the assumption is phrased, L2 is seen as positive, L1 as negative. The L1 is not something to be utilized in teaching but to be set aside” (p.324).

The present study attempts to analyze the issue in detail and aims to give a place to learners’ mother tongue in foreign language classrooms. We believe that there needs to be an empirical attempt to guide especially non-native teachers since there is not any consensus about this issue.
Literature Review

In the teaching of second/foreign languages throughout the centuries, one of the issues that has attracted universal attention was 1) whether the first language of the learner is to be allowed, and 2) if it is to be allowed at all, to what extent it is to be allowed.

Historical Roots of L2-Only Language Instruction

The shift towards the English-only movement in 19th century forced the language educators to refocus their approaches on language learning and teaching since a need arose for learning languages to communicate and negotiate directly with the rest of the world through a lingua franca. No longer could language educators and teachers rely on L1 since the only way for learning and teaching a language was believed using merely L2 as the medium of instruction. And a wide accepted believe is flourished i.e. the mother tongue should be eschewed at all costs and the target language should be practised especially by ideal native-speaker teachers since learners’ native language interferes with and hampers the process of second language learning. (Phillipson, 1992), Auerbach (1993), Atkinson (1987) and Cook (2001b) assert rightly that this kind of beliefs merely stem from particular ideological or political grounds and also do not rest on any empirical base. For example, the Makarere Report reinforced the idea of using nothing but English in the classroom. Phillipson (1992, p. 185) stated five basic tenets originating from this report:

- English should be taught monolingually.
- The ideal teacher of English is a native speaker.
- The earlier English is taught the better.
- The more English is used in the class the better.
- If other languages are used much, English standards will drop.

The issue of advocating the L2-only movement is also discussed at length by Cook (2001b, p.412) in reference to her work and concluded three principles:

1) The learning of an L2 should model the learning of an L1 (through maximum exposure to the L2).
2) Successful learning involves the separation and distinction of L1 and L2.
3) Students should be shown the importance of the L2 through its continual use.
It may be apparent for Krashen (1982, 1985) and some others that for learning a target language, learners need to be exposed to TL input, i.e. all the lesson should be in L2 since there is a close relationship between comprehensible input in L2 and proficiency in L2 but some educators such as Ellis (2001) and Sharwood-Smith (1985) argue that sheer maximum exposure to the TL input does not guarantee that it becomes intake.

This study does not have the aim to attack or assault the monolingual use of English or those who support the practices of this approach, but rather, as Auerbach (1993) suggests, this will be an invitation to re-examine the issue of L1 use/abuse in foreign language classrooms as a whole since like Ellis (1985), a number of theorists such as Auerbach (1993), Weschler (1997), Cook (2001a), Turnbull (2001) and Juarez & Oxbrow (2008) suggest that the learners’ mother tongue can be a valuable contribution to the L2 classroom.

**Supports for L1 Use in Classroom**

Auerbach (1993) asserts that despite growing strong disagreement with the monolingual approach its supporters remain steadfast in their determination to use English as the target language and the medium of instruction. According to Pennycook (1994) one reason why monolingual approach has been so readily accepted is due to “language myths of Europeans” which sees English as the medium of instruction and second, the belief in its superiority over non-European languages. In the same line, Weschler (1997) defines this belief as a “blind acceptance” indicating the unproven thoughts of monolingual approach as reference. Nowadays, however, there is a significant consensus among language educators that the use of L1 can be highly beneficial resource for teachers and learners.

Stern (1992) suggests precisely that the use of both L1 and TL should be seen as complementary, depending on the characteristics and stages of the language learning process. That means learners’ characteristics such as motivation, attitude and anxiety towards language and their proficiency level being beginner, intermediate or advanced are important variables in an EFL classroom since Stern (1992) argues that it makes theoretical and practical sense for teachers to teach intralingually (i.e. speaking the TL), when a course aims to develop students' communicative competence. In the same line of thinking, Turnbull (2001) highlights the idea that maximizing the TL does not and should not mean that it is harmful for the teacher to use L1. According to Turnbull (2001) learner’s mother tongue and the target language can exist simultaneously and states rightly that “One could also argue that using the L1 can save time in
the SL or FL classroom. I agree that it is efficient to make a quick switch to the L1 to ensure that students understand a difficult grammar concept or an unknown word (p.208). Similarly, Hitotuzi (2006) claims that learner L1 is a tool that neither the teacher nor the learner can afford to dispense with. It is possible that teachers can ban the use of L1 in language classes but they are not able to stop the cognitive processes that the learner will realize during his/her language learning. That is, learner’s previous language and language learning knowledge is not a programme file which can be deleted by teachers during learners L2 learning experience. For that reason, we are in the same line with Buckmaster (2000) and allege that the L1 should be welcomed into the classroom with open arms and assert that not allowing the use of L1 in the foreign language classroom is a sin: a sin of omission.

Nevertheless, as Hitotuzi (2006) rightly warns that some cautious steps should be taken when the amount of L1 use is in question, otherwise, the precious resource might be counter-productive. Supporters of the Bilingual Approach such as Auerbach (1993), Cook (2001a) and others clarify by stating that they do not support the widespread and indiscriminate use of L1, however, on the contrary, they contend the systematic and judicious use of the mother tongue. For example, Atkinson's paper (1987) which is developed in greater detail in his book, Teaching Monolingual Classes (1993) exemplifies 'a careful, limited use of L1' to help students get the maximum benefit from activities which in other respects will be carried out in the target language. Atkinson (1987), Collingham (1988) and Piasecka (1988) suggest some principal occasions where the use of mother tongue is helpful with respect to EFL setting (see Table1).
Table 1. Suggested L1 Use Occasions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Eliciting language</td>
<td>• Educational counselling,</td>
<td>• Discussion/negotiation of the syllabus,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Checking comprehension</td>
<td>• Publicity,</td>
<td>• Role-play,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Giving complex instruction</td>
<td>• Negotiating the syllabus,</td>
<td>• Teaching grammar,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-operation among learners</td>
<td>• Negotiating the lesson,</td>
<td>• Teaching language functions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discussion of classroom methodology</td>
<td>• Access skills,</td>
<td>• Teaching vocabulary,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presentation and reinforcement of language</td>
<td>• Profiling and record keeping,</td>
<td>• Teaching phonology,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Checking for sense</td>
<td>• Integrating newcomers,</td>
<td>• Teaching literacy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Testing</td>
<td>• Personal contact,</td>
<td>• Comprehension,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of useful learning strategies.</td>
<td>• Classroom management,</td>
<td>• Creative writing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Using translation to highlight a recently</td>
<td>• Setting the scene,</td>
<td>• Record keeping,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taught language item.</td>
<td>• Language analysis,</td>
<td>• Providing information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rules governing grammar, phonology,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>morphology, spelling, formal speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and writing can be arrived at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collectively or explained by the teacher,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cross-cultural issues,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Materials (Worksheets and tapes with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mother tongue instruction),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Correcting,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resolving individual areas of difficulty,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment and evaluation of lesson,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focusing on a particular skill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All in all, we assume that the acceptance and valuing of students’ mother tongue in EFL classroom will increase their openness to learning the target language; and the optimal L1 use, i.e. active, systematic and judicious use of the mother tongue, in an EFL setting will reduce anxiety, increase and class participation, and enhance affective environment for learning a second/foreign language.

Methods that Actively Create Links between L1 and L2


Butzkamm (1976, p.228) asserts above that “the mother tongue … is not tolerated only here and there, but it undertakes also indispensable functions right there where it was assumed to inhibit learning.” According to him, L1 should be consciously used in the initial stages of language learning for the semantization of L2 vocabulary through L1 equivalents. Similarly, in the New Concurrent Method by Jacobson (1990), the teacher switches from one language to another at key points according to particular rules. This method acknowledges code-
switching as a normal L2 activity and encourages the students to see themselves as true L2 users in both languages. Likewise, in Dodson's Bilingual Method (Dodson, 1967) the teacher reads an L2 sentence aloud several times and gives it's meaning in the L1. Next the students 'imitate' by repeating the sentence, first in chorus and then individually. Another method that creates a link between L1 and L2 is the Community Language Learning (CLL) by Curran (1976). This method resembles Dodson's Bilingual Method but here the initiator is the learner him-/herself. Learner’s utterance is translated into L2 via the help of teacher. CLL is aimed to remove the anxiety from learning by changing the relationship between the teacher and student.

Studies on L1 Use in Language Classrooms

Various attempts have been made to examine teachers’ and language learners’ use of L1 in the classroom. However, these attempts are mostly resulted as listing the occasions where L1 is appropriate to use (listed in Table 1) or stating the amount of teachers’ L1 and/or L2 use. For example, Duff and Polio's study (1990) quantified the use of English (in this case English is the L1 and the other 13 languages L2) in a large sample of foreign language classes at the University of California, Los Angeles, during the 1988-89 academic year. They recorded two 50-minute sessions of each of 13 classes covering 13 different languages. Researchers aimed to figure out what the ratio of L1 use to L2 use by the teachers in FL classroom is. Teachers were recorded in class for quantifying L1/L2 ratio which was being spoken in a particular utterance every 15 seconds. The major finding was that a wide range of 10 to 100 percentages of L2 use is by teachers displayed in twenty six hours of sampled classroom discourse. That is, there are teachers who use only L2, but on the other side teachers who merely and sheerly use his/her mother tongue in teaching the target foreign language in their EFL classes. Furthermore, they found that most students were satisfied with the status quo regarding L1/L2 use. Similarly, Schweers (1999) calculated the amount of L1 spoken by teachers in his monolingual Spanish classes at the University of Puerto Rico and also investigated for what purposes these teachers used Spanish in their classes. His research consisted of recordings of a 35 minute long samples from three classes at the beginning, middle and at the end of the semester of the academic year 1997-1998. Later on the participant-teachers filled out a short questionnaire with seven items which was aimed to figure out their attitudes towards the use of L1 in L2 setting, in this case Spanish in English language classroom. A pretty high number (88,7%) of the student participants in Schweers’ study felt that Spanish (L1) should be used in
their English classes. Additionally, 87% of them claimed that the use of Spanish facilitated their learning of English and finally, 86% of them wished the use of Spanish in explaining difficult concepts. Schweers’ (1999) results are worth to mention, since he agrees that English should be the primary vehicle of communication, but suggests also that pedagogical and affective benefits of L1 use has justified its limited and judicious use in second and foreign language classroom. He also believes that his results of his research prove that a second language can be learned through raising awareness to the similarities and differences between the L1 and L2. Likewise, Prodromou (2002) carried out a research including 300 Greek students. A questionnaire was addressed to the participants regarding L1 use in the monolingual classroom at three levels - beginner, intermediate and advanced. The participants were mostly adolescents or young adults and were asked general questions to elicit their view on whether the teacher should know and, in principle, use the learners’ mother tongue. 65% of the beginner level and 53% of both the intermediate and advanced learners stated that the teachers need to know learners’ L1. Moreover, a relatively high percentage of beginner and intermediate students answered that both the teacher and the students should use L1 in classroom - changing percentages from 53% to 66%, and even 35% of advantage level students support the view that learners may use their L1s in class. Prodromou (2002) has concluded his survey arguing that the learners’ L1 is a valuable resource and it should be carefully used both by teachers and learners in EFL settings. Juarez and Oxbrow (2008) have also explored the role of L1 use and decided to integrate translation activities as both a conscious cognitive learning strategy and a means of raising meta-cognitive awareness in EFL settings. They asserted that translation activities as a teaching and learning resource can greatly facilitate second language learning or acquisition process and help learners understand and associate with the target language. Finally, they conducted a study and began with integrating explicitly the translation activities into their teaching sessions. In sum, there is a favourable response to the form-focused consciousness raising and translation activities on L1 use as having a scaffolding role. Participants of Juarez and Oxbrow’s (2008) study also appreciate the judicious use of L1 which coincides with the ideas of Schweers (1999).

Differently from these above mentioned studies, Kaya (1995), explored the relationship among motivation, anxiety, self confidence and class participation of Turkish EFL learners, and found a strong correlation among the variables. Namely, motivated and self confident learners participated to class activities more than unmotivated and anxious language learners.
Though some researchers assert that a positive mode of anxiety exists, others display a negative relationship between anxiety and language learning or achievement. This kind of anxiety mostly called as debilitating anxiety since it harms learners’ language achievement directly. There are some studies which show a negative correlation between anxiety and language achievement and for instance Oxford (1999, p.61) has searched the literature and listed the negative correlation of anxiety with the following:

- Grades in language courses
- Proficiency test performance
- Performance in speaking and writing tasks
- Self-confidence in language learning
- Self-esteem

Many other researchers investigated different variables’ correlation with anxiety but we could not find any correlation between language anxiety and systematic L1 use. Although there are some important teaching methods and approaches which suggest the employment of L1 use. For example in Community Language Learning (CLL) where teacher’s role as a walking-translator reduces language learners’ negative attitude towards class participation and hinders learners being anxious in turn-takings in the class activities. That is, contrary to the claim that the use of L1 will slow down and impede the development of L2. Auerbach (1993) suggests that the use of L1 may actually facilitate the process and asserts that the use of L1 reduces affective barriers and facilitates the language learning process in establishing the affective environment for learning.

Under the light of these studies, so far, a study which compares directly students’ language anxiety, their attitudes and beliefs to L1 and/or L2 use in the classroom was not conducted. For that reason, this study aimed to draw a theoretical framework by touching upon the numerous considerations required to understand the basis of:

1. whether the first language of the learner is to be allowed or not and,
2. if it is to be allowed at all, to what extent it is to be allowed.

**Methodology**

**Research Questions**

The present study aims to investigate the debate whether English language classrooms should include or exclude students’ native language. In the light of literature, questionnaires and in-class treatment, this study aimed to highlight the following research questions:

1. Do ELT freshman students’ anxiety levels decrease with the use of L1?
2. Does L1 use in suggested occasions increase class participation and/or enhance affective environment for language learning?

Subjects and Setting
The study is conducted in the fall semester 2008-2009, at the English Language Teaching (ELT) Division at the Faculty of Education of Hacettepe University, Ankara by participation of 42 freshman students to investigate the above mentioned research questions. All 42 students are enrolled in two separate sections (Section one and section two) or better said there are two intact groups each consisting of 21 participants (4 males and 17 females) for İDÖ173 Advanced Reading and Writing Skills-I course. It should be underlined that these groups are not chosen randomly. Such groups are called as intact groups since they are as a set of research subjects pre-existing as a group prior to the research study. However, researcher randomly assigns section one as the control group and section two as the experimental group.

Participants’ ages varied from 18-21 and their proficiency level upper-intermediate to advanced. Their proficiency level is assigned as upper-intermediate to advanced since; first, they graduated from Anatolian Teacher Training High Schools and attended preparatory school for two semesters including 24 language courses per week. Second, they entered Higher Education Council’s Student Selection and Placement Test answering properly 90 to 98 questions for English language and scored 376 to 382 points. Finally, at the School of Foreign Languages of Hacettepe University, additional to their grammatical knowledge, their reading, writing and listening skills were also tested, that is they passed this so-called exemption examination.

Data Collection Procedure
The data collection procedure is twofold; descriptive and experimental. The descriptive part consists of an anxiety scale developed from the foreign language classroom anxiety scale by Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B. & Cope, J. A. (1986) to ensure comparability of the participant groups prior and after treatment as a pre- / post-tests to measure the effects of treatment. The experimental part is conducted through in-class treatment where the course teacher and freshman students in control group are not allowed to use their mother tongue but in experimental group they do.
Instruments
The main instrument to assess participants’ anxiety level is using questionnaires/scales. “The major advantage of the questionnaire/scale is that data can be collected from large number of respondents in a cost-effective way within short period of time” (Kormos et al., 2002, p.21). If the respondents are chosen appropriately, the results obtained with the help of the questionnaires/scales can be generalized to the target population.

Foreign Language Writing Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLWCAS)
The data about students’ anxiety levels is collected through a scale at the very beginning of the course and repeated immediately after the treatment to see whether there is a significant difference in their behaviours before and after the treatment. This scale is the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) which was developed by Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B. & Cope, J. A. in 1986 but it is slightly modified by the researcher to suit the requirements of the writing course “İDÖ173 Advanced Reading and Writing Skills-I” and renamed it as the Foreign Language Writing Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLWCAS) (see Appendix). Horwitz’ scale is prepared for speaking classes, but FLWCAS for writing classes and merely the wording is changed i.e. in the scale the word “speaking” is replaced by “writing”. For such a tiny change, we do not think that a pilot study is needed for the renamed scale since Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B. & Cope, J. A. (1986, p.560), in their study with 300 participants measured the internal consistency of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) and measured Cronbach’s alpha coefficient as .93 and test retest reliability .83 and p = .001. Additionally, reported by Aydın (1999), Vancı Osam (1996) found satisfactory reliability (p=.002) for the same scale in a study at METU with 105 participants. Finally, Aydın (1999) also piloted the same scale at Anadolu University with 72 participants and found the internal consistency as .91.

Our scale consists of 33 items and uses a five point Likert type scale which ranges from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. 5 points is assigned “strongly agree”, agree 4, undecided 3, disagree 2 and finally for strongly disagree 1 point and we measured the internal consistency of our FLWCAS and the scale items indicated high internal reliability and consistency: $\alpha = .9167$.

Treatment
In the course “İDÖ173 Advanced Reading and Writing Skills-I”, a control and an experimental group is assigned to investigate learners’ anxiety level when using and/or abusing learners’ L1 especially under specified occasions listed below. These specified occasions, in which L1 use is asserted as beneficial, are suggested by some scholars such as Atkinson (1987), Piasecka (1988) and Collingham (1988). The complete version of these suggested occasions for L1 use are listed in Table 1. In the treatment phase, the researcher did not employ all of the occasions which have been highlighted by these authors but chose the suitable ones for the course “İDÖ173 Advanced Reading and Writing Skills-I” getting the approval of the dissertation committee. These mentioned occasions are:

- Checking comprehension
- Giving complex instructions
- Co-operation among learners
- Presentation and reinforcement of paragraph structure
- Negotiating the topic of the paragraph
- Using translation to highlight a recently taught topic or language item
- Classroom management
- Setting the scene
- Materials (worksheets, tapes, OHP’s etc.)
- Correcting / feedback
- Resolving individual areas of difficulty

Data Analysis
Experiments are designed to establish cause-effect relationships. In this experiment there are two groups of participants created by the manipulation of an independent variable (the cause). The two groups are measured on the same dependent variable (the effect) in order to compare their scores. As known, data analyses are needed to determine whether the independent variable manipulation produced significant differences in scores between the two groups on the dependent variable. In short, in our case, there are two sets of scores on the dependent variable, one pre-test and one post-test, but the scores are not independent. In such correlated samples design, the statistical package program for social sciences (SPSS) is run to display the Pearson correlation coefficient (r) and significance value (p) of the data. As the result of the data shows, there is a statistical significant correlation between the scores when compared before and after the treatment (r = .772; p = .000).

Results
The data for participants’ anxiety level is analyzed statistically and the first research question which asserts that participants’ anxiety level decrease with the use of L1 is tested. As a result, this research hypothesis is accepted and a statistical strong correlation is displayed ($r = .772; p = .000$). Moreover, the needed paired samples t-test is run and resulted in a significant difference regarding the data before and after the treatment. So far the statistical analysis of the data is displayed; however, it is also crucial to look closer at the scale item results which display the significant changes mentioned above.

In terms of anxiety, participants showed a great deal of changes between their pre- and post test results and therefore the results in percentages are compared for pre-test and post-tests. As shown in Tables below, there is really a great deal of decrease in anxiety level of participants. For example, items 3, 4, 7, 9, 12, 18, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33 (see Appendix) are highlighted since these items display highly meaningful decrease in anxiety level of participants when compared before and immediately after treatment. This analysis provides evidence that the treatment is, indeed, effective in leading to decrease the anxiety level of participants when students’ L1 is used.

**Table 2. Percentages for FLWCAS items 3, 9 and 33.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Group Pre-test (%)</th>
<th>Experimental Group Post-test (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>item no</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA=strongly agree    A=agree   UD=undecided   D=disagree     SD=strongly disagree

As seen above in Table 2, 61.9 % of the participants agreed that “they start to panic when they have to write without preparation” (item 9). Additionally, most of the participants (71.4%) “get nervous when the teacher asks questions which they have not prepared in advance” (item 33) and “they tremble when they are called on in writing class” (item 3; 38.1%). However, although participants’ anxiety-level before treatment is high, it inclined significantly after the treatment. Post-test results after treatment illustrate participants’ substantial disagreement with items 9, 33 and 3 as seen above in Table 2. Their anxiety level decrease to 28.6%, 33.3% and 19% respectively, but much more noticeable outcome is that their disagreement increased more significantly to 61.9%, 47.7% and 76.2%.
Another outcome is that anxious students fear being less competent than other students. Language learners mostly have the feeling of not being capable especially in writing courses. In our case, 52.4% of the participants in the experimental group have high pressure to prepare very well for the writing classes before treatment and agreed with item 22. Similarly, nearly one third (28.6%) of our participants agreed with item 4 and reported that it frightens them when they don’t understand what the teacher writes. After treatment, however, the data displayed some significant changes, that is, participants’ anxiety level reduced to 23.8% and 14.3% on the other side, the disagreement increased to 52.4% and 80.9% respectively.

Along the same lines, the following change is also important to mention (see Table 4). Nearly half of the participants (42.9%) are not certain about their feelings when their opinion on item 25 is asked: “Writing classes move so quickly that I worry about getting back”. However, after treatment the population is much more certain about their feelings since the unsure estimation shifted to 14.3% and more strikingly disagreement increased to 85.7%.

An additional outcome resulted from the data analysis is the lack of participants’ self-confidence. When the language learner thinks of oneself as deficient and less competent, self confidence can be negatively influenced, on the contrary, high self-confidence can be associated with achievement in language learning. In our case, however, participants have again insignificant opinions. As seen in Table 5, before the treatment, only 23.8% of the
participants were confident about their writings but the disagreement increased to 81% immediately after the treatment (item 18). Similarly, 42,9% were also confident and relaxed on their way to writing classes but the disagreement increased once more to 81%. That is, although students had never taken a writing course at high school, they were pretty sure about themselves and their knowledge in paragraph patterns before the treatment. In our informal discussions, they confessed that they previously wrote paragraphs and essays without thinking about and knowing the general writing rules. As a final remark, it seems that our students have an unprecedented over confidence. Considering item 12 in the same way, 23,8% of the participants reported their getting nervousness in writing class and forgetting things they know. Additionally, 14,3% were not really sure about the same item. After treatment, conversely, participants were much more certain and disagreement raised from 52,4% to 76,2%. That means, it seems that they are no more such anxious in writing courses as they were initially.

A final outcome resulted from the data analysis is participants’ self comparison to others. Social comparison is a theory initially proposed by social psychologist Festinger (1954). This theory explains how individuals evaluate their own opinions and desires by comparing themselves to others. Comparing oneself to others and competing to achieve what they have is an expression of fear. The underlying issue is not competitiveness, but fear and shame. Low self-esteem and insecurity are masked in an effort to be as good as the other.

As seen above in Table 6, participants were not sure about their writing skills before treatment (items 7 and 23) but after treatment nearly all group members (85,7%) were highly sure about the issue. It seems that they are more relaxed and at ease in their writing paragraphs since they have learnt the main paragraph patterns. Nevertheless, after treatment 47,7% of the participants started to keep thinking that the other students are better at writing courses than they are (item7).

All in all, it seems statistically evident that the acceptance, valuing and active, systematic and judicious use of the students’ mother tongue reduces anxiety, facilitates the
intake process (assist efficient-learning), increases task involvement and class participation, and enhances affective environment for learning a foreign language.

**Discussion**

The debate on whether English language classrooms should include or exclude students’ native language has been a contentious issue for a long time. Therefore, the present study attempted to analyze this subject experimentally and aimed to give place to learners’ mother tongue in foreign language classrooms considering, analyzing and discussing empirical data. The first research question of the study was whether or not using learners’ mother tongue judiciously in foreign language classrooms fosters affective factors i.e. reduces FL anxiety and provides a positive learning atmosphere. We conducted a treatment phase and carried out a FL anxiety questionnaire twice i.e. before and after treatment to see whether there is any significant difference. Additionally, we observed our participants both in experimental and control groups and as a vital result, there is, indeed, a significant correlation between the scores before and after the treatment ($r = .772; p= .000$), however this correlation is negative indicating that those who scored high anxiety before the treatment tended to score low after treatment. The data displayed important changes in the anxiety level of the participants as evidenced by the statistical analyses of the pre- and post-test results.

We asserted that L1 use, when taken as a technique or strategy, is not merely an effective way in clarifying meaning but also can decrease learners’ language anxiety since using learners’ mother tongue as a compensation strategy is not only helpful in furthering negotiation in L2 but also an important psychological motivation. This study gives us some opinion about the possibility and effectiveness of using the mother tongue especially in settings where teachers and learners share the same L1. The result of the statistical analysis has indeed confirmed this expectation. The negative correlation between participants’ anxiety levels and the use of L1 show that the systematic and judicious use of L1 is not a taboo subject or a source of embarrassment but a tool or complementary source not only for reducing FL anxiety as seen in this case but also a source for increasing involvement and class participation and enhance affective environment for learning a second/foreign language.

Additionally, our classroom observation has also yielded the expected result, that is, inserting the native language into experimental groups’ lessons gave the impression that it influenced the **classroom dynamics**, enhanced a more positive environment and provided a sense of security. The sense of security caused by permitting judicious L1 use seemed to
increase self confidence and rooted learners to participate much more willingly to in-class activities than the control group. Anxious participants in control group, for example, mostly seemed not to dare to look at the teacher when he asked questions to answer voluntarily. It looked as if they did not dare to ask some unknown vocabulary items or paragraph patterns because they feared to come short with the target language in in-class communication and negotiation. However, the experimental group participants seemed to be much more fearless and involved themselves unafraid in in-class communication and negotiation which indeed fostered a positive environment for learning. Thus, we dare to say that allowing optimal L1 use raises self-assurance thus decreases FL anxiety and directs learners to take part eagerly to in-class activities.

Schweers (1999), relating the ideas to Atkinson’s (1987), precisely alleges to encourage teachers to insert learners’ mother tongue into lessons to influence the classroom dynamic. He seconds rightly that using learners’ L1 provides self-esteem and validates learners’ previous experiences they bring into the classroom. In sum the expected result has indeed confirmed the probability and the use of L1 displayed that the systematic and judicious use of L1 is not a taboo subject or a source of embarrassment but a tool or complementary source not only for reducing FL anxiety as seen in this case but also a source for increasing involvement and class participation and enhance affective environment for learning a second/foreign language.

Conclusion
Although, many authors as well as teachers and educators do believe in only-English instruction in FL classrooms, they fail to provide any hard evidence to support their assumptions. This situation is similar to passing a legislation through hypotheses which is merely based upon anecdotal evidence and assumptions. Therefore, unless a language learning theory is supported by concrete empirical evidence cautious should be exercised to draw premature conclusion. However, the king is naked. The king is really naked. As evidenced in this study, raising the status of the mother tongue increases the participants’ self-esteem and makes them more confident and effective learners. It is evidenced that using L1 in treatment phase decreased anxiety level of the learners and affected classroom dynamics positively. Learners were much more relaxed after the treatment and this influenced classroom dynamics, increased their self-confidence and provided a sense of security. Moreover, L1 use enhanced a more positive environment for learning which in turn raised involvement or class participation. During and after treatment where students’ L1 is used judiciously, we observed that participants were more at ease and they seemed not to start to
panic when they had to write without preparation. Moreover, they seemed not to get nervous when the teacher asked questions which they had not prepared in advance and they seemed also not to tremble when they were called on.

As asserted truly by Cook (2001a) and Prodromou (2002), the mother tongue in the EFL classroom has been a 'skeleton in the cupboard' and the process of L1 use in language classroom is treated as an educational taboo; the language educators and teachers prefer to hide or bury learners’ L1 and by no means say any word about it and through it. The use of L1 is the source of embarrassment for the teachers as it reflects their failure to teach properly. However, a skeleton in the cupboard is something most people probably have, in one form or another and it is really not possible to hide or bury it. It is simply there rising in solitary splendor in front of teachers, educators and researchers but nobody dares to shout the pure truth that the king is really naked.

**Pedagogical Implications**

As an important pedagogical implication, we believe that L1 should be welcomed into the classroom with open arms and teachers need not to feel committing a sin when they use learners’ mother tongue. Nevertheless, we also warn teachers of taking careless steps and overusing L1 in FL classroom. Therefore, the amount of L1 use, when to use and by whom it should be used plays crucial role; since otherwise, the precious resource might be counter-productive. Additionally, some authors without any empirical results assert that the use of L1 is merely useful with beginner level of learners but the result of this study contradicts with such findings. Rather L1 use seems to have a scaffolding role in all proficiency levels - beginner, intermediate or advanced - especially where learners and teachers share the same L1. As a final remark, we sturdily believe that the implications of this and any other similar study on the subject under discussion is essential especially for the departments who are in charge of training prospective teachers of any foreign language.

**Further Research**

All the studies reviewed in literature, including this study, investigated the relationship between learners’ foreign language anxiety and achievement at the university level; however, young learners have been remained relatively unexplored. Additionally, considering the size of population, in future research a larger population of students and teachers can be chosen in order to generalize the outcomes to a much larger population. Finally, it would be very wise
to see the long lasting effect of L1 use, and for that reason it is suggested that participants could be asked to write the same post-test paragraph 6 months later.
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**Appendix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLWCAS (Foreign language writing class anxiety scale items)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- I never feel quite sure of myself when I am writing in my writing class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- I worry about making mistakes in writing class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- I tremble when I’m called on in writing class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- It frightens me when I don’t understand what the teacher writes.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- It bothers me to take writing classes more often.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- During writing class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- I keep thinking that the other students are better at writing courses than I am.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- I am usually at ease during tests in my writing class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- I start to panic when I have to write without preparation in writing class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- I worry about failing in writing class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- I understand why some people get upset over writing class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- In my writing class, I get so nervous that I forget things I know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13- It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in writing class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14- I would not be nervous corresponding with native speakers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- I get worried when I don’t understand what the teacher is correcting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- Even if I am well prepared for writing class, I feel anxious about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17- I often feel like not going to my writing class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18- In writing class, I feel confident about my writings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19- I am afraid that my teacher corrects every mistake that I make.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20- I can feel my heart pounding when I am called on in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- The more I study for writing test, the more confused I get.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22- I feel pressure to prepare very well for writing class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23- I always feel that the other students write better than I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24- While I’m writing in front of other students, I feel worried.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25- Writing classes move so quickly that I worry about getting left behind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26- I feel more tense and nervous in writing class than in other classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27- I am usually very bored in my writing class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28- When I am on my way to writing class, I feel very confident and relaxed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29- I get nervous when I don’t understand every word the teacher says.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30- I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to write in English language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31- I am very worried that the other students will laugh at my writings in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32- In my writing class, I would probably feel more comfortable around native speaker-students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33- I get nervous when the teacher asks questions which I haven’t prepared in advance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The authors compared attitudes to English as an international language and to non-native varieties of English held by students who had just completed the English as a Global Language course in the English MA Programme at the University of Rijeka and by BA students from the same institution who had never been exposed to those concepts in the course of their formal education. They also investigated whether and to what extent the two groups believed they would rely on native speaker norms and teach their future EFL pupils about non-native varieties of English. The sample comprised 45 students, who were asked to fill in a questionnaire. MA students were, due to their exposure to EIL and to non-native English varieties, more open to the idea of international English as a separate variety of English based on features of various native and non-native English varieties; however, they still thought that native features should predominate. BA students were, on the other hand, less open to the same idea and more likely to prepare their future pupils primarily for communication with native English speakers.

1. Introduction
1.1. In the Summer Semester of 2009 (March to June) we taught an English as a Global Language course as an obligatory part of the MA programme in English Language and Literature, University of Rijeka. This was the first time that such a course had been taught at the University. As none of the topics discussed are covered in the first three years of study (the BA in English Language in Literature), students had never come across the relevant concepts before in the course of their formal education.

1.2. The topics covered in the course included the notion of English as a global and international language (EIL); the historical and cultural context in which English became an international language; attitudes to English as an international language; World Englishes; English as a lingua franca; and the future of English as an international language. Within those topics, particular attention was devoted to the concept of the three circles of English (Kachru 1985), the status and perceptions of native as opposed to non-native speakers and native as opposed to non-native varieties of English, and the problem of ownership of (international) English. Although native speakers have long been accorded special status, the rise of English as a global language and the emergence of New Englishes, as well as the English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) movement (Jenkins 2000, 2006, Seidlhofer 2001), have challenged the idea of the centrality of the native speaker of English (e.g. Graddol 1997, 1999, Modiano 1999). As the majority of English speakers today are non-native and communication in English occurs largely between non-native speakers (e.g. Crystal 2003; Graddol 1997), the question arises whether the norms should reflect this and in what way (outer and/or expanding circle norms, in addition to or replacing inner circle ones?), and also whether the norm should be defined in reference to intelligibility rather than native speakers, as proposed by the exponents of the ELF movement.

1.3. Whether ELF is to be understood as form or function (cf. Mollin 2006, Saraceni 2008), it seems that insights provided by analysis of ELF discourse could have a practical application in communication involving non-native speakers, identifying strategies that speakers (including native speakers) should employ in order to achieve better communication, as well as a practical application in teaching, identifying what need not be taught and what should be taught. This is of particular relevance to our students as future teachers of English as a foreign language (EFL): the MA programme has a strong teacher-training focus and this type of degree is a formal requirement for teachers of English in Croatian primary and secondary schools, as well as in language centres. Our course therefore included a discussion of the ideas on ELF pronunciation and morphosyntax that have been advanced, respectively, by Jennifer Jenkins and Barbara Seidlhofer.
1.4. In several works (most notably in Jenkins 2000 and 2002), Jennifer Jenkins has suggested that some types of mispronunciation lead to a breakdown in communication and others do not, which has led her to propose a distinction between what she terms the core and the non-core features of pronunciation. The core features include: distinguishing between short and long vowels of English, as well as between voiced and voiceless stops; preserving rather than simplifying initial consonant clusters; and the use of tonic stress. Non-core features, the (correct or native-like) use or non-use of which makes no difference to understanding according to Jenkins include: the fricatives /θ/ and /ð/; the so-called dark l ([l]); vowel quality (as long as non-native vowels are used consistently); weak forms and other features of connected speech, especially assimilation; as well as word stress, pitch movement, and stress timing.

1.5. Seidlhofer (2004) has identified a number of features typical of ELF morphosyntax. These include: the non-use of third person present tense -s (She look very sad); the interchangeable use of relative pronouns who and which (a book who, a person which); omission of definite and indefinite articles where they are obligatory in native speaker English as well as insertion where they do not occur in native speaker English; the use of an all-purpose question tag such as isn’t it? or no? (They should arrive soon, isn’t it?); increasing redundancy by adding prepositions (We have to study about ... and Can we discuss about ...?), or by increasing explicitness (How long time? vs. How long?); reliance on verbs of high semantic generality, such as do, have, make, put, take; pluralisation of nouns considered uncountable in native speaker English (informations, staffs, advices); and the use of that-clauses instead of infinitive constructions (I want that we discuss about my dissertation).

1.6. At the end of the semester, we wished to ascertain to what extent the exposure to the relevant concepts influenced our students' attitudes towards them. Our aim was, first, to compare their attitudes to EIL and to non-native varieties of English with those of BA students, who had never been exposed to those concepts in the course of their formal education; and, second, to investigate whether and to what extent the two groups believed that as future teachers of EFL they would rely on native speaker norms, teach their students about non-native varieties of English, and tolerate the use of non-native features.

2. Methodology
2.1. The sample comprised 45 students of the English language of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences in Rijeka: 20 fourth-year students (MA students) and 25 second-year students (BA students).

2.2. The data was collected by means of a questionnaire, which consisted of five parts: the first part elicited the respondents’ personal data; the second enquired into their familiarity with different varieties of English; the third examined their communication with native and non-native speakers of English; the fourth investigated their attitudes to EIL and to non-native varieties of English; and the fifth and final part investigated whether and to what extent they would rely on native speaker norms and tolerate non-native speaker features as future teachers.

2.3. The collected data was then statistically analysed using Microsoft Office Excel 2003.

2.4. We based our research on two hypotheses. The first predicted that MA students were more open than BA students to the idea of EIL as a separate variety of English based on features of various native and non-native English varieties, due to their formal exposure to the concepts of EIL and non-native varieties of English. The second predicted that BA students were more likely than MA students to prepare their future pupils primarily for communication with native English speakers.

3. Analysis of results

3.1. With respect to the respondents' familiarity with different varieties of English, MA students are, as expected, more familiar with non-native varieties than BA students. Indian and Nigerian English are the most frequently listed non-native varieties among MA students. On the other hand, 62.5% of BA students (as opposed to 20% of MA students) are familiar only with native varieties, or they regard only native speaker varieties, such as British, American or Canadian, as English language varieties.

3.2. As to their communication with native and non-native speakers of English, around 60% of both groups say that their English is different when they communicate with non-native speakers than when they communicate with native speakers. In their additional comments some of them are primarily focused on non-native, and some of them on native varieties. Most of the respondents primarily focused on non-native varieties are MA students (61.5% ↔ 23% of BA students). They say that when they communicate with non-native

---

3 All the differences in attitudes of MA and BA students presented in the paper are statistically significant (p < 0.05).
speakers they tend to simplify their speech, pronounce clearly, and use no idiomatic expressions. In fact, they show a rather high level of linguistic accommodation, as defined by Giles and Smith (1979), and they notice that their interlocutors who are more comfortable with English than they are tend to adjust to them.

Those who are primarily focused on native varieties, among whom BA students prevail (54% ↔ 38.5% of MA students), say that when they communicate with native speakers they pay more attention to grammar, pronunciation and choice of words (collocations), try to avoid mistakes, and sound as fluent as possible.

They all agree that communication with native speakers puts them under a certain amount of pressure, while communication with non-native speakers makes them feel more relaxed.

3.3. Regarding the respondents’ attitudes to EIL and to non-native varieties of English, the analysis of results shows that MA students are more open to the idea of EIL as a separate variety of English based on features of various native and non-native English varieties. According to 45% of MA students (↔ 32% of BA students), EIL should be a separate variety of English used for international communication and based on commonalities of various native and non-native English varieties, which even native English speakers should learn. Similarly, 20% of MA students (↔ 0% of BA students) believe that Indian or Nigerian English are as important linguistic models for international English as British or American English. Furthermore, 75% of MA students (↔ 60% of BA students) feel that international English belongs to its non-native speakers as much as to its native ones. The majority of BA students (52% ↔ 30% of MA students), on the other hand, state that EIL should be based only on British or/and American norms.

Although both MA and BA students, in about equal measure (around 33.5%), hold that between two teachers of English who have the same teaching skills the native speaker is the more competent, there are more MA students who disagree with the statement (55% ↔ 36% of BA students).

Our first hypothesis, which predicts that MA students are more open than BA students to the idea of EIL as a separate variety of English based on features of various native and non-native English varieties, is thereby confirmed.

3.3.1. Those that do not support the idea of EIL as a separate variety usually have additional comments4, where they express their doubts over the possibility of codification of

---

4 Additional comments are reproduced in their original form.
such a variety, and where they show their loyalty to the norm of the English language as spoken by those for whom English is the first language:

#9: A global form of English can never exist because local varieties of English are vastly dissimilar.
#16: One variety of English should be the norm…If we do not have a norm, how can we teach properly? And, what to teach?
#23: Global English shouldn’t be a separate variety because English has its norms and rules which we have to stick to.
#31: English learners should put effort in acquiring the language as it is, not adjusting it to their own norms and abilities.

3.4. With regard to the respondents’ reliance on native speaker norms and their tolerance of non-native speaker norms once they become EFL teachers, the analysis of results shows that 60% of BA students (↔ 45% of MA students) will only teach native speaker norms, and 76% (↔ 15% of MA students) will devise their course in such a way as to prepare students primarily for communication with native speakers of English. Consequently, 88% of BA students (↔ 50% of MA students) will try to sound native-like.

On the other hand, 45% of MA students (↔ 35% of BA students) will teach their students about various non-native varieties of English.

Both groups are split evenly when it comes to tolerating their future pupils' non-native pronunciations that do not hinder communication (e.g. pronunciation of [ð] as [v] or [z]); however, no student from either group would tolerate morphosyntax which does not conform to native speaker norms (e.g. he play instead of he plays).

Therefore, our second hypothesis, that BA students are more likely than MA students to prepare their future pupils primarily for communication with native English speakers, has also been confirmed.

However, although MA students are more open to non-native English varieties and more inclined to introduce their future pupils to their features, they are neither (more) tolerant of the use of features of non-native varieties of English in schools nor (more) willing to accept them as normative.

3.4.1. The respondents’ reluctance to accept features of non-native English varieties as normative is clearly indicated in the following comments:

#6: Why should students in Croatia bother for Chinese or Caribbean English?
4. Concluding remarks

4.1. Both our initial hypotheses have been confirmed: MA students are more open to the idea of EIL as a separate variety of English based on features of various native and non-native English varieties. BA students are less open to the same idea and more likely than MA students to prepare their future pupils primarily for communication with native English speakers.

Exposure to the concepts of EIL and to non-native English varieties obviously has a considerable impact on the level of students’ openness to, and acceptance/tolerance of, these concepts.

4.2. Nevertheless, although MA students are more open to the idea of EIL as a separate variety, 30-35% of them believe that international English should be based on native norms, a native speaker is more competent as a teacher, and native English varieties are better than non-native ones. Furthermore, only 20% of them believe outer-circle Englishes to be as important linguistic models for international English as inner-circle Englishes.

Although MA students are generally willing to introduce their students to the concepts of EIL and to non-native English varieties, they are not willing to tolerate grammar which does not conform to native speaker norms. In other words, although the majority of MA students are open to the idea of EIL as a separate variety, they object to its accommodation to much-used grammatical forms such as he don’t.

Finally, 45% of MA students state that they will only teach native speaker norms, while no more than 50% will teach their students about various non-native varieties of English and tolerate non-native pronunciation.

The respondents’ additional comments clearly show how a majority of them are still unwilling to accept non-native varieties as equal to native ones and how strange and vague the idea of accepting outer-circle Englishes as norm-providing seems to them.
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Introduction
The global spread and use of English have become an important focus of research in the applied linguistics field (Seidlhofer, 2001) based on the fact that the English language has become the part and parcel of the daily lives of people all over the world from a great deal of areas ranging from politics to education. Currently, the number of non-native users of English outweighs the number of native-users (Graddol, 1999). This situation has resulted in tremendous demand in English language teachers, which has also led to an increase in the number of non-native English language teachers and prospective non-native English language teachers attending Department of English Language Teaching at universities all around the world.

Regarding the current status of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), much discussion has focused on the issue of ELF and English language teaching (Jenkins, 2006, 2007; Kirkpatrick, 2006; McKay, 2003a, 2003b; Seidlhofer; 1999). These discussions highlighted the need to revisit common assumptions considering English language teaching and the manner in which it is taught. The monolithic perception of the native speaker’s language and culture, the mono-centred view on Standard English, norm-biased approaches to foreign language teaching have been challenged in the related literature (Alptekin, 2002; McKay 2009; Sifakis & Sougari, 2003). Following these lines of challenges is bound to have an impact on English language teacher education since this will raise the awareness of
prospective English language teachers and play a crucial role in their future teaching practices. As Seidlhofer asserts (2004: 228):

Rather than just being trained in a restricted set of pre-formulated techniques for specific teaching contexts, teachers will need a more comprehensive education which enables them to judge the implications of the ELF phenomenon for their own teaching contexts and to adapt their teaching to the particular requirements of their learners.

It would not be a failure to note that empirical studies on non-native pre-service English language teachers’ knowledge, thoughts and beliefs about ELF have great potential for contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of the current English language teacher education. Bearing this in mind, this paper explores the discussion of the status of English, the question of ownership of English, what constitutes the Standard English, the definition of bilingualism and successful bilinguals, and pedagogical considerations from the perspective of ten senior non-native pre-service English language teachers.

Methodology

Setting and participants

Ten non-native pre-service English language teachers studying in the Department of English Language Teaching at a foundation university in Istanbul, Turkey in the spring term of 2008-2009 participated in this study. Participants were selected based on convenience sampling. Regarding ethical concerns, we collected written consents from the participants. For each participating non-native prospective English language teachers, a pseudo-initial will be used from this part on.

Data collection and analysis

Data were collected by ten semi-structured interviews each of which lasted for about forty-five minutes. As the participants were all non-native prospective English language teachers in Turkey, we asked them if they would rather speak English or Turkish during the interviews. They informed us that they would prefer Turkish with the flexibility of code switching to English when it was needed and more appropriate. The interview questions centred on themes such as status of English, ownership of English, basic terminology related to the aim of the study, definition of bilingualism and successful bilinguals and future teaching practices. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. In order to analyze and report the findings, Turkish responses in the interviews were translated and crosschecked.
Findings and Discussion

The subsequent part of this paper reports and discusses the findings that centre on the themes which question the basic terminology related to the aim of the study, status of English, Standard English, ownership of English, definition of bilingualism and successful bilinguals, and future teaching practices from the perspective of non-native pre-service English language teachers.

With respect to exploring participants’ knowledge of basic terminology, we asked each participant whether they knew what EFL/ESL/EIL/ELF denotes. Among ten participants all of them were able to clearly define what EFL and ESL mean whereas only two of them heard the acronyms EIL and ELF at a conference they had attended but still they were not able to tell what these terms stand for, such as:

EFL is the way we learn English as a foreign language. And ESL is like for example you are born abroad and you learn it as your second language. But I haven’t heard ELF. (Inf. S)

Yes, I’ve heard it at a conference but I don’t know what exactly it means. (Inf. D)

Yes I heard about this, too. English is the language which is spoken by the all the people in the world. The common spoken language. I learned about these terms at a conference here. (Inf. H)

From the statements above with respect to knowledge of basic terminology, it can be realized that participants’ knowledge is limited to commonly known EFL/ESL distinction. It is evident that they are not aware of the recent discussions on EIL and ELF in the field of ELT. However, as it is argued by Seidlhofer “…teachers should be well informed about developments which are potentially relevant for the profession” (1999: 239).

Findings of the study also reveal that participants consider the status of English as a global language and as to this status the most frequently given reason was the effect of globalization, for instance:

I think globalisation is really effective. From the clothes we wear, the food we eat, and to the music we listen to, everything is the same with the whole world. So it’s quite normal
that everybody can speak the same language. Even when we speak in Turkish, we use a lot of English words, everybody looks alike each other. (Inf. A)

The communication between all the people in the world is carried out in English, not German or French. And now everybody is assumed to be able to speak English. It is like out of question not being able to speak it. (Inf. K)

Participants detected superpower countries such as the USA and the UK as the responsible agents for the globalization process and the current status of English, for example:
Well, it’s a global language. Why? The superpower countries in the world are the US and England. In near future, even if there are new superpower countries, English is spoken in these countries now, too. (Inf. F)

Participants’ responses display that the underlying reasons of English becoming the global language stem mainly from historical, political and socio-economical reasons and on the grounds that Britain and the USA are the two superpower countries leading the world economy and technology. The insights gained from the participants are line with Crystal’s (1997) reviews that British colonialism in the 17th and 18th centuries, being the leading country of Britain through the industrial revolution period, and then becoming the leader economic power of the USA in the late 19th and the early 20th centuries were the prevailing reasons for the spread of English.

Concerning what constitutes Standard English; findings reveal that majority of participants hold mono-centred view of Standard English and they identify the English norms of inner circle speakers i.e. American and British as the standard, based on the fact that these norms are seen as more correct. However, pointing at the growing number of non-native speakers of English, some participants noted that ELF could also be regarded as the standard. Both views are exemplified below:

It is the correct usage, correct pronunciation. The way it was taught to us within certain rules, the language spoken in the US and England. (Inf. T)

Its origin, I mean the country in which it is spoken. We take this country as a model. And in Turkey we take the United States as model, American English. (Inf. A)
Well, since there are more people speaking English in the world today than the native speakers, may be it is the standard I mean the one we determine. Because while we are talking we add new words to English. I mean what is spoken most becomes the standard anyway. (Inf. K)

As their statements demonstrate, not surprisingly, standard language ideology is prevalent among participants. Jenkins (2007) dwells on the same issue that long after the colonial period even in regions of the world which were not colonized, native speaker norms continue ‘to colonize the minds’ (Tsuda, 1997 as cited in Jenkins, 2007) of non-native English speakers.

Majority of the participants agreed on the idea that English is owned by either Americans or British people. Some participants seem to question the ownership of English as they think that non-native speakers may also have the right to claim ownership but they still feel more attachment to the idea of native-speakers being the real custodians of English language, for example:

Americans own it for sure (Inf. D)

Of course English people; it is the language of English people in the end. Actually the language is changing but I do not know whether they react against this or not. (Inf. B)

Well, there is one owner of it. But the others also have the right to claim ownership, too. Because these people are living on English, they depend on English in various fields of their lives; we are all destined to English. Everybody owns it but the real owners of English are the Americans. (Inf. K)

In practice, yes the whole world owns English. But from the historical and original aspects, it is Britain of course. (Inf. G)

As it can be seen from their statements, participants are grouped in two regarding the ownership of English. The first group viewing English as the language of American or British people forms the majority. This in itself is not surprising with respect to the argument by Jenkins “The desire to preserve the English ‘asset’ for its historical ‘owners’ is inevitably bound up with the kinds of standard language ideology” (2007: 34). On the other hand, it is worth noting that, the second group, few in number, begins to argue that non-native users may
have the right to claim ownership of English. This is in line with what Alptekin notes: “Unlike local/national languages, ELF is an international medium of communication. It has no speakers and no proper culture of its own to speak of. In this sense, it is everyone’s property” (forthcoming: 6). Yet, it would be a failure not to note that even the second group has not been able to escape the idea of linking English with her historical owners.

With regard to the question of bilingualism and successful bilinguals, all participants only came up with the definition of balanced bilingualism, such as:

A bilingual is a person who can speak two languages. The successful bilingual is a person who can speak two languages perfectly. But these two languages cannot be at the same level, because one of the languages is someone’s native language. And the native one will be always superior, better compared to the other and we always try to do our best to improve the other one. (Inf. O)

I would call the person who expresses himself in both languages I mean who speaks both languages like his native language. It is possible with some people. (Inf. T)

Participants’ responses reflect the fractional view of bilingualism, which argues that the bilingual is two monolinguals in one person (Grosjean, 1992) and which results in the idea of viewing the real bilingual as a person who is equally fluent in two languages. This is a commonly held view among laypersons, as well as researchers and educators. However, as Grosjean puts it ‘because the needs and the uses of two languages are usually quite different, the bilingual is rarely equally or completely fluent in two languages’ (2001:14). Unfortunately, the responses collected in the present study suggest that the notion of the balanced bilingual is unlikely to fade away even it is a rare figure all around the world.

Regarding their future teaching practices, participants highlight the importance of ‘mutual intelligibility’ (Alptekin, forthcoming) in communicating in English. However, when it comes to teaching they value grammatical accuracy and fluency, which can be regarded as a norm-bound attitude as participants consider themselves to be ‘the correct model’ for their students. Moreover, most participants declared that as teacher practitioners they can tolerate spoken errors while they feel themselves obliged to correct written errors, for instance:

The important thing is being able to understand the other person, having the enough ability to discuss about an issue. I think intelligibility is the most important thing. (Inf. S)
If she said ‘He goed’, I would correct it but it is important if she can speak when she is abroad. It is necessary to display the correct usage but not to intervene while they speak. I am responsible to model the correct usage at school. It is my duty. I need to display them American or British usage. (Inf. H)

For example, I don’t think that “s” inflection is that important. I think we can tolerate the mistakes in speaking but in writing we can correct them. (Inf. F)

Another interesting result is that most participants find it easier and feel themselves more comfortable in communicating in English with non-native speakers rather than native speakers as follows:
It’s easier to speak with non-native speakers, they are like us. Sometimes I don’t understand what native speakers say. When I was in Erasmus, I was speaking in the lectures if the teacher was German, because I felt more relaxed. But we had some British teachers and I was too shy to speak in their lessons. (Inf. G)

This exemplifies what is put forward by Alptekin that ELF “puts the users, technically speaking, on an ‘equal’ status in both the linguistic and cultural aspects of the communicative act” (forthcoming: 6).

Conclusion and Implications:

Findings of the study reveal that participants still hold idealised, conventional and fixed thoughts and beliefs about English and language teaching. From the responses it is inferred that the knowledge of the participants is still restricted within the realm of EFL and ESL and that they still feel commitment to native-speaker forms and consider native speaker as the ideal speaker-hearer when defining what constitutes the Standard English. Participants attribute the characteristics of bilingualism to the notion of ‘balanced bilingualism’. Moreover, although majority of them recognize and acknowledge the present status of English as Lingua Franca, evidently this mainly stems from the effect of globalization process on every phase of our lives; is not a proof or consequence of their awareness of the current debates and discussions in our field.

In terms of their teaching perspectives, our participant pre-service teachers display norm-bound attitudes towards their future teaching practices although they acknowledge the significance of intelligibility factor in EFL discourses in which the interlocutors are mainly
non-native speakers of English. Since there have been shifts in the understanding of the status of English and reconceptualization of bilingualism and an inclination towards post-method approaches questioning the appropriateness of West-marketed methodologies and approaches for local contexts, we argue that the curriculum of ELT departments at universities should be re-evaluated and modified as has been mentioned by Seidlhofer ‘if a language is perceived to be changing in its forms and uses, it is reasonable to expect that something in the teaching of it will also change’ (2004:225).

In recent literature, there have been discussions on how teachers can accommodate with these changing concepts (Sifakis, 2004; Sifakis and Sougari, 2003; Llurda,2009) and ‘how teachers can take advantage of their non-native speaker status and develop it as an important resource for asserting the needs and preferences of their specific Expanding Circle settings’ (Seidlhofer, 2004: 233). We argue that this accommodation or transfer is possible only if pre-service teachers are well-informed about these current issues and educated with a critical stance in their undergraduate studies. Our main focus points are on awareness raising and encouraging critical thinking regarding English language teacher education as a whole. We do not only suggest that specific courses related to ELF should be included in the curriculum of teacher education, what we suggest indeed is that all these changing notions and related issues to ELF should be integrated in all courses that take place in the curriculum of an ELT department. Evidently, academics play a significant role in that case. Academics themselves, first of all, should be following the recent discussions in ELT acknowledging the current status of ELF rather than merely dwelling on their field of expertise. For instance in courses such as:

- Approaches and methods in language teaching: Students should be encouraged to think critically about the methodologies taught (especially Communicative Language Teaching) in terms of their appropriateness for their own local contexts rather than accepting them as norms and sticking to tried and tested routines.
- Second Language Acquisition: In the presentation and discussion of studies related to language acquisition, a critical stance should be taken since in many studies second language acquisition is measured against native-speaker competence.
- Bilingualism: Students should be familiarised with the holistic view of bilingualism and notions such as ‘multicompetence’ and ‘bicognitivism’. (Alptekin, forthcoming)
• Testing: ELF corpus studies might be examined and in line with these assessment criteria for written and spoken exams can be reconsidered and the notion of ‘mutual intelligibility’ should be discussed.

• Material Evaluation and Development: Cultural content of textbooks should be analysed critically. Different types of textbooks (the ones focusing on target-culture, global culture, cosmopolitan culture) can be demonstrated and evaluated.

• The use of literature in ELT: Students should be introduced to post-colonial writers in addition to teaching them how to use Shakespeare’s plays American short stories or novels of British writers in their language classrooms. This will also help them gain insights about World Englishes, as well.

These are just few examples to give insights about how we can make modifications in our syllabuses. In addition to these, specific courses such as World Englishes and Language Policy and Planning can also be included in the curriculum as elective courses. Moreover, students should be encouraged to attend conferences held at various universities. We argue that once these suggestions mentioned above are established in our curriculums ‘EFL teachers who have a good idea as to what options are in principle available to them, and have learnt to evaluate these critically, sceptically and confidently, are unlikely to be taken in by the absolute claims and exaggerated promises often made by any one educational philosophy, linguistic theory, teaching method or textbook” (Seidlhofer, 1999:240).
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Abstract
English continues to dominate the knowledge economy and academic publication globally with over 85-90% of academic publications worldwide published in English (Hamel, 2007). Yet a large proportion of the world’s students and faculty are denied access to English speaking universities and the English knowledge economy essential to their professional academic advancement due to their inadequate academic literacy in English (Flowerdew, 2007). These global inequalities of access to knowledge and consequent limited access to career advancement, academic promotions and tenure cause enormous constraints on the world-wide development and dissemination of knowledge and negatively impact the development of local as well as global knowledge cultures. While the open course-ware (OCW) movement has been instrumental in providing widespread financially-free access to public knowledge, this public knowledge requires academic literacy in English. Further, there are few approaches that have been proposed as to how accreditation could be obtained by the large proportion of the world’s students and faculty in developing countries who have access to open course-ware but for economic, geographical or English academic literacy limitations cannot receive academic credit for such courses. The tested and replicated Pan University Open Model that I describe in this paper effectively advances and promotes English academic literacy for students and faculty in their chosen disciplines through a pan university electronic forum that provides both credit for participation in an English online course for each of the participants at their individual home universities, while also providing for the professional
academic development in academic English for all participants. The replications of this model of pan university credit courses for diverse global audiences of students and faculty from universities in developed and developing countries has found impressive results for English as an Other Language (EOL) academic literacy as a result of the focus on intensive scholarly online collaboration and debate.

**English as an International Language**

English has increasingly become the international academic language due in part to the internet and new media technologies which have promoted the need for a common world language for global academic and economic communication. With over 85-90% of academic research papers being published in English on a global level (Ammon, 2006; Hamel, 2007) it is imperative that many students and faculty in all countries world-wide improve their academic English in order to participate and contribute to academic courses, conferences and publications. Access to tertiary education and professional success require reading and writing literacy in academic English and the inability to write well in academic English constitutes a barrier of immense proportions to academic and professional advancement. The attainment of academic literacy can take many years to achieve and is often never attained by many scholars in all countries and consequently these thousands of scholars are unable to optimally contribute to the global knowledge economy. With increased migration internationally this need for a common academic language is only increased. In spite of this pressing world-wide need there are few efficient and practical approaches proposed to overcome this global problem.

In Kachru’s (1990) view world English is composed of three concentric circles with the native English speaking countries at the core, an outer circle consisting of those countries where English is of historical importance, such as in former British colonies, like India, and an expanding circle where English is increasingly widely used as a foreign language or a *lingua franca*. Those countries in the expanding circle are increasingly trying to address the need for their people to learn English in order that they can better participate in both international academic and commercial activities. For example, in the Arab countries of the Gulf Cooperative Council (GCC), English is a quasi-official language actively incorporated into the educational systems as well as daily life in diverse ways where signage, car registration and drivers’ licenses are issued in both Arabic and English. In the United Arab Emirates students are required to qualify in English to enter the national universities. In
addition, the Higher Colleges of Technology (HCT) was established to provide, technical courses and undergraduate degrees where the language of instruction is English. In these examples and elsewhere in Arab countries there is a strong movement to promote academic literacy in English so that these countries are not so exclusively dependant on native English speaking ex-patriots to assume academic and professional leadership roles where English academic literacy is required. Further, HCT offers teacher preparation programs to Emiratis which qualify them to teach English in the public elementary schools where English is now taught from the primary grades. Furthermore, a number of other international tertiary institutions such as the University of Wollongong from Australia and the American University in Dubai have been encouraged to offer undergraduate and graduate courses in English. Similar situations exist not only in other Arab countries but most countries worldwide where foreign universities have been generously funded to establish satellite campuses and numerous global network links to promote EOL instruction at all levels of the educational system. In Turkey there is also a strong movement to encourage students to master literacy in academic English.

However, this is a daunting task and many students who have the financial resources choose to go abroad to study in a setting where they can immerse themselves in English language and culture. While all of these numerous initiatives are impressive, the fact remains that to develop a high academic literacy in a particular academic discipline or domain demands immersion in that particular linguistic ecological niche and remains an elusive goal for many who cannot access such a linguistic niche for financial or geographic reasons. Due to massive world migration, even within English speaking countries including those in North America, many speakers of EOL or even those whose first and dominant language is English, fail to attain high levels of academic literacy and are prevented from academic publication and professional advancement. Many such students who satisfy the minimal English entry requirements to English speaking universities also experience difficulty mastering English academic literacy. After supervising more than one hundred EOL graduate students who were temporary or long term immigrants or Canadian francophones and who struggled taking graduate courses in English and writing academic theses in English, I have created an online approach which I believe has considerable merit in overcoming the intractable problem of attaining high academic literacy for EOL students and faculty.
In this paper I propose a pan university model of online seminars that can allow EOL students and faculty from developing and developed countries to advance their academic literacy in those academic areas that are of paramount importance to their academic career advancement. As Flowerdew (2007) has pointed out the combined pressures of globalization and marketization of the academy has created a situation where scholars need to write in English for international journals in an academic setting and where writing in English is perceived as a sort of ineluctable necessity, related to both international prestige and editorial needs, rather that a matter of free choice, by non-Anglophone scholars (Guardiano, Favilla, & Calaresu, 2007). Since it is recognized that academic literacy remains a barrier for EOL students and faculty globally (Flowerdew, 2007), this approach has centered on academic literacy in English as an access issue. Therefore, the model in this paper attempts not only to provide ways to allow the participation of EOL students to engage in research and knowledge sharing but also as a way of developing academic literacy in English as an integral part of participation. If we recognize that one must be academically literate in English in order to progress naturally in one’s academic career and we also recognize that the majority of the global population of university scholars lack optimal academic literacy then we must recognize the enormous cost globally to universities worldwide that do NOT efficiently advance the research knowledge enterprise through promoting English academic literacy.

Unfortunately, this extremely important issue has not been resolved in an efficient way due in part to the unique needs of each individual scholar who must master a type of academic literacy that relates to the domain and discipline in which their academic research specializes. Consequently, conventional ESL classes are not particularly helpful to the individual academic because they do not deal with the special domains of knowledge and technical vocabulary that must be mastered. What each of these academics needs is to be immersed into a communicative situation where they actively develops communicative competence with other specialists communicating on topics and using professional and technical language that is relevant to the area of research each individual is publishing in. The ideal situation should include a communicative environment where each individual can communicate on chosen topics with other chosen specialists at chosen times. At present, due to the lack of such venues which would promote specialized academic communication in the appropriate language register and using the appropriate technical language for the appropriate domain, hundreds of thousands of leading scholars worldwide are denied their potential to optimally contribute to world knowledge and to advance toward their own career promotion. These
academics worldwide who are highly motivated to master English academic literacy are prevented from doing so because there are no highly efficient procedures for giving them access to English academic literacy in their knowledge domain. The cost to global knowledge in all disciplines is staggering because these gifted researchers spend their professional careers unable to develop their potential as academics, (see Flowerdew, 2007 for examples). While there is a massive effort to promote ESL and EOL in the general student population, there are few choices available for graduate students and faculty to refine their English academic literacy in their particular ecological niche of discipline knowledge. The global knowledge economy would benefit substantially if this large proportion of scholars worldwide could enhance their English academic literacy. The tested and effective pan-university model proposed in this paper has been found to be an efficient next step in promoting English academic literacy following the first step; the internet and the use of Open Course Ware (OCW) technology.

**Open Course Ware (OCW) Models**

Following MIT’s highly acclaimed move to make its vast educational course resources freely available to the public, the number of open learning initiatives has continued to expand. International organizations such as UNESCO and the Open University together with public and private institutions have continued to make educational content and courses freely available to the public through the internet. The OpenCourseWare Consortium (www.ocwconsortium.org) has brought together more than 200 universities, institutions and organizations providing open education resources (OERs) and Open Course Ware (OCW). These OER courses which range from largely self-directed/access DIY style learning to open-course-with-open-teaching are free to access but there is no obvious way to receive credit for studying these diverse course materials. This lacunae has received insufficient attention and there are few initiatives to address this issue. More recently, the open teaching efforts of David Wiley, (Wiley and Hilton, 2009) have stimulated thinking about how students in other countries could participate in higher education while overcoming the existing barriers to access. Yet few such initiatives have been realized or are in practice.

Consequently, while the OCW movement has been instrumental in providing widespread access to public knowledge, accreditation for these courses is still strictly curtailed due to the economic/geographical isolation or English academic literacy limitations of the students. The model proposed here effectively overcomes these limitations and
promotes English academic literacy for students and faculty, in their chosen disciplines, through a pan university electronic forum that provides credit for online participation and collaboration from their home universities, while also providing for the professional academic development using their English academic literacy for all faculty and student participants.

The Integration of Member Universities into the Pan-University Online Forums.

Since most international students cannot attend prestigious English speaking universities because they cannot satisfy the TOEFL or IELTS university entrance requirements or they lack the financial resources to pay for travel, tuition, rent and living expenses or they have families to support in their home cities, it was reasoned that these students could register in their home universities and participate in a pan-university online forum where they would read and write in asynchronous online discussion forums with similar students from other worldwide universities. In this way, because the online written communication is asynchronous, the pressure to perform and compete orally with native English speakers would be obviated. Conversely, having unlimited time to read and compose questions and answers online would allow these EOL speakers the opportunity to express their highly valuable insights and knowledge to other participating members of the pan-university credit course. Accordingly, students from universities in Japan, Russia, Mexico and Canada for example could be registered in courses in their home universities and receive credit for the courses in their home university but would collaborate in written format with students and faculty from all three universities in a common online discussion forum on topics of common interest and choice (Carey, 2009, Basharina, 2007, Morgan and Carey, 2009)

There are several advantages to this approach. First, where the course content includes topics that are of global interest such as global warming and pandemics (Carey, 2009), students’ unique viewpoints from each country can be very valuable and enriching to the other students from the other countries and therefore, all students’ viewpoints and opinions are highly valued by the other student participants. Furthermore, the course is much more rich and educational for all participating students and faculty. For example, in discussing how business negotiations are conducted differently in Japan, Mexico, Russia and Canada can be enlightening when graduate students discuss assigned readings on this topic on this pan university online forum. I have taught numerous versions of this pan-university model where all faculty and student participants found it to be a much richer and enjoyable course due to the multicultural nature of the participants and where they could readily improve their English
academic literacy in their academic discipline. Much of the research has centered on the superiority of these pan university courses over conventional courses. In particular, the instructors appreciated the fact that they could discuss issues online in academic English and this was viewed as a major opportunity to improve their academic English literacy in their academic discipline. Instructors noted that this opportunity was much better than going to a conference because each course provided for months of professional academic development.

In a number of these pan-university courses, the students and instructors have been interviewed in terms of their learning experience and extensive analyses of their online communications have been conducted (Basharina, 2005, Basharina, Guardado & Morgan, 2008). Taken together a summary of the results consistently found that students claimed they were more active and communicative and were able to makes greater advances in their English academic literacy. In addition, there was a consensus that the courses offered enriching, highly stimulating academic discussions which were decidedly conducive to learning. In part this is due to the autonomy students have in discussing topics of their choice with students and faculty of their choice when they choose. This promotes authentic interest-driven communication in appropriate registers and topics which is ideal for language acquisition within sociocultural language acquisition theory. Furthermore, the authenticity of the community of scholars who were well qualified to discuss these scholarly topics was also an essential feature to promoting English academic literacy. Many participants remarked how they appreciated this scholarly community and linguistic authenticity which was not possible to find in conventional language courses. This was particularly valued because faculty members remarked that this course directly related to their need to publish in English if they wished to gain tenure and promotion and stressed that at most universities publications that are not in English do not count as international publications and are not valued for promotion. In this regard they stated that the pan-university course was a welcome aid to a frustrating academic issue.

Conclusion

In conclusion, all ethnolinguistic groups worldwide need to develop their academic literacy in English to ensure their collective prestige in international academic, economic and cultural domains to ensure the maintenance, development, value and prestige of their own individual group ethnolinguistic vitality. While the attainment of academic literacy in English remains a challenge for professionals and academics world-wide, this paper has proposed that the advent
of Open Course Ware and the Public Knowledge movement are major steps forward to promoting universal access to world knowledge and, when combined with models such as the Open Pan-University Public Knowledge model proposed in this paper, offer productive new possibilities for achieving universal academic literacy in English as a common world language for universal collaborative knowledge development.
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It has become unquestionable that English is the ‘lingua franca’ today. Studies show that there are more non-native speakers of English than its native speakers. This fact has implications for the English language teaching practices in the world. One of these is the emergence of EIL as a field of study. The studies in this area delve into issues such as the intelligibility, varieties and users of English. Thus, English language teachers are in a position to reconsider how to reflect the current status of English in their classrooms and which goals to achieve. In this respect, the model of Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) appears to offer suggestions. This paper argues that an inseparable part of teaching English as an International Language should be developing the Intercultural Communicative Competence of learners. Therefore, ICC should be thought of in the context of EIL and practices in the teaching of EIL foster ICC.
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As McKay (2002, p.5) points out, it is not the number of native speakers of English, but the large number of native speakers of other languages who speak it that makes English ‘a language of wider communication’, and therefore an international language. Indeed, studies show that today English is used mostly among its non-native speakers, rather than between its native speakers or between native and non-native speakers.

Kachru (1989) has explained the way English is used in the world with three concentric circles: a) the Inner Circle b) the Outer Circle, and c) the Expanding Circle. In Inner Circle countries English is used as the ‘primary language’, in Outer Circle countries English has the role of a ‘second language’ and in Expanding Circle countries English is taught as a ‘foreign language’. In the Outer Circle countries we see local varieties of English. Considering the fact that English is used not only between people from different countries but also among people in one country, it can be said that English has both a global and a local status. McKay (2002), talking about English in a global and local sense, revises Smith’s (1976), opinions on the relationship between an international language and culture, stating that:

1) As an international language, English is used both in a global sense for international communication between countries and in a local sense as a language of wider communication within multilingual societies.

2) As it is an international language, the use of English is no longer connected to the culture of Inner Circle countries.

3) As an international language in a local sense, English becomes embedded in the culture of the country in which it is used.

4) As English is an international language in a global sense, one of its primary functions is to enable speakers to share with others their ideas and culture (p.12).

Studies in teaching English as an International Language (EIL) have been dealing with defining and developing an appropriate pedagogy which reflects both the global and local status of English. The above assertions of McKay (2002) imply important points to be considered in this respect. One of these points is the fact that native speaker norms of the Inner Circle are no longer adequate to meet the needs of English language learners who will be using English for international communication. Second, the culture of speakers where English is locally spoken can not be neglected. Third, accommodation and establishing mutual intelligibility are important skills in the EIL pedagogy in the process of sharing ideas and cultural exchange with others.
Discussions on an appropriate EIL pedagogy have mainly originated from the issue of the ‘native speaker’. Many scholars have raised doubts about using a native-speaker based model in today’s realities of the owners and users of English. (e.g., Alptekin, 2002). Following these discussions, competence in relation to teaching English as an International Language has been discussed in several studies (e.g., Acar, 2007) in terms of the insufficiency of the existing communicative language teaching practices based on the model of communicative competence. The communicative approach has been widely used in English language teaching. However, considering the fact that English is used mostly among its non-native speakers in the world today, it is questionable that the underlying beliefs of the communicative language teaching based on a native-speaker model are still valid.

Cook (1999) maintains that it may be unrealistic to abandon the native-speaker model in language teaching. This is due to the fact that both teachers and learners have strong opinions about the necessity of such a model. Instead, what he recommends is to “place more emphasis on the student as a potential and actual L2 user and be less concerned with the monolingual native speaker”(p.196). He makes suggestions about how to do this in English language teaching which are: ‘setting goals appropriate to L2 users’, ‘including L2 user situations and roles in materials’, ‘using teaching methods that acknowledge the students’ L1’ and ‘basing teaching on descriptions of L2 users’. These practices, he claims, may help language learners to see themselves not as ‘failed native speakers’, but as ‘successful multicompetent speakers’ (p.204).

Byram (1997, p.11) also criticizes taking the native-speaker as a model in foreign language teaching, as it causes the problem of “creating an impossible target and consequently inevitable failure”. He states that, especially in terms of sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence, there are actually few bilinguals who can reach native-like competence. He goes on with his criticism claiming that, even if it were possible to acquire the competence of a native speaker, it would still imply that a foreign language learner has to abandon one’s own language and culture “in order to blend into another linguistic environment, becoming accepted as a native speaker by other native speakers” (p.11).

Alptekin (2002) criticizes the model of communicative competence on the grounds that it is utopian, unrealistic and constraining because of the native speaker norms it is based on. He
maintains that the conventional framework of communicative language teaching has the underlying assumption of the foreign language learner as someone to be enculturated in the new target language culture that one is exposed to. This view brings with it problems for all foreign language learners. It is even a greater problem for the English language learner, as English is an international language “whose culture becomes the world itself” (Alptekin, 2002, p.62).

In his discussion of International Communicative Competence in relation to EIL, Nunn (2007) states five aspects of International Communicative Competence which are ‘multiglossic’, ‘strategic’, ‘linguistic’, ‘pragmatic/discourse’ and ‘intercultural’. He explains ‘intercultural competence’ as ‘the ability to adjust to unpredictable multicultural situations’ (p.41). He also maintains that the international view of communicative competence is a broader concept than communicative competence, rather than a reduced one.

In the same line of thought, Byram and Fleming (1998, p.11) state that:

A further development making things easier for learners, or at least different, is a change in our perception of what they should be aiming to achieve. Instead of the assumption that learners should model themselves on the ‘native speaker’, it is becoming apparent to teachers and their learners that successful cross-cultural communication depends on the acquisition of abilities to understand different modes of thinking and living, as they are embodied in the language to be learnt, and to reconcile or mediate between different modes present in any specific interaction. This is not the ‘communicative competence’ on which people using the same language in the same, or closely related, cultures rely; it is an ‘intercultural communicative competence’ which has some common ground with communicative competence, but which also has many unique characteristics.

Establishing mutual intelligibility has been raised as an important issue in EIL. In her discussion on intelligibility, McKay (2002, p.52) explains three concepts involved in the umbrella term of intelligibility: 1) intelligibility meaning ‘recognizing an expression’ 2) comprehensibility meaning ‘knowing the meaning of the expression’ and 3) interpretability meaning ‘knowing what the expression signifies in a particular sociocultural context’. She claims that it is interpretability that causes the main problem in EIL used for cross-cultural communication, as it is a matter of being familiar with another culture and context. Brutt-
Griffler (1998, p.389) also states that “the concerns of cross-cultural miscommunication stem more from problems of interpretability than intelligibility”. The issue of interpretability underlines the importance of culture in EIL. Teaching culture in EIL has the aim of helping for successful interaction in cross-cultural encounters. In her discussion of the place of culture in EIL, McKay (2002, p.81) states that “the use of EIL involves crossing borders, both literally and figuratively, as individuals interact in cross-cultural encounter”. This brings with it the necessity of knowledge about different cultural values rather than mere information about facts on different countries.

It can be argued that culture is inherent in EIL not only in terms of the different values and belief systems of different speech communities, but also in types of varieties of English. McKay (2002) lists three main types of variations taking place in Outer Circle countries: lexical, grammatical and phonological variation. Lexical innovations have cultural underlying origins. Grammatical and phonological variations also indicate cultural implications. For example, as McKay (2002) points out, using a specific grammatical feature may show membership to a community. In the same way, different patterns of pronunciation are signals of personal identity that one feels attached to as a member of a community. Therefore, it can be claimed that culture is at play both among members of different circles and members of one circle where there are emerging norms of English.

The word ‘international’ implies ‘intercultural’ communication, as international communication requires moving between cultures. Brutt-Griffler (1998, p.390) states that EIL should not be restricted to an ESP, and quotes from Smith (1987) that “all English speakers need training for effective international communication”. This view emphasizes the use of English for cross-cultural communication as playing a major role in EIL. It also suggests that learning about other cultures is a responsibility of the native speakers of English, as much as it is of the non-native speaker. In this respect, it can be maintained that accommodation is an important skill in EIL pedagogy, both for the native and non-native speakers of English, if effective international communication is one of the major goals.

Apart from accommodation, reflection and mediation skills should be equally important in EIL pedagogy. McKay (2002, p.81), in her discussion on the place of cultural content in EIL, states that it is of primary importance to “understand one’s own culture in relation to that of others” in EIL pedagogy. She argues that, for this reason, a reflective approach to culture
should be encouraged. In this way, learners can be more skillful in coping with cultural difference. Mediation skills, on the other hand, are necessary for negotiating between different modes of thinking and altogether, these skills contribute to effective intercultural communication.

Various disciplines such as communication studies, international relations, psychology, business, and intercultural communication have done research on different aspects effective intercultural communication. In these fields, the term ‘intercultural communication competence’ is used interchangeably with ‘intercultural willingness to communicate’, ‘cross-cultural competence’, ‘intercultural effectiveness’, and ‘intercultural sensitivity’. While there does not seem to be a standard definition of intercultural communication competence, most of the research reflect a view of it as “knowledge, motivation and skills to interact effectively and appropriately with members of different cultures” (Wiseman, 2002, p.208), which mainly refer to cognitive, affective and behavioral adaptability.

Byram (1997) has developed a model of intercultural communicative competence for foreign language teaching. In his argument on communicating across linguistic and cultural boundaries, he refers to Gudykunst’s (1994) model of ‘competent communicator’ which has the components of motivation, knowledge and skills, stating that the model is helpful for reminding foreign language teachers that preparation of the language learner for conflict management is necessary for interaction with other linguistic groups in international communication. Based on such research on inter-group and intercultural communication, the intercultural competence dimension in Byram’s (1997) model of intercultural communicative competence has three components of knowledge, attitudes and skills. For each of these components, he lists objectives that he suggests for foreign language teaching, as the aim of foreign language teaching should be, he claims, helping for becoming an ‘intercultural speaker’. Following the argument that skills of accommodation, reflection and mediation skills are important for the teaching of EIL, some of these objectives which are relevant will be mentioned here, although Byram’s (1997) model does not specifically deal with the teaching of English, but covers foreign language teaching in general.

Some of the objectives of ‘knowledge’ in this model are knowing: a) the types of cause and process of misunderstanding between interlocutors of different cultural origins b) the national memory of one’s own country and how its events are related to and seen from the perspective
of other countries c) social distinctions and their principle markers, in one’s own country and one’s interlocutor’s, and d) the processes of social interaction in one’s interlocutor’s country.

Several objectives of ‘attitudes’ are to develop: a) willingness to seek out or take up opportunities to engage with otherness in a relationship of equality b) interest in discovering other perspectives on interpretation of familiar and unfamiliar phenomena both in one’s own and in other cultures and cultural practices c) willingness to question the values and presuppositions in cultural practices and products in one’s own environment, and d) readiness to engage with the conventions and rites of verbal and non-verbal communication and interaction.

In terms of ‘skills’ on the other hand, some of the objectives are stated as to a) identify ethnocentric perspectives in a document or event and explain their origins b) mediate between conflicting interpretations of phenomena c) identify similar and dissimilar processes of interaction, verbal and non-verbal, and negotiate an appropriate use of them in specific circumstances, and d) use in real-time knowledge, skills and attitudes for mediation between interlocutors of one’s own and a foreign culture (Byram, 1997, p.57).

As it can be seen in these objectives, reflection on one’s own culture is highlighted, as well as accommodation and mediation skills. If this model is thought of in relation to EIL pedagogy, it can be argued that these objectives of the intercultural competence component of the model, aiming for the ‘intercultural speaker’ should also be the objectives of the English language speaker crossing the borders of Inner, Outer and Expanding circles and interacting with people from different cultures. In that case, ‘knowledge’ would also entail ‘familiarity with the varieties of English’. Furthermore, in the context of EIL, ‘intercultural competence’ and its components in this model can be viewed as what the English language speaker should develop ‘an awareness of’ in interaction with members of different cultural backgrounds.

Conclusion:

The status of ‘English as an International Language’ brings with it important implications for the teaching of English. The native speaker norms and teaching practices based on communicative language teaching do not reflect the current status of English and therefore they can not be claimed to be appropriate for preparing the English language learner for the English speaking world. English is mostly used between its non-native speakers today and this highlights the importance of effective intercultural communication. Research on effective
intercultural communication can offer insights for the discussions on what should be included in EIL pedagogy with knowledge, attitude and skills as the main components of intercultural competence. Byram’s (1997) model of Intercultural Communicative Competence for foreign language teaching is a good example which develops ideas from the field of intercultural communication and emphasizes accommodation, reflection and mediation skills. These skills are also of high importance in EIL. Viewed from this perspective, Intercultural Communicative Competence in English language teaching would be seen in the context of EIL as an inseparable part of it.
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Although there are many different forms of English, British and American English are the two varieties that are taught in most ESL/EFL programs. Although it is generally agreed that no one version is “correct”, the question of dialect awareness on the part of the students and the instructors is becoming an important issue in most EFL settings, and is particularly important in a country like Turkey. This study aims to explore students’ and teachers’ level of vocabulary knowledge in the two main dialects of English. Conclusions were drawn after the subsequent steps were followed to collect data:
1. A questionnaire was given to university students about vocabulary differences between British and American English.
2. The same questionnaire was also completed by university language teachers in order to determine their level of knowledge in both dialects.
3. Faculty professors were interviewed to find out any preferred choice of materials being taught.
The main implication of the study is that one of the best ways to give students every opportunity to perform at their highest level is to ensure that all teachers, regardless of nationality, are fully aware of the differences between the two dialects.

1. Introduction

Variations in English, differences between dialects in particular, presents a considerable challenge for both learners and language instructors, regardless of nationality. Today, the term English as an International Language (EIL) is used widely in language teaching contexts (Brutt-Griffler, 2002; Crystal, 2003; Jenkins, 2003; McKay, 2002), and it brings about discussions on the ‘status’ of English(es) to be taught. Despite these extensive discussions, the question of whether the ESL/EFL institutions satisfactorily address the “dialect awareness” issue remains unanswered. Educational programs usually do not thoroughly analyze dialectal differences and make this particular issue a point for consideration in the implementation of the programs. That is, issues about dialect are not widely understood in most ESL/EFL programs, a point also made by Temple Adger (2004). It is more important to ask how much language teachers are aware of dialect differences, a question which might have significant implications for teacher training. Although there are a number of studies on this particular issue (Ann Snow et al, 2006; Jenkins, 2006; Lai, 2008; Matsuda, 2003; Sifakis, 2004.), it can be claimed that more studies on teachers dialect awareness, regardless of their nationalities, could contribute to the quality of English language teachers, and particularly, these studies can contribute to the quality of teacher education in Turkey, an ‘expanding circle country’ (Kachru, 1985).

In Turkey, as in most countries, it is widely believed that standard English can ensure the high quality of clear communication and standard of intelligibility. Thus, British English and American English, both as the standard English, are considered as the right choice for ESL/EFL learners in formal education (Ling, 2008), and, therefore, learners in the expanding circle countries look upon native speaker English as their model (Tübingen, N.V., 2006). Some scholars view this so-called ‘prestige’ varieties phenomenon as “linguistic imperialism” (Modiano, 2001), yet this does not change the fact that these two varieties are still the most widespread dialects taught in the field of ELT. This being the case, the question of how much language teachers are aware of dialectal differences presents itself as an interesting area for exploration. Heyl and McCarthy (2003 in Quezada&Cordeiro, 2007) state, “a key role for higher education institutions must be to graduate future teachers who think globally, have
international experience, demonstrate foreign language competence, and are able to incorporate a global dimension into their teaching” (p.3).

2. Study
2.1. Aim
EIL theoretically promotes the idea that there are many different varieties of English (Lai, 2008), yet the perceptions of language teachers on the issue and what actually goes on in language classrooms are not entirely clear, thus, this study aims to shed light upon the ‘teacher awareness’ issue. Since the teachers are the most important influence in the classroom, they can be said to have a profound effect on students’ own dialect awareness. To gain an understanding about teachers’ as well as students’ knowledge and perceptions on dialectal differences in English, this study attempts to explore the advantages and/or disadvantages of teaching students vocabulary in the two main dialects of English, namely, American and British at an English medium university in Turkey. The ultimate aim of the study, besides making implications for the general English language teaching programs, is to consider implications for teacher education programs, and how teachers’ dialect awareness can be addressed within teacher education curricula.

2.2. Institutional Context
The School of Foreign Languages, in which the study was conducted, consists of approximately 1600 students and 140 teachers in the English Language Teaching Programs, namely, English Preparatory Program and Freshman English (Undergraduate) Program. Teacher profile in the school is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>NNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3. Participants
The participants in the study were:

1- Students: 62 students from the Freshman English Program took the vocabulary quiz (see 2.4.) given to collect data. The group mainly consisted of the students who had completed the English Preparatory Program the year before. Since the students’
previous exposure to different dialects before university was a variable in the study, they were specifically asked to note whether they were aware of dialect difference, and if so, whether they had been more exposed to one or the other, or had an equal exposure.

2- English Teachers: 75 teachers from Preparatory as well as the Freshman Programs participated in the study. They were given the same vocabulary quiz as the students to test their knowledge of two main dialects of English. In regards to their nationalities, the profile of the participant teachers was as follows:

British: 14
American: 6
Turkish: 55

Since no particular dialect to be taught is dictated by the school administration, the native speaker teachers tend to teach the students mainly their own dialect, and non native teachers tend to teach the variety they consider as standard or were exposed to when learning the language, as was also pointed out in Sari and Yusuf’s study (2009).

3- Faculty Professors: Approximately 30 professors from 7 different departments in different faculties were interviewed to identify which of the two dialects is commonly used throughout the university with regards to both professors’ dialect choice and the dialect variety used in the department course books. The profile of the participant professors was as follows:

Nationalities: Turkish, British, American, South African, Tunisian
Departments: Translation & Interpretation, Psychology, Computer Engineering, Fashion Design, Mathematics, Software Engineering, Industrial System Engineering

2.4. Vocabulary Quiz
Since the study aimed at looking into both students’ and teachers’ level of knowledge in the two main dialects taught, a vocabulary quiz was prepared. Despite the fact that differences in dialect are certainly not limited to vocabulary, this was the only focus of this study for practical reasons. Other areas of dialect differences such as grammar and pronunciation, therefore, were excluded.

A total of 30 words were tested; 15 British English and 15 American English. The test takers were simply asked to replace the given British/American words with the corresponding
word from the other dialect. To ensure the clarity of meanings of words, each was given in a contextualizing sentence. For the instructions in the quiz and sample items see below:

**Student quiz**

In the high school that you attended did you learn:

a. British English?
b. American English?
c. Both?
d. I don’t know which English I was taught

Instruction: Write the common American word that has the same meaning as the underlined British word.

Sample Item: Some of the many items in a woman’s **handbag** are a wallet, brush, keys, and cosmetics.

If you don’t know the underlined word put a check mark here ____

Instruction: Write the common British word that has the same meaning as the underlined American word.

Sample Item: The car stopped at the side of the road so that the passenger could ask the two people walking on the **sidewalk** for directions.

If you don’t know the underlined word put a check mark here ____

**Teacher quiz**

Nationality:

Instruction: Write the common American word that has the same meaning as the underlined British word.

Sample Item: I want to mail a letter to my friend but I don’t know her **postal code**.

If you are unsure of the underlined word put a check mark here ____

Instruction: Write the common British word that has the same meaning as the underlined American word.
Sample Item: Most mothers who take their baby shopping with them use a baby carriage to push the baby around.

If you are unsure of the underlined word put a check mark here ____

To control the order effect, two versions of the test was prepared, so, half of the group was given the version of the quiz that had the dialect words reversed.

2.5. Interview

30 professors from a variety of faculties and departments were interviewed to discover any dialect preference for materials being taught throughout the university. Answers to the following questions were recorded in note form:

1) Do you take into consideration the variety of English used in the materials?
2) Do you simply select the material based on the author and/or content?
3) Do you think it is important for our students to learn one variety, not the other?

3. Results

3.1. Vocabulary Quiz Results

3.1.1. Students

The quiz results were obtained by giving “1 point” for each correct answer and “0 point” for the wrong and/or no answers. Because the students’ previous exposure was the main variable in the study (see 2.3.), the data was analyzed using the One-Way ANOVA to compare the students’ level of dialect knowledge.

The analysis of variance revealed a significant difference between the groups, F(3,58) = 3.91, p < .05 (Table 1). The means and standard deviations for students’ knowledge of British words are presented in Table 2. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey test revealed that students who were exposed to both British and American English in the past scored higher in the British words part of the test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Summary of ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As for students’ knowledge of American words, the analysis of variance yielded a significant difference between the groups, $F(3,58) = 3.50$, $p < .05$ (Table 3). The means and standard deviations for students’ knowledge of American words are presented in Table 4. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey test revealed that students exposed to both British and American English in the past scored higher in the American words part of the test.

**Table 3. Summary of ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>53,131</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17,710</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>293,143</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5,054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>346,274</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4. Students’ Knowledge of American Words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Past Exposure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British English</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American English</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.1.2. Teachers**

The results regarding teachers were also obtained by giving “1 point” for each correct answer and “0 point” for the wrong and/or no answers. In order to compare the teachers’ level of dialect knowledge, One-Way ANOVA was used to analyze the data, and the main variable for teachers was their nationality (see 2.3.).

In regard to teachers’ knowledge of British words, the analysis of variance revealed a significant difference between the groups, $F(2,72) = 5.86$, $p < .01$ (Table 5). The means and
standard deviations for teachers’ knowledge of British words are presented in Table 6. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey test revealed that British teachers scored significantly higher in the British words part of the test. Other comparisons were not significant.

**Table 5. Summary of ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>163,869</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81,934</td>
<td>5,860</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1006,718</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13,982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1170,587</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.01**

**Table 6. Teachers’ Knowledge of British Words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s Nationality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>4.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>3.977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for teachers’ knowledge of American words, the analysis of variance revealed no significant differences between the groups, F(2,72) = 2.61 (Table 7). The means and standard deviations for teachers’ knowledge of American words are presented in Table 8. These results suggest the teachers’ lack of knowledge about the vocabulary in that particular dialect.

**Table 7. Summary of ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>65,951</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32,975</td>
<td>2.612</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>909,036</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12,625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>974,987</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8. Teachers’ Knowledge of American Words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s Nationality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>3.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>2.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>3.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>3.630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. Interview results
The results of the interviews conducted with the faculty professors suggest that language variety is an important, if not the most important, factor to be taken into consideration while selecting course materials. The vast majority of the professors indicated that dialect was the most important consideration for both themselves, and for their students, and they primarily chose course material from the dialect of their personal preference.

The results also show a tendency to use American English materials throughout almost all the university departments. It can be seen that almost 85% of the professors said they used American English course materials and lectured in that particular dialect. The remaining 15% said both British and American English were used in their departments. The reasons for this were given as follows:

1) *The field itself*- Professors stated that the field itself dictated the variety chosen. Computer Sciences Faculty Professors, for instance, said almost the entire literature as well the printed course books in their field is in American English. Fashion Department professors said both varieties were used in their department because some course materials were in both American and British English; and, interestingly, even when the material is in British English, some professors speak American English, or vice versa.

2) *Professors’ Background*- They also pointed out that their preferred variety was related to their own academic background, namely, depending on the country in which they obtained their academic degree, the UK or the US, they were exposed to different varieties of English.

4. Conclusion and Implications
The overall results of the present study suggest the following:

1. Students exposed to both varieties were more successful in the vocabulary test.
2. Teachers from all three different nationalities (British, American and Turkish) seem insufficiently equipped in terms of knowledge of the two main dialects the study focused on.
3. In the university where the study was conducted, it was discovered that ‘American English’ is the most preferred variety for faculty courses, and the students are mostly likely to be exposed to; however, the preparatory and freshman English teachers in the study seem not to be preparing the students for the use of that particular variety due to a lack of knowledge of ‘American English’ (see 3.1.2.).
Based on these main findings in the study conducted in an English medium university in Turkey, twofold implications are discussed: 1. implications for curriculum, 2. implications for teacher education programs.

4.1. Implications for Curriculum

The results obtained in the study raise the question: ‘Are we adequately preparing our learners for the language to which they will be exposed to during and after their studies at the university?’ It appears to be difficult to answer that question in the affirmative. Considering the ultimate aim of an English-medium university in a lingua franca setting enabling the students to perform to the best of their abilities in a foreign language, dialect awareness programs should be part of any ESL/EFL curricula. In this context are great theoretical and practical benefits from incorporating English dialect programs into the language curricula. This point was also highlighted by Matsuda (2003) who claims “the international scope of learners’ English learning agenda should logically be matched by pedagogical approaches that teach English as an International language (EIL), in part though inclusion of varieties of World Englishes” (p. 719), and Talebinezhad and Aliakbari (2001) who point out that

Students are suggested that they should get familiar with different varieties, native and non-native. Our curriculum for teaching English should, thus, be improved with the inclusion of varieties of English spoken by different native or non-native speakers. This measure will help students broaden their appreciation and knowledge of the language they use and get prepared for any variety not yet known to them (p.4).

4.2. Implications for Teacher Education Programs

The most significant implication of the present study is, probably, for ESL/EFL teacher education programs, and teacher educators. The premise that should be taken into consideration is that teacher education programs should prepare more ‘cosmopolitan’ teachers. This simply requires all teachers to have dialect knowledge in order to support their students’ language development in lingua franca settings. What is suggested here is that ‘training the teachers with respect to dialect awareness’ appears to be an important issue not only for in-service but also for pre-service levels (Snow, et al, 2006; Wolfram, 2008).

Another issue for teacher educators to consider is that both native and non-native teachers need training in EIL (Talebinezhad & Aliakbari, 2001). Considering the fact that even within the inner circle countries, there are differences in the way people speak depending
on their gender, socio-economic stratum, and an inclination towards having negative attitudes for different dialects (Hazen, 2001); it is imperative that native speaker teachers also undergo a dialect awareness training program.

The following suggestions for developing a training program on ‘dialect awareness’ may be offered to both pre-service and in-service teachers:

1. A needs analysis could be conducted to identify which varieties of English should be incorporated into the training program depending on the profile – nationality, background, attitudes, etc- of the target teachers.
2. A corpus in the form of ‘the Bank of English’ could, then, be formed (Nunn, 2005) from which teachers, and ultimately, learners can be exposed to different varieties of English (Nunn, 2005).
3. A structured set of ‘awareness-raising’ activities and tasks could help to develop more ‘cosmopolitan’ teachers.
4. Since language and culture are inseparable, teachers’ cultural knowledge could also be addressed; and ways to increase their cultural awareness could be sought.
5. Teachers could be introduced methodological implementations regarding dialect awareness for learners, e.g. how to create and set up classroom tasks and activities and how to provide feedback.

When all teachers have a better understanding of differences between varieties of English, the quality of learners’ second/foreign language development will be ensured, which is, and should be, the ultimate aim of any language program.

References


Title
Globalization and English language policy at primary education in Turkey

Author
Yasemin Kırkgöz
Çukurova University, Turkey

Abstract
This paper gives an overview of the developments of Turkey’s foreign language policy in response to the global influence of English in Turkish primary education. After introducing the planning underlying the introduction of the early English language teaching in primary education, problems faced by the teachers in implementing the 1997 curriculum initiative are presented based on the findings of available studies. The findings suggest that although the English language, as the lingua franca, occupies an important role in Turkish education, the teachers encounter challenges in practice. The paper concludes with a discussion of the recent changes introduced into the ELT curriculum at the primary level education in Turkey.

Keywords: Globalization, language policy, primary education

Introduction
There is hardly any disagreement about the fact that the world we are living in is changing at an accelerated rate. Globalization and its impact on socioeconomic, political, cultural and language dimensions of societies, has for a long time, been a topic of considerable discussion (see Bottery, 2000; Harley, 1990). The development of globalization has been closely associated with the power and the dominance of English language (Bottery, 2000). Tsui & Tollefson (2007) maintain that globalization is effected by two mediation tools, technology and English; and that all countries have been trying to ensure that they are adequately equipped with these two skills to respond to changes brought about by globalization. Chang (2006), similarly, points out that ‘globalization has been functioning as a driving force to strengthen the position of English as a global language’. (p. 515)
As the English language, the lingua franca of international communication (Crystal, 2003; Kachru, 1986) has spread along with globalization, the question of how to respond to the challenges posed by globalization on language policy has been on the agenda of many countries, including Turkey. This paper provides an overview of the ways in which Turkey has responded to the global influence of English in its foreign language policy at the primary level education. The paper first analyses the planning underlying the introduction of the early English language teaching in state primary education. Then, problems and challenges faced by teachers in the implementation stage of the policy are presented based on the findings of several studies. Finally, recent changes introduced into the ELT curriculum in primary education in Turkey are presented.

Turkey’s English language policy at primary education

Although the English language has retained an important role as the most influential foreign language particularly in secondary and higher education, it was in 1997 that the English language, as a compulsory subject, was introduced in the curriculum of Turkish primary education, following a major Educational Reform. In 1997, The Turkish Ministry of National Education (MNE), in cooperation with the Turkish Higher Education Council, made major changes in English language policy in its effort to reform Turkey’s ELT practice by initiating a curriculum innovation project in ELT, known as ‘The Ministry of Education Development Project’ (Kırkgöz, 2005; 2006).

At the level of primary education, the 1997 education reform had several impacts. The first impact was to extend the duration of primary education from the previous five to eight years by integrating the primary and secondary education. Another impact of the reform was the introduction of English for grades four and grade five students, thus shifting the introduction of English from secondary to primary schools in order to provide a longer exposure to the foreign language (see MEB, 2001). As a result of this, English started to be taught to young learners (TEYLs) in grades four and five.

In addition, the 1997 curriculum innovation introduced the concept of communicative approach (CLT) into the Turkish education system. The objectives for learning English in the primary education are stated by the MNE as the development of learners’ communicative capacity to prepare them to use the target language for communication through various classroom activities. The teacher-centered model of the earlier practices was gradually replaced by a much more student-centered approach to pedagogy. Teacher’s role was seen as that of a guider and a facilitator of the learning process, addressing students’ different learning
styles. Students were expected to take an active part in the learning process through various activities orchestrated by the teacher. At the level of Higher Education, teacher education departments were redesigned to increase the number of methodology courses, and a new course, The Teaching English to Young Learners, was introduced into the curriculum of the undergraduate level in the ELT Departments of Faculties of Education to familiarize prospective teachers with ways of TEYLs (Kirkgöz, 2005).

Challenges in practice

The nationwide implementation of TEYLs posed serious challenges for the country. Initially, there existed a shortage of teachers particularly for grades 4 and 5. To compensate for the existing teacher shortage, the MNE recruited all available people with some proficiency in English, i.e., classroom teachers, former adults-only EFL teachers, graduates of Western Departments, e.g., French and German with a certain level of English as well as non-ELT teachers with some proficiency in English. In order to help teachers keep up with new developments in ELT methodology, the MNE, organized regular local seminars for state primary school teachers (Kirkgöz, 2005; 2006; 2007a).

Despite the intention to develop students practical communicative abilities, communicative approach to teaching English was not prevalent in Turkish state primary schools as identified through a series of studies conducted by Kirkgöz (2007b; 2008a; 2008b). In a survey conducted with 50 teachers of English involved in TEYLs in Adana, one of the regional cities in Turkey, it was found that classroom practices and use of methodology in facilitating young learners’ acquisition of English were largely based on traditional methods of teaching.

In a later study involving 32 teachers (Kirkgöz, 2008b), considerable variation was observed among teachers in implementing communicative activities. It was found those teachers’ perceptions towards what constitutes an effective way of TEYLs, and teachers’ prior training experiences differed considerably. The findings demonstrated that teachers’ instructional practices ranged along the Transmission and Interpretation teaching continuum with most teachers being in the Transmission oriented paradigm (n=16). Observation of the Transmission-oriented teachers revealed that teachers’ classroom practices deviated considerably from the principles of CLT. The major characterizing feature of these teachers was their tendency to put greater emphasis on the delivery of knowledge about the language, less emphasis on encouraging pupils’ active participation in the lesson, and the development of their communicative abilities, as identified in the previous study.
Several factors impeding the use of communicative approach in the classroom were identified (Kirkgöz, 2008a). One of the major factors was teachers’ understanding of TEYLs and their background training. Classroom observation and interview findings indicated that teachers, whose views were consistent with the current views of CLT and TEYLs, had a greater chance of implementing the new communicative oriented curriculum (COC) in their classroom. The teachers’ lack of experience in using practical communicative tasks, their emphasis on grammar, their background experience to teach ‘adults-only’ seemed to reduce the extent of implementation of communicative teaching in their classrooms. Lack of guidance was another factor that impacted the teachers’ classroom implementation of COC.

Another factor that had an impact on the teachers was insufficient time allocation to TEYLs. Several teachers interviewed expressed their concern that doing some communicative activities may lead to a reduction of time spent on written or grammar focused activities. Besides the lack of time, the class size was found to create difficulties in implementing the syllabus effectively. In state primary schools, an average of 40-50 students per class made it increasingly difficult for some teachers to use communicative activities, and apply pair and group works in their lessons. Lack of adequate resources; tape recorder, video, CDs various other supplementary aids also tended to operate against successful implementation of the curriculum innovation.

**Recent developments**

Since the education reform in 1997, Turkey’s language policy has gone through further changes along with the nation’s attempts to enter the European Union. Thus, in 2005, the English curriculum was revised to bridge the gaps resulting from the previous policy implementation (MEB, 2006). The revised primary ELT curriculum (C2005) has been conceptualized to incorporate recent methodological trends in ELT not only in the formulation of objectives and the content of the curriculum but also in the teaching materials and the assessment system. The communicative dimension of the curriculum aims at promoting learners’ communicative proficiency in English, by fostering integrated development of four language skills with a particular emphasis on speaking and listening, focusing on learner-centered instruction. C2005 encourages teachers to present lessons in a variety of ways so that individualized learning styles and interests of pupils may be addressed. C2005 adopts content and language integrated learning (CLIL) through a selection of topics from non-language cross-curricular subjects, e.g., geography, mathematics, music and sports which are taught in Turkish and are scheduled in the students’ program to make the foreign
language learning experience more effective for learners, and for certain cross-curricular topics to be learned in L2. In addition, C2005 is also influenced by the philosophy of constructivism. Based on this notion, in the curriculum framework, tasks are assigned to the students as the basis for collaborative and cooperative learning. Arts and craft activities, and drama are suggested as they promote creativity in young learners at the same time develop their social, cognitive, artistic and linguistic skills. Finally, C2005 introduces performance-based assessment as being the most appropriate model to evaluate the learning outcomes of young learners, and to support the curriculum that aims to develop pupils’ communicative proficiency to update the assessment system that of the European Union (EU).

Unlike the previous curriculum, which was implemented nationwide, the revised curriculum is planned to be implemented gradually; starting from grade 4 and gradually proceeding to upper grades. In the 2005-2006 school-year all state primary schools implemented C2005 only in grade 4 classes, to be followed with the revised curricula for the upper grades in the pursuing years. Following the introduction of C2005, MNE introduced further changes into the curriculum of the primary education. Textbooks were updated in line with the specified curriculum objectives, and the Ministry started to finance the textbooks to all recipients of primary education. There has also been an increase in the number of teaching hours; each primary grade is now allocated an additional one hour.

The revised curriculum document was disseminated to primary school directors, and it was also made available through the MNE website. To ensure that teachers can appropriately implement the curriculum objectives, MNE organized seminars and conducted in-service training workshops in different cities (MEB, 2008).

Conclusion
This paper has outlined changes in ELT in the Turkish primary education system dating back from the introduction of English in Turkish primary education in 1997 until the most recent policy reforms. As seen throughout the paper, the effects of globalization and Turkey’s desire to become more open to the external world, has brought about several changes in the foreign language policy at the primary level education. Given the fact that English has now become a significant part of the foreign language teaching, the Turkish government has taken a number of initiatives, and is continuing to do so to catch up with the globalized world and to sustain continuity in curriculum innovation in primary ELT.
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Abstract
The study investigated English and Science teachers’ representations of different facets of comprehension that are enhanced by code-switching and their concern for the external ramifications of the code-switching. Interview data were collected from 18 teachers (9 English, 9 science) in three secondary schools in an urban part of Kuching City, Malaysia. The results indicated that the teachers categorised their students’ comprehension problems into inability to understand terms, instructions and concepts, with concepts being the least represented. All the teachers reported use of code-switching to ensure student comprehension despite their concern about deviating from the designated language of instruction and the negative effects on their students’ construction of the knowledge in English and the kind of English language model they were giving their students. The study indicated that code-switching is used for solving comprehension problems rather than averting them, indicative of the teachers’ resolve to use the designated language of instruction, with student comprehension being the yardstick for deciding when code-switching is needed. The findings suggest that in multilingual settings where the status of English as an international language is valued, code-switching in formal instruction is the norm rather than a marked choice.
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Introduction
In speech communities with members from different ethnic and language backgrounds, interethnic communication usually takes place in a language of wider communication. The shared language may be English in countries with a British colonial history if it is retained as an official language (e.g. Singapore) or it may be relegated to a position of secondary importance after the national language (e.g. Malaysia, Philippines, Brunei). However, with the current status of English as an international language (McKay, 2003), countries such as Malaysia cannot help but institute language policies to ensure acceptable levels of English proficiency among the people. In such multilingual settings, English may be both taught as a subject and used as a language of instruction. Nevertheless, considering the different language backgrounds of the students, code-switching is an inherent part of their learning process (see Foley, 1998; Soo, 1987). Code switching is “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems” (Gumperz, 1982, p. 59). In the classroom context, code-switching usually takes the form of the teacher or students using languages other than the designated language of instruction.

From the review of studies on code-switching in the classroom context, it is evident that teachers have used code-switching for various reasons, inclusive of humour and praise (Seidlitz, 2003), grabbing students’ attention and maintaining the planned structure of lessons (Greggio & Gil, 2007). Selective attention on the use of code-switching to ensure student comprehension revealed that this is an aspect covered in several studies, and we sought to uncover the aspects of comprehension highlighted in the reports. For example, Ruan (2003) found that the teacher of a Chinese class in an American university switched from Chinese to English to re-explain new or complex concepts to the Chinese-English bilingual students. The concepts took the form of grammar rules in language classes. In a study on the teaching of French as a second language, the teachers were found to code-switch to the students’ first language when they expected their students not to understand words about to be uttered in French (Flyman-Mattsson & Burenhult, 1999). Flyman-Mattsson and Burenhult also reported that sometimes repetition was used to get the message across but there was “no obvious
reasons for switching code” (p. 11). In Brazil, the teachers of English also translated vocabulary items to Portuguese when comprehension problems occurred (Greggio & Gil, 2007). Besides language classes, code-switching was also useful in content-based classes for explaining concepts and procedures. In a study involving bilingual Hispanic students in hands-on and inquiry-based chemistry lessons in Maryland, Choi and Kuipers (2003) found the students co-constructing their understanding of the curriculum through Spanish. The Malaysian science teacher in Then and Ting’s (2009) case study switched from the language of instruction (English) to Bahasa Melayu to elaborate the concept of the pulley, using a juxtaposition of reiteration and message qualification. In so doing, the teacher achieved a balance between using the designated language of instruction and the students’ comprehension of the subject matter.

The studies reviewed mentioned the use of code-switching by teachers to aid their students’ comprehension of the subject matter in language or science classes. However, student comprehension was only one of the aspects touched on in the studies, and the notion of code-switching aiding student comprehension was assumed to be a general notion. In our literature review, we sought to tease apart the aspects of comprehension described and succeeded in showing that the teachers used code-switching to address their students’ inability to understand concepts (Ruan, 2003; Then & Ting, 2009), grammar rules (Flyman-Mattsson & Burenhult, 1999), vocabulary items (Greggio & Gil, 2007) and procedures (Choi & Kuipers, 2003). This indicates that there are different facets to the notion of how teacher code-switching can assist student comprehension of what is taught in class but such complexities have not been systematically investigated in studies on code-switching in the classroom context. To use an analogy, this notion of teacher code-switching aiding student comprehension is likely to be multi-toned rather than single-toned. Knowing how teachers represent students’ comprehension problems would shed light on how they adjust their code-switching to address different facets of the comprehension problems for better learning outcomes.

**Purpose of Study**

The study investigated English and Science teachers’ use of code-switching to aid comprehension of secondary school students. In this paper, we report the teachers’ representations of different facets of comprehension that are enhanced by code-switching and their concern for the external ramifications of the code-switching.
Method

The study involved interviews with 18 English and Science teachers in three secondary schools in Kuching, the capital city of Sarawak, Malaysia. This study is part of a larger research on the functions and nature of teacher code-switching in the classroom context.

Interviews were conducted with nine English teachers who taught English as a second language, in accordance with the Malaysian language policy. The policy places English as second in importance after Bahasa Melayu, the national language of Malaysia (Ministry of Education Malaysia, 1990). While English may be the second language to some, it is an additional language or foreign language to others as languages other than English often suffice in daily communication (Ting, Mahadhir & Chang, 2009).

The other nine Science teachers used English as the medium of instruction for science and mathematics, following the language policy of the Malaysian government. In line with Bahasa Melayu as the medium of education for public schools, science and mathematics were taught in Bahasa Melayu prior to 2003. In that year, the then Prime Minister of Malaysia implemented the policy of using English for teaching these subjects to address the declining standard of English in Malaysia and to keep up with advancements in science and technology in the global arena. The policy was implemented simultaneously with a switch to English at Primary One, Form Four, and Lower Six levels (Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2002). However, in October 2009, a new language policy was announced to revert to Bahasa Melayu as the language for teaching science and mathematics in 2011 beginning with Primary One (Juahir, 2009; Sani, 2009). At the time the data for this study were collected in mid-2009, the Form One and Form Two students had learnt science in English for seven to eight years from the beginning of their primary education.

The three research sites had a mixed ethnic composition in the student population. Schools A and B had more Chinese students than Malay and Indigenous students (e.g. Iban, Dayak) but School C was predominantly Malay. The students could speak Bahasa Melayu or Mandarin Chinese better than English, evident from their preferred language used in conversations among themselves before and after the lessons. All the teachers involved in the study were proficient in English and Bahasa Melayu but only the Chinese teachers could
speak Mandarin Chinese. See Table 1 for other demographic characteristics of the teachers (E1 to E9 refers to the nine English teachers and S1 to S9 refers to the nine Science teachers).

Table 1:
Demographic characteristics of English and Science teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Years of teaching</th>
<th>Ethnic background</th>
<th>Subject trained to teach</th>
<th>Subject taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moral education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English for Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English for Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moral education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>Science and Mathematics</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Permission was sought from the Ministry of Education Malaysia, the State Education Department, the school principals, and the target teachers before the study was conducted. Then appointments were made with individual teachers for the interview at their convenience. Some appointments were rescheduled due to unanticipated events such as meetings announced at short notice, sudden fire drills, impromptu school duties and sudden sick leave. The interviews were conducted in the most conducive environment available in the school premise, usually in a quiet part of the staffroom, the office of head of department or the science laboratory (see Appendix A for interview guide). The teachers’ consent was sought for the audio-taping of the interviews. As video-taping was not carried out, observation notes were taken of obvious facial expressions and body language that might indicate emphasis in the message. The interviews were transcribed and the transcripts were read several times to obtain a holistic understanding of the teachers’ perspectives on code-switching in the English and Science lessons before emerging themes related to student comprehension were analysed. The excerpts from the interview transcripts used to illustrate results are not edited for grammaticality to retain authenticity of the data.

**Result and Discussion**

1. Facets of student incomprehension addressed by code-switching
Table 2:

English and Science teachers’ code-switching to address different facets of student comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code-switching Problem</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To solve comprehension problems</td>
<td>Students’ general incomprehension</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ incomprehension of terms</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>E4, E6, E7, E8, E9, S2, S5, S6, S8, S9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ incomprehension of instructions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>E2, E5, E6, E8, S5, S7, S8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ incomprehension of concepts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S2, S7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To prevent comprehension problems</td>
<td>Students’ incomprehension of terms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E2, E4, E7, S4, S8,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ incomprehension of instructions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S2, S6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this section, we present results that shed light on the facets for the notion of how code-switching aids comprehension. The phenomenon of teachers resorting to code-switching when students could not understand their explanation was reported by all the 18 teachers in the study (Table 2). However, further analysis of the interview data revealed that the teachers did not merely view students’ comprehension problems as a general notion, but they represented the different facets of the students’ comprehension problems as being linked to words, concepts and instructions.

Of the different facets of the students’ problems with comprehension, the most common was the students’ understanding of terms. Table 2 shows that the English and Science teachers were equally likely to code-switch to address their students’ incomprehension of terms. More teachers reported code-switching to solve their students’ comprehension problems after the communication breakdown had occurred (10 teachers) than before (5 teachers). At times the code-switching was prompted by students’ request to explain science terms they did not understand in Bahasa Melayu:
After the lesson, I discuss it in English. Then they ask me to explain again in BM [Bahasa Melayu] then I will do it. Sometimes but sometimes the some terms, hah, some difficult terms I will explain in BM [Bahasa Melayu] also. (S8)

However, for classes with less proficient students, S8 used Bahasa Melayu to explain scientific terms such as “cell” before her students asked for it -- in anticipation that the students would not be able to comprehend her explanation in English. Given the students’ low proficiency in English, code-switching was a good coping strategy. As pointed out by Halliday (2004), scientific jargon is often pinpointed as the main cause of science subjects appearing unfriendly:

When their [science] teacher tries to diagnose the problems the students are having, it is usually not long before the discussion begins to focus on language. Scientific texts are found to be difficult to read; and this is said to be because they are written in “scientific language”, a “jargon” which has the effect of making the learner feel excluded and alienated from the subject-matter. (Halliday, 2004, p. 159).

In the context of English language learning, it was the unfamiliar vocabulary items that posed comprehension problems to the students but teachers such as E4 sometimes wrote sentences with unfamiliar words to help their students figure out the meaning in context instead of providing a translation in Bahasa Melayu. Nation (1990) acknowledges that while translation may be used to save time “if the concepts in English and the learners’ mother tongue are the same” and prevent learners from making their own uncontrolled and often incorrect translations, extensive use will reduce the learners’ experience of English in the class (p. 62). First language vocabulary translation is a strategy adopted by teachers of English language in Brazil when their students encountered unfamiliar words and enquired about the meaning in Portuguese (Greggio & Gil, 2007).

Besides code-switching to explain terminology, nine out of 18 teachers in this study also reported using languages other than English to give instructions: seven to solve comprehension problems, and two to ensure that students would not misunderstand the instructions. These two teachers were, not coincidentally, Science teachers as it is important for their students to carry out the correct laboratory procedures during the science practical
sessions. S2, for instance, pointed out the necessity to use code-switching for reinforcement of the message:

(2) For reinforce[ment]. So that they really understand what is being said in English. For example when you want to do experiment, this is not, ah, doing the elaborate lesson, the experiment, you want to reinforce the step of the experiment, then you can also speak in Bahasa [Melayu].

In comparison, the teachers’ instructions in English lessons were for students to carry out class activities, which ranged from group work to underlining certain words in a comprehension text (Excerpt 3):

(3) … after I have given the instruction there [is] still no action, there is still no action, you know, they, if I said underline, you know, like that day you observed already, some of them underline but some of them [are] still sitting there. They don’t know what to do. So in that situation I will code-switch. … I will say bariskan [underline], tahu [understand]? Underline. (E5)

E5 explained that her use of Bahasa Melayu moved the students into action as the instructions were comprehensible to them. However, we contend that the students might have understood the instruction to underline something in the text, and the code-switching merely served to emphasise the teacher’s message. Montague (1998) warned that teachers may be tempted to code-switch for important information in class such as announcements and directions, thus discouraging and invalidating students’ language learning (cited in Montague & Meza-Zaragosa, 1999). In the context of the functions of language, giving instructions is categorised as using language “primarily for action” rather than for information or entertainment (see Halliday, 1985, p. 40). When the teachers give instructions in English, the students’ ability to correctly carry out the instructions provides indication that students have the receptive comprehension skills for the communicative use of the language.

The final facet of student comprehension that emerged from the analysis of the interview data is code-switching for explanation of concepts. Only two science teachers reported using code-switching for this purpose. S2 explained he would first explain in English
and if students still did not understand the concept, he would explain the concept in other languages:

(4) Code-switching with the … if the concept they don’t understand the concept, then there is a way to explain in other language. Other language. And that you need to explain. Because of the concept. If not the the student must know the concept that you are teaching.

Examples of science concepts include the notion of density and the physiological mechanism by which the body releases excess proteins from the system. Taking the example of the notion of density, referring to it as “compactness” in everyday language would provide a general sense of the meaning before moving on to explanations of the computation of mass per unit volume (e.g. kg/m³). Part of the difficulties arises from the use of symbols to represent concepts (Ali & Ismail, 2006). Ali and Ismail reported that Form Four Malaysian students who learn science not in their first language were able to cope reasonably well with the scientific terminology but encountered some difficulties with the use of everyday, familiar language in a highly specific, often-changed and unfamiliar way in a scientific context (see also Tao, 1994). In the present study, the comprehension difficulties were minimised by switching to Bahasa Melayu to explain difficult-to-understand concepts. Then and Ting (2009) explained that the code-switching took the form of an initial explanation in English, followed by a subsequent explanation in Bahasa Malaysia and an elaboration in a mixture of English and Bahasa Malaysia. Code-switching for explanation of concepts is prevalent in previous studies (e.g. Ruan, 2003; Then & Ting, 2009) if grammar rules are considered language concepts (Flyman-Mattsson & Burenhult, 1999; Greggio & Gil, 2007).

Our analysis has revealed that the notion of code-switching aiding student comprehension is far from being a simple notion as the teachers distinguished between terms, instructions and concepts when they described their use of code-switching in English or science classes. From the interviews, it is clear that the teachers were alert to their students’ comprehension problems, signaled by both verbal (e.g. requests for clarification, silence) and non-verbal cues (e.g. confused look). Overall, the results show more teachers reported using code-switching upon encountering comprehension problems (18) rather than using it in anticipation of comprehension breakdown should they continue teaching in English (7). In the context of a discussion on the use of the designated official language of instruction for
teaching English and science, the results indicate that the teachers’ modus operandi was to use the specified language until student learning is compromised. Skiba (1997) claimed code-switching is a linguistic advantage rather than language interference because switching provides continuity in speech that is in danger of communication breakdown.

2. Ramifications of code-switching to aid student comprehension

Albeit conscious of the role of code-switching in aiding student comprehension, 10 out of 18 teachers interviewed voiced their reservations about code-switching in class. Their reservations were derived from both external pressure and individual concern with their students’ learning. Six of the teachers stated that the education policy insisted on the use of only the official language of instruction and was intolerant towards the use of code-switching (S2, S5, S6, E4, E5, and E6). E5 admitted that she would limit her code-switching if she was observed by a ministry official. Other than the external pressure, the results also indicated the teachers’ concern with how code-switching might cause over-dependence on languages other than English and provide inappropriate language models, thereby compromising the students’ academic achievement.

Although the teachers reported using code-switching to ensure that their students understood the lesson content, they were concerned how the over-dependency on teacher code-switching might compromise their ability to learn the subject matter in English. Four teachers stated students would not make an effort to learn if too much code-switching is used (S5, S9, E4 and E7). S9 indicated that students would wait for them to translate the message from English to Bahasa Melayu instead of trying to understand it in English:

(5) Because I thought that if they are going to sit for their PMR [Lower Secondary School] exam in English, the Science paper is in English, I cannot pamper them by going bilingual all the while. Because if I go bilingual all the while all the students will always listen to the BM [Bahasa Melayu] version. And ah they never really pay attention and never be serious about them teaching in English medium. So they always prefer ah never mind teacher will always translate to us will always go bilingual she will always say it in BM [Bahasa Melayu] for us. Ah so they will never make an effort to learn in English.
As a result of the students’ over-reliance on their teachers’ code-switching to understand the lesson, they were not able to properly construct their understanding of the subject matter in English in the written examination. Frequent code-switching is predictable causing students to pay attention only to the translated version of the message (Sert, 2005). It seemed that while code-switching is a useful short-term strategy to solve students’ comprehension problems, it has negative implications on the long-term outcome of learning, measured in the form of grades in public examinations.

The teachers in this study were also concerned that teacher talk with code-switching provided an inappropriate language model to students who needed to learn English as an international language to use for their tertiary education (S9) or work in English-speaking countries. E8 referred to the form of language full of code-switching as “rojak language”, literally translated as “salad language”. One of the effects of code-switching is the students’ confusion with the spelling of Bahasa Melayu words coined from English words and therefore having similar pronunciations. As an example, S7 provided the word “oxygen” which is spelt as “oksigen” in Bahasa Melayu but wrongly spelt as “ojigen” by some students. In light of the relevance of English as an international language (McKay, 2003), the teachers’ concern about providing a good model of English for their students moderated the extent of code-switching they carried out in the classroom to ensure student comprehension.

Despite their reservations about code-switching, all the teachers reported using languages other than English for addressing various facets of comprehension problems, suggesting that it is a common instructional practice in the classroom. In a neighbouring country, Brunei Darussalam, Martin (1996) found that although code-switching is seen as an essential tool for teachers and students, the teachers admitted they felt “uneasy” and “guilty” over their Malay usage in History, Science, Mathematics and Geography lessons in Brunei (p. 139). Martin posited that code-switching is not seen as the unmarked and spontaneous norm in Brunei. The teaching-learning situation is different for the Malaysian secondary schools involved in this study. We found that code-switching is a norm for formal instruction in English and science classrooms – perhaps no different from the practice of code-switching outside the classroom. In the work context, for example, Malay employees were found to seek their colleagues’ assistance when they encountered communication difficulties in English and they also appealed for a language switch (Ting, 2002). Code-switching may also feature in interactions with colleagues of higher hierarchical status or from Chinese ethnic backgrounds.
(Ting, 2007) as English is associated with prestige and with certain ethnic groups (Ting, 2001). The formal learning setting in the classroom did not seem to be a boundary for the exclusion of code-switching.

**Conclusion**

The study on code-switching by English and science in secondary schools showed that in a setting where English is not the home language or even the second language for many students, code-switching is a necessary tool for ensuring student comprehension when English is the language of instruction. The findings indicated that code-switching is used for solving comprehension problems rather than averting them, indicative of the teachers’ resolve to use the designated language of instruction within reasonable limits without compromising student learning. The study has contributed in demystifying the general notion of how teacher code-switching aids comprehension by revealing the different facets of student incomprehension linked to terms, instructions and concepts. The teachers in this study also expressed concerns on the negative ramifications of code-switching. Considering that code-switching may be unmarked in multilingual setting, the issue of teacher code-switching in either language or content-based subjects can be broached in teacher education courses so that the trainees are informed of the advantages and drawbacks of code-switching based on empirical research rather than leaving them to form their own opinions based on their own experiences. However, in view of the reliance on teacher reports of code-switching in the present study, further investigations are needed to find out how code-switching functions to address the different facets of students’ comprehension problems in various teaching-learning settings.
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Appendix A: Interview Guide

1) What do you think of a teacher who code-switches in an English/Science lesson?
   • Do you code-switch in your English/Science lesson? If yes, why? If no, why not?
   • When do you usually code-switch in your lesson? Why? If no, why don’t you code-switch and what do you usually do?
2) What makes you decide to code-switch or not in your lesson?

3) Can you tell me some of your experience of code-switching in your English/Science lesson?

4) You’ve taught several classes. Do you code-switch in any of those classes? Which class?
   • What about the rest of your classes? Is there any class that you do not code-switch?
   • Why do you code-switch in some of your classes but not in other classes?

5) Would you code-switch if Ministry officials were to observe your lesson? Why?
Title
English-only conferences: What did a non-native speaker expert note?

Author
Tahar Rabassi
University of Tunis, TUNISIA.

Abstract
It is now confirmed that the visibility of academics depends on their written production. However, established scholars in English as an Additional Language environments are also striving to be more visible at English-only conferences. Thus, oral proficiency, in the case of non-native-speaker (NNS) experts, is no longer a deferred need. The paper examines the notes taken by a Tunisian professor of chemistry while attending an international conference. The communicative functions of the expressions selected by the attendee are identified and categorized. The findings could contribute to a more effective teaching of English for Conferencing. The aim is to shed further light on the particular linguistic and rhetorical needs of NNS professionals who wish to participate at English-only international conferences.
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1. Introduction
Visibility is an essential factor in assessing the authority and prestige of academics. Therefore, attending conferences is a necessary activity, particularly for established scholars. Some communities meet regularly at conferences to present and discuss their most recent results. The community of applied linguists in North America meet regularly at the AAAL Conference. The community of chemists makes all sorts of arrangements so that they attend the conference organized by the American Chemical Society. Attending these events is highly regarded by experts working in under-resourced countries, and particularly in the non-
Anglophone world. The acceptance of papers that some non-Anglophone scholars submit to English-only conferences, organized by American or British learned societies, is a source of great satisfaction, and is, most of the time, viewed as a sign of distinction by local peers.

Rowley-Jolivet (2002) rightly argues that:

> Participating in conferences, whether it be by giving keynote speeches and papers, presenting posters, chairing sessions or sitting on the scientific committee, plays a central role in furthering both the visibility of a laboratory’s research and the careers of individual scientists (p. 19).

The community of scholars in non-Anglophone environments is no exception. However, since most highly specialized conferences are held in English, NNS academics are almost invisible. Delivering papers in English is much more demanding than writing them in English. Rowley-Jolivet (2002) reports the feelings of a nonnative professor of Mathematics who confesses that participating in conferences requires a good command of “natural language”. It seems that NNS scholars could cope with formulas, technical jargon, but lack the language which accompanies the highly specialized discourse of their community. It seems that the low command of discursive markers which typify the oral discourse of conferences is among the causes of the poor visibility in the case of NNS scholars.

The present paper is a preliminary case study on the “natural” language most needed by an expert population who aspires to participate actively at English-only conferences. The data were selected by a Tunisian scholar who participated in an international conference. The analytical reading of the notes shows the most needed communicative functions in the eyes of the expert. The findings could serve a better understanding of the communicative needs of the non-Anglophone community of scholars, who are more visible at the written level, but almost invisible at conferences because of a poor command of spoken academic English.

2. **Review of the literature**

It seems that studies on the language of research are no longer focused on written genres. Thompson’s (1994) study on lecture introductions, Dubois’ (1980) discussion of the use of slides in biomedical speeches, and Shalom’s (1993) investigation of the language of plenary
lecture and poster session discussions, were among the pioneering studies on oral discourse in academic settings. More recent studies are targeting the particular discourse of conferences (Ventola, 2002). Hood & Forey (2005) focused on the introduction section of conference papers, and Mauranen (2004) investigated the discourse of round tables, while Rowley-Jolivet, (2002) studied visuals in scientific conference papers from a genre perspective.

The advent of the computer has made modes of interaction more complex. Montero et al (2007) have explained how

the socialization of the internet in the last decade has favored the expansion of written network interactions among users in both synchronous and asynchronous modes. Synchronous written communication implies real-time, online interaction, the tone and register of which, although physically typed, reflect conversation through written discourse, especially when participants are accustomed to interacting electronically (p. 567).

Montero et al’s (2007) investigation of the discourse of discussion forums has implications for the teaching of academic English. They stressed the importance of developing speaking skills as well as modes which occupy the middle ground between oral and written discourse.

Oral discourse of professionals constitutes a highly informative source for genre analysts and EAP course designers. However, very few studies focused on the use of original conference talks as authentic pedagogical source material for the teaching of English to professionals in English as an Additional Language environments. The importance of authentic and specialized corpora has been noted by Wulff et al (2009). However, they admit that access to this type of data, in the case of conferences, is not always easy. Hood & Forey (2005) have mentioned the existence of teaching guides aimed at graduate and undergraduate students. Some recipes for effective speech at conferences, and publication in journals have been proposed by communication experts (Fieser & Fieser, 1960; Day, 1993; Porusch, 1995; Madden & Rohlick, 1997; Kline, 2004; Levis & Pickering, 2004), but no textbooks, informed by typical empirical data, are available for the teaching of English for conferencing to NNS experts based in non-Anglophone environments.

The use of English as the main language of dissemination of knowledge has been noted by Crystal, 1997 and Graddol, 1997. Crystal (1997) has reported that 85% of
international organizations use English as the official language, 85% of films are in English and up to 90% of research, in some disciplines is disseminated in English. Graddol (1997) has noted that the number of people who speak English is growing. The attitudes towards the hegemony of English has shifted from denunciation (Philipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1999; Swales, 1997) to effective recuperation (Widdowson, 1994; Siedlhofer, 2000; Llurda, 2004; Friedrich, 2007; Labassi, 2008).

It seems that the community of scholars has opted for a pragmatic attitude toward English as the medium of interaction. The rhetoric of resistance to English as an instrument of imperialism (Philipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1999; Canagarajah, 1999) has been replaced by an instrumental attitude toward the language. Siedlhofer (2000) rightly proposes a functional and realistic attitude, and Labassi (2008) argues for responsible uses of English. It seems that scientists prefer a single language, even if it is not theirs. Rogerson-Revell (2008) confirmed this pragmatic attitude in the context of business:

This pragmatic view is frequently reflected in business and management. For instance, commenting on the choice of English, as corporate language in the multinational engineering and telecoms firm Siemens AG of Germany, Bernhard Welschke, head of European policy at the Federation of German stated that “German companies are very pragmatic…They value a single language for business, even if it is not their own (p. 106).

It seems then, that the use of English as the official language of communication in international academic conferences has become a noticeable phenomenon, to the extent that it has triggered several reactions of exasperation. English as the medium of knowledge production is occupying the written, oral and electronic spheres. The debate over which language to use in education is obsolete, as most nation states are using their national language. However, in the validation of the results of research, whether through publication or in international conferences, the language used, most of the time, is English. When Japanese, Italian, French, Egyptian, and Russian organic chemists, or medical doctors meet, the language they use to interact, most of the time, is English.
3. English-only conferences

English has become the official language of several conferences hosted by Tunisian institutions. One should admit that there are no reliable figures to evaluate the phenomenon. However, some scattered events have taken place, even though not regularly, in Tunisian higher institutions. The Faculty of Medicine in Sousse (third biggest town in the country) organized two symposia which used English exclusively. Two Austro-Tunisian Meetings on Analytical Chemistry were held in Tunisia; and English was used as the official language of the meetings. One cannot claim that the phenomenon is gaining more ground; and no prediction as to the future might be made, since the events rely on the enthusiasm of individuals. Therefore, their survival depends on the good will of those who worked toward their very existence. Austrian and Tunisian analytical chemists agreed to hold annual meetings regularly; however, the events were discontinued, because the presidents of the Tunisian and Austrian Chemical Societies which organized the events left office and were replaced by presidents who had their own agendas.

The number of English-only conferences in Europe and Northern America, particularly in business, is increasing (Rowley-Jolivet, 1999, 2002). Rogerson-Revell (2007, 2008) has traced the evolution of the phenomenon in Europe. She claims that her study is preliminary and will be part of a broader study on the linguistic and socio-cultural issues involved in using English for International Business.

Scholars who want to keep abreast of events in their area of expertise recognize the importance of attending international conferences. Conferences are sites of novelty par-excellence, as they constitute adequate spaces for throwing around innovative ideas and assessing feedback from peers. Indeed, it is at conferences, more than through research papers and books, that academics exchange novelty. When ideas are presented in papers and books they have, most of the time, received positive feedback at meetings. Needless to say then, that the participation at regular specialized meetings has become an unavoidable practice for established scholars. Experts attend these conferences in order to test their new claims, display their new findings, and be informed about the innovations of their peers/competitors.

The present paper assesses the phenomenon of English in Academic Conferences, and reports on the communicative functions most needed by nonnative attendees as revealed by an analytic reading of the notes taken by a nonnative participant. Some linguistic exponents that
could be used to teach the communicative functions identified in the notes are suggested. It seems that the special needs of established nonnative scholars are not adequately answered by EAP/ESP textbooks. These textbooks seem to target an audience of would be experts, and are, in most cases, based on traditional means of needs analysis, namely questionnaires and interviews. Very few textbooks target nonnative experts who are aware of their needs and who want to improve their proficiency in speaking at conferences and listening to other experts.

The paper presents an analytic reading of conference notes taken by a Tunisian expert in the field of chemistry. The notes were taken by the expert as he was attending the Fourth International Symposium on “New Trends in Chemistry: The Role of Analytical Chemistry in National Development”, held in Cairo from the 4th to the 9th of January 1997.

4. Research questions
The aim of this paper is to classify the notes taken by the expert according to their linguistic and rhetorical orientations. More particularly the paper addresses the following questions:

a) What are the linguistic constructions selected by the expert?
b) What are the communicative functions selected by the expert?
c) How could the results of the examination of the notes be used to propose similar linguistic exponents which might serve the same communicative functions?

5. The study
5.1. Context
The aim is to identify the communicative functions of the notes selected by the expert. The results may orient the teaching of English for Academic purposes to nonnative established scholars, who manage to publish in English, but who lack the oral proficiency to present papers, answer and ask questions, or chair sessions at international conferences. I have often been told by Tunisian scholars that they decline invitations to conferences, because they lack the required command of English. Some Tunisian scholars publish in top journals, but apologize and decline-when invited to present at conferences or chair sessions.

This hesitant stand has been noted by Rogerson-Revell (2007) in the case of European non-English speaking members of the Groupe Consultatif Actuariel Europeen (GCAE)
whose function is to facilitate discussion between European Union institutions on existing and proposed EU legislation which has an impact on the actuarial profession. Experts and top professionals do not want to lose face because they have status and prestige to defend. Thus, a poor command of English might cause embarrassment that highly ranked professionals would not allow. Therefore, silence is most often the strategic option left for them. The repercussions are frustration at a personal level and lost science for the community. Several studies have discussed the repercussions of the poor visibility of scholars from under-resourced countries in scholarly journals (Gibbs, 1995; Flowerdew, 2000, 2001; Salager-Meyer, 2008). This lack of visibility at conferences would add to their isolation.

5.2. The informant

The expert in this study is a professor at the Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Sciences in Tunis. He was 56 years old when he attended the conference. He chaired the department for a three-year term. He worked as a director of a high institution and a laboratory; he has supervised several doctoral dissertations and published many articles in the field of chemistry. He holds a Thése d’Etat (PhD) from a French University. He attended a course the author taught at the same Faculty. The course targeted professionals and researchers who wanted to read, write and speak academic English. He has a good command of written academic English. He believes that he understands written English in his field, and that his difficulties are mainly in speaking and listening. The expert’s reactions to the author’s questions on regular meetings with the informant were used to account for the results of the analytic reading of the notes.

5.3. The notes

The notes were found by chance. After his return from the conference, we discussed the linguistic problems he had faced, and he informed me that he had taken notes of the expressions that he felt were most important to him. I immediately sensed the importance of these notes. They were authentic and unsolicited, but a valuable source of information to someone who aims at better serving the needs of EAP nonnative audiences. The expressions selected by the expert showed the need for “general English”/”natural English” (Rowley-Jolivet, 2002). What struck me was the absence of technical or domain specific items.
5.4. Method of analysis
The notes were read closely. Each expression was assigned a communicative function. The results are given in Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4. The same tables contain expressions which might be used to teach the functions prioritized by the expert. In other words the results section is first analytical, and then pedagogical. After assigning functions to the expressions in the notes, similar linguistic exponents have been suggested in order to promote the listening/speaking linguistic repertoire of potential academic audiences.

6. Results and discussion
The close reading of the notes showed that they could be divided into four major categories:

a) Opening and closing
b) Making transitions and clarifications
c) Presenting and commenting on results
d) Chairing

What struck the analyst was the absence of technical expressions. When asked to comment on the findings, and particularly the absence of domain specific notes, the informant said that, he was interested in expressions that would be used by all the participants, regardless of their narrow research niche. He maintained that scientific results are unique, and cannot be re-used. However, the “general” expressions are what all scientists would use. In other words, he was interested in the metadiscursive elements of discourse to use Hyland’s (2005) term.

6.1. Opening and closing expressions
The data in Table 1 is displayed in three columns, the first contains the original notes taken by the expert, the second column contains the assigned communicative function, and the third contains linguistic exponents which serve the same function and which could be used for the teaching of English for Conferences. The ultimate aim is to promote the linguistic repertoire of potential nonnative target audiences, and to help them construct more interactive texts.

Table 1
Opening and closing expressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes taken by the expert</th>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Other linguistic exponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before I start with my communication I would like to thank Mrs .... For her invitation</td>
<td>First I would like to thank .. Allow me to thank…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 1972, I published a paper on …and it found a lot of interest.</td>
<td>Opening/Closing</td>
<td>Our work on….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you Mr. chairman</td>
<td>Thank you for your presence/patience/attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expert noted three statements which were used either to open or to close presentations. What was noticed was the need felt by the participant to acquire this rhetorical skill. He was aware of the importance of the opening and closing statements and wanted to learn the appropriate expressions in English. As an established scholar who had participated in other than English conferences, he was aware of the target rhetorical needs. What remained was how to say it in English. Therefore, one could argue that the expert used his background rhetorical knowledge to filter the target linguistic exponents in English.

An English for conferencing course should use the rhetorical background knowledge of expert audiences and aim at promoting their linguistic repertoire in the target language. Expressions in the third column in Table 1 should be taught particularly through listening and speaking exercises.

6.2. Chairing expressions
Table 2 presents the results of analytic reading of the second category of expressions noted by the expert.

Table 2
Chairing expressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes taken by the expert</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Other linguistic exponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We shift now to the second speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Now, the floor is yours Dr/Prof X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We can expect a very interesting talk</td>
<td>Chairing</td>
<td>Interesting/informative/insightful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think we have some time for a last question</td>
<td></td>
<td>I believe …………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the culture of academia, established scholars do not only present papers, they are also invited to chair sessions. Chairing is an honorary activity, and a sign of high esteem. The expert, in this study, selected linguistic constructions used by chairmen in order to learn them, so that he occupies the honorary position of chairing. When asked about why he had noted chairing expressions, the expert confessed that he had been solicited in the past and declined, but that it was not going to happen again. He said:

“J’ai présidé des séances pendant des années, et dans plusieurs pays. C’est dommage que je ne puisse pas le faire lors des conférences dont la seule langue est l’anglais /I’ve been doing this for years (chairing); and in several countries. It’s a pity I’ve never done it in English-only conferences (Translation mine)”.

When we know that prestigious conferences are held in English, we realize the frustration that an expert feels because of the linguistic handicap. It is clear then, that the
expert was getting equipped with the required linguistic competence to chair sessions in English-only conferences.

The expressions in the column “linguistic exponents” contain items which may enrich the repertoire of non-Anglophone scholars who are called upon to chair conference sessions. This is an example of a very restrictive need which is rarely found in EAP textbooks. The reason, once again, is that most pedagogical materials are aimed at an audience of would be experts, whose fundamental needs do not include chairing conference sessions.

The teaching of these linguistic expressions to established scholars is not very challenging. The audience has the strategy, the posture, the awareness, the motivation, the experience, but lacks the linguistic competence. Therefore, the focus should be on lexical items, and on drawing the attention of the learners to the specific use of terms like “floor” in the expression:

Now the floor is yours, or, we now give the floor to ….

Tony-Dudley Evans (1994) gave a list of natural/general expressions used in academic settings, and that nonnative/speakers of English might either not comprehend or, worse, misinterpret. Below are three authentic and telling examples:

I won’t labor this point.

You’re letting me get away with murder on this one.

If you let the design life drift up a little bit, you won’t pay a fine.

NNS attendees will find it hard to process the meaning of labor in the first example. They will not see what the term murder means, nor will they guess the sense of the expression you won’t pay a fine. The point is that the metalanguage, or the natural language, and particularly metaphorical expressions which accompany the discourse of experts, might constitute an obstacle to proper comprehension. The functions of notes under study confirm NNS experts’ need to learn such expressions.
6.3. **Presenting and commenting**

Table 3 presents the third category of linguistic expressions noted by the expert, their rhetorical function and other linguistic expressions which may be used when presenting results and commenting on them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes taken by the expert</th>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Other linguistic exponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was well-established that…</td>
<td>It was found that…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This explains very nicely the phenomenon.</td>
<td>This accounts for …..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You must not take it for definitely granted…</td>
<td>It might be argued that the phenomenon is due to…</td>
<td>One <strong>may</strong> have to be more cautious/tentative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results seem to be reasonably good.</td>
<td>Presenting results and commenting on them</td>
<td>Results are apparently/to the best of our knowledge …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We find very nice relationship between theoretical previsions and our experimental results</td>
<td>Experimental results are in good/excellent agreement/agree with ….</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expert noted the expressions most typical of the discourse of presenting results and commenting on them. He noted a passive expression, some modals verbs and a hedging expression. The notes taken by the expert confirm the results of some studies on the discourse of science (Hopkins & Dudley-Evans, 1988; Butler, 1990; Bruce, 2009) as well as the exercises proposed in textbooks for the teaching of academic English to NNS audiences, and that draw on the findings of empirical investigation of scientific discourse (Swales & Feak,
The present study provides empirical evidence, though very limited, to the claim that there are some similar linguistic conventions in the oral and written discourse which present and explain scientific findings. Hood & Forey (2005) explained the similarities and differences between written and oral scientific empirical discourse:

In most instances, for example, the oral performance is strongly associated with the development of a parallel written text. As such, a spoken conference presentation is likely to be a highly reflective text with many features that correspond to written research writing. On the other hand, there is an immediacy of audience in time and in place. This suggests a pressure in the other direction, towards a more interactive text, as the writer shapes the message in ways intended to connect with the immediate context (p. 291).

The tentative verb in the oral expression noted by the expert: Result seem to be reasonably good is similar to what Hyland (1996, 1998) noted in his studies on hedging in written scientific discourse. The rhetorical functions of the expressions noted by the expert; namely passives, modal verbs, and hedges have been identified in several studies on scientific discourse (Thompson, 1993; Swales, 1998; Hyland, 1996, 1998). Swales (1998) for instance, argued that hedging is an important device for establishing a good interaction with readers. The aim of the expert in the present case is to learn expressions in English which would help him establish a good interaction with conference attendees.

When the expert was asked about the reasons why he had noted the expressions in Table 3 he answered that he was interested in original ways of expressing the state of the field, and distinguishing between facts and speculations:

"Exprimer l’état des lieux dans la discipline et distinguer entre les faits et les hypothèses/Express the state of the field and distinguish facts and speculations (Translation mine)".

According to him, the modal verbs he noted are “highly useful expressions (Translation mine)/Des expressions très utiles”. It is clear that the expert was aware of the rhetorical requirements in the field and that he engaged in hunting the expressions which would best serve his rhetorical needs.
6.4. Making transition and clarifications

Table 4 sums up the results of the analysis of the fourth category of expressions noted by the expert.

Table 4
Expressions of transition and clarifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes taken by the expert</th>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Other linguistic exponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The second point of my communication concerns | | I move to ….
| I’ll come back to this point further in my communication… | | The second point is about/deals with …
| Taking accounts of that we have … | Transition and Clarifications | This issue will be clarified later…
| Now I would like to make a point clear… | | Bearing this in mind …
| | | Clarify/elaborate on/explain…

The first expression in Table 4 signals a move to the second section of the presentation. Speakers must signal the end of a section and the beginning of another if they want their audiences to keep track of their discourse and ensure its coherence. The expert was aware of this rhetorical requirement; that was why he wrote the expression. The last expression reveals a need to draw the attention of the audience. The expert knows the importance of direct appeal to the audience in conferences. This strategic move enhances the degree of receptivity of discourse. The expert confirmed this interpretation, as he said:
“On ne peut pas bombarder les gens de chiffres, on doit sortir du texte initial de temps en temps/ we cannot bombard the audience with figures, we have to get out of the original text from time to time (Translation mine) ».

Results in Table 4 show the expert’s awareness of the importance of coherence in oral discourse. This indicates a high level of discourse competence, but also the need to promote linguistic competence. Canale & Swain (1980) drew the attention of applied linguists to the forms of competences. In the case of the expert under study, one can claim that background discourse competence is hindered by poor linguistic competence. In other words, the expert is aware of the importance of textual structuring, but does not possess the required language to produce the appropriate and correct oral discourse. The expert has acquired the specialist contextual knowledge of his field (Widdowson, 2004), as well as the technical lexis, while reading and writing in the discipline, but lacks what Hyland (2005) calls metadiscourse, or the lexical potential required to enhance addressivity, particularly in settings which require knowledge of metadiscursive items.

7. Conclusion

EAP courses which target experts with rhetorical background knowledge, a high sense of discursive requirements, but limited linguistic competence should focus on the promotion of the latter. An English for Conferencing course should be highly selective in terms of which target skills and strategies. Experts are not full time learners, and effective courses should be tailored according to the specific needs and take into consideration professional constraints.

The notes are highly informative, and point to the authentic needs of an expert population. The use of experts’ background knowledge could save time particularly in the case of courses that are taught under tight time constraints. The notes under study show the direction that English for conferencing, in the case of non-Anglophone experts should take. Less time should be devoted to what experts know, but more time to what they need: linguistic exponents which serve particular rhetorical functions.

The analysis of the data generated by a Tunisian expert in the specific context of English medium conferences was used to identify the target functions and the linguistic exponents which might serve as teaching item. Instead of anticipating the needs of ESP/EAP audiences one might rely on these same target audiences (when they are conscious of their needs) to identify the rhetoric and language which should be enhanced. Authentic data generated by target audiences may serve to identify the “desired” communicative functions.
The poor status of ESP in some non-Anglophone environments is partly due to reliance on teaching materials which target nonnative undergraduates or postgraduates in English as a Native Language Environments. Very little work is carried out to evaluate the real needs of local expert audiences. Tunisia, a Francophone country, has engaged in a policy which favors the expansion of English (Daoud, 2007), therefore, Tunisian applied linguists should know how to work on maximizing this trend. The hegemony of English has led other non-Anglophone countries to revise their linguistic policies and invest in the teaching of English. Applied linguists in these environments are called upon to evaluate the real needs, to design programs, and to advise decision makers.

The limited scope of the study, and the fact that the results are based on one case might not allow general guidelines. Access to data of this type is not easy, if not impossible, but the case of the Tunisian expert might concern the typical population of non-Anglophone experts, who are, for the time being, relying on autodidactic learning to acquire the necessary skills so that they function as full-fledged academics in a world dominated by English.

With the spread of English as the medium of interaction in conferences where nonnative users of English resort to English because of the diversity of their native languages, the study of non-native to non-native oral interaction through the medium of English in academic settings is timely. Nonnative participants are figuring out their own rhetorical and linguistic needs. It seems that, in the case of the absence of a native norm, nonnative populations are appropriating the medium and shaping their own standards.
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**Abstract**
Interest in issues relating to oral English in a second language (L2) environment has been growing steadily as exemplified in Nigeria during the last decade. However, it has primarily been learner-focused; gauging phonological proficiency via learners’ performances. The all-important role of the teacher is often either mentioned in passing or all-together ignored. This study is a deviation from the existing trend. The research examines oral English teacher-inputs which have continued to impact adversely on the oral proficiency of learners of English in the light of a supposed decline in the standards of education in Nigeria. It further elucidates the circumstances that brought about the downward trend in learners’ performances debunking the constant reference to learners as mostly responsible for the situation. Findings from the study reveal the wide gap that exist between Teacher-talking–Time (TTT) and Learner-Talking-Time (LTT) and the significance of Teacher-Language Awareness (TLA) to Oral English pedagogy. The study calls for a re-examination of Teacher-talking–Time (TTT), and teacher language awareness since application and response to factors regarding TTT and TLA examined in this paper are important precursors of learners’ oral proficiency. The study concludes by suggesting the need to pay more attention to these areas in ESL teaching operations.
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**Introduction**

Writers such as Banjo (1976) and Rivers (1981) have in different contexts reiterated the all-encompassing significance of teacher-input to the successful acquisition of oral proficiency by the learner. However, empirical assessment of teacher-input in oral English learning in a Second Language (L2) environment such as Nigeria is rarely, (Banjo, 1993; Brumfit 1984) if at all, undertaken. Most studies on Oral English proficiency in the L2 environment, centre on either the speaker or the learner (Cook 1991; Kujore 1993)

In Nigeria, there is a popular concern about a supposed decline in the standards of education. Among these concerns, standardizing Nigerian English to meet Nigerians’ socio-cultural needs and choosing a model for pedagogical purposes are of perennial prominence. However, the usual pedagogical practices are learner-centered. The usual move is to highlight deficiencies (of present day learners/users) in comparison with a hypothetical golden age of education in Nigeria. Although, evidence of such comparisons may be difficult to find as no solid corpus of past evidence is readily available yet these comparisons cannot be dismissed as untrue given the certain existing pedagogical phenomena in Nigeria presently. However,
the effectiveness of education and pupils’ performance particularly in English language largely depend on the people responsible for making the school system work and teachers are at the centre of this process.

Teachers constitute an important social and economic force in almost all countries: half of all government employees in Nigeria are teachers, and teachers’ wages account for nearly 75% of the operating budget allocated to ministries of Education. They play an indispensable role in transmitting knowledge (especially by words of mouth), their great number and the large budget share devoted to them mean that teacher-management needs to be all the more rigorous and effective. The basic premise of the present paper therefore is to discuss the centrality of competence in the spoken language and methodology of the teacher to successful teaching and meaningful learning of especially the Oral English.

1.1 THE IMPORT OF THE SPOKEN LANGUAGE IN TEACHING

Language experts identify oracy or the spoken language as a crucial component of learning, (Stubbs 1983; Banjo 1993). Speaking and listening thus consequently became a requirement in all subjects of the curriculum. Its inclusion as a separate profile component in the curriculum gives official support to the importance of the spoken English. In Nigeria, there has been no methodical investigation of Teachers’ attitudes to the role of speaking in the national curriculum. This may be one reason why students’ performance particularly in oral English has been consistently low as remarked by Oladele (2001). It should be acknowledged that oracy does not only take place in English lessons. It is a condition of learning across the whole curriculum. But what kind of talk do we have in Nigerian classrooms today? It is the teacher dominated and directed talk. Pupils have limited opportunity for participation and the talk which is allowed is usually of a low level.

1.2 TEACHER TALKING TIME (TTT)

Teaching methods for learning in Nigeria place little emphasis on talking by pupils. In most classrooms settings, where oral English is taught, teachers ask many questions 80% of which require mere recall of knowledge, produced after the teacher’ pronunciation (Ufomata; 1995) and the students, from my teaching experience normally give it almost verbatim). This method is known as initiation/response/feedback (IRF) discourse structure, discussed by Edward and Westgate (1994). Initiation-response-feedback or IRF is a pattern of discussion between teacher and learner. The teacher initiates, the learner responds, the teacher gives feedback. This approach to exchange of information in the classroom is more about the
learner replicating the teacher than communicating or being creative. The method allows little opportunity for pupils to interact with other pupils, ask questions or initiate comments, coupled with the problem of extremely large classes in especially our tertiary institutions in Nigeria with averagely 150-200 students per class as in the researcher’s University.

Lessons, where pupils passively receive the teachers communicated wisdom, remaining largely silent unless invited to speak will only contribute to the annihilation of quality education in Nigeria. Lessons in oral or spoken English require that students be given opportunity to pronounce especially the English sounds over and over, so as to internalize them. Mercer and Wegerif (1999;84) wrote on the importance of oracy or the spoken language, as one of the best reliable methods of assessing pupil’s abilities, especially in oral English.

Pupils’ language-learning propensities may be assessed by getting them to try to produce oral texts. By listening, the teacher can gain idea of which areas of grammar and lexicon need help, and modify his teaching accordingly.

p. 84

In their research, 88% of the respondents reacting to a questionnaire agree that if learners do not get the chance to talk they will not generate ideas. It is significant that some of our learners lose ability to speak fluently; a skill they acquired during the pre-school age. One of the reasons for this deterioration is the very little opportunity they are given to talk freely during class lessons. The bulk of their lessons, especially in the primary schools are “repeat after me”- mere repetitions. The spoken language, like an outer coat of an orange, gives the first impression about the speaker to the listener or hearer.

The development of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) which is an approach to the teaching of second language emphasizes interaction as both the means as well as an end in language acquisition (Bern 1984:5). Studies on CLT brought with it a methodology which emphasized communication in the classroom and a reduction of the teacher talking time (TTT) which has been proved to be counterproductive for the following reasons:

- Excessive TTT limits the amount of LTT. If the teacher talks for half the time in a 60 minute lesson with 15 students, each student gets only 2 minutes to speak. Besides, the
classes in the humanities of most Nigerian Federal Universities range between 100 and 500 students.  

- A large amount of TTT results in long stretches of time in teacher-to-class mode and a monotonous pace. Student under involvement inevitably leads to loss of concentration, boredom and reduced learning.  

- TTT often means that the teacher is giving the students information that they could be finding out for themselves, such as grammar rules, the meanings of vocabulary items and corrections. Teacher explanations alone are often tedious, full of terminology and difficult to follow. There may be no indication of whether the students have understood.  

- If the teacher takes the dominant role in classroom discourse in terms of initiating the topic, allocating turns and evaluating comments, (as is the case in Nigerian schools) the student’s role is only that of respondent. Opportunities for developing the speaking skill are therefore severely limited.  

- If the teacher is constantly dominant and controlling, the learners take no responsibility for their own learning but learns what the teacher decides and when. Student autonomy is thus limited and it becomes difficult to have an objective assessment or empirical analysis of students’ pronunciation patterns especially in matters relating to expression of identity (bringing their home culture or cultural 'niche' into their classroom participation).  

1.3 THE TEACHER’S LANGUAGE AWARENESS (TLA)  

Also important, is the teacher’s language awareness. In the context of any second language (L2) classroom, the three main sources of input for learners are materials, other learners and the teacher. As mentioned earlier, this study concentrates on the teacher as a major source of input for oral English learners.  

The TLA has very great impact on the input which is made available for learning as explained by Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999). It is difficult to expect an excellent performance from among English teachers who themselves are product of an educational system in which the formal teaching of pronunciation was anathema. This factor is elaborated in Andrews (1999:161-177), Fajobi (1999) and Faleye (2004). Teachers Language competence is described as the knowledge that teachers have of the underlying systems of the language that enables them to teach effectively.
The L2 teacher may not attain native speaker proficiency, but he can strive to approximate the target language. The spoken mode is particularly important for prospective teachers who act as models (substitutes) for native speakers. To expect Nigerian English teachers to speak with an Oxford or Received Pronunciation or even BBC accent would be a quixotic task. However, teachers of English should speak in such a way that ridiculous ambiguities are avoided. For instance if a teacher pronounces shells instead of cells, while teaching on a topic like “Snails in West Africa” ambiguity may set in, since both shells and cells are contextually appropriate. Taking cognizance of minimal pair is important and teachers in especially the ESL environment should make efforts to make distinctions in the pronunciation of seemingly homophonous words which are minima pairs (words which have their pronunciation different only by one single sound) as in the words worn and won or live and leave. Learners depend more on context to resolve ambiguities caused by mispronunciations. Due to the fact that most teachers in Nigeria do not often make distinctions in the pronunciation of minimal pairs (Soneye 2004), when a teacher makes a sentence like “working is good for one’s health” except he/she adds another statement such as “slothfulness hurts a great deal” many students in the Nigerian classroom may write down walking instead of working. The reason for this, being that walking is also good for one’s health and both words are often pronounced the same way in Nigerian English.

If the teacher, especially the language teacher, constantly attempts explicit expression, his teaching methodology will become a source of motivation for learners to learn. Effective teaching in a second language situation such as Nigeria requires of the teacher more than just the possession of the knowledge of English language. The teacher also needs to reflect upon that knowledge as well as the knowledge of the underlying systems of the language. This is a major way to ensure that students maximally benefit from the input for learning. Most teachers are contented with the ability to draw upon a language just for communicative purposes. According to Leech (1994:18) a model teacher should be aware of the contrastive relations between native language and foreign language.

There are other issues which affect the teachers’ proficiency directly or indirectly in Nigeria. Prominent among these are the language policy of the 6-3-3-4 system of education, the question of model choice and identifying a standard variety. The 6-3-3-4, system of education is such that Nigerian pupils spend the first six years of education in the primary school, and receiving instruction in their indigenous language for all subjects in the first three years; the first three years of secondary education is used to assess if the pupil can cope with
academic rigor or should spend the next three years in a technical school and the last 4 years in the University (see Fafunwa 1974; Awobuluyi 1979 for details)

2.1. The implementation of the Language policy of the 6-3-3-4 system of education

The national policy on Education (N.P.E) section 3, paragraph 15: FRN 1991 dwells on primary education and states that:

The government will see to it that the medium of instruction in the primary school is initially the mother tongue or the language of the immediate community and at a later stage English.

The implementation of this policy till date seems incongruous because of the vagueness as to when the transition from L1 to L2 should take place. This lack of uniformity frustrates the teaching and learning process and leads to a poor foundation for literacy in both the Mother tongue and English. The implication of this shoddiness is often seen in the absence of a good foundation for most pupils and leaves the teacher frustrated.

2.2 The choice of an ELT model in Nigeria

The British RP dialect has continued to be the ELT model in schools since the 19th century to date. Teachers, themselves cannot speak this variety, so the in-put has been largely Nigerian English. Little wonder, that students fail woefully in oral English examinations which are based on RP accent as investigated by Soneye (2004b).

According to Awonusi (2004: 14-15) RP is almost a century old and Estuary English (EE) is taking its place; forces of globalization are making alternative models like General American (GA) more appealing to non native speakers and gradually making in-roads into Nigerian local accents. He concludes that RP has been grossly domesticated in the very many environments in which, it is adopted as a model such that there is no uniformity.

2.3 Identifying standards or standardized varieties

McArthur (2004; 416) states that ‘at the moment there are demands for a standardized international variety so that it can be taught’. But the word standardization is viewed from several perspectives, as there are interest groups, such that an objective standard does not seem easily attainable. According to Joseph (1987:12):
Standardization implies a decision about which are right variants in cases of existing variability, a necessary limitation of acceptable options and a regrettable inflexibilization of potential. In a modern context, ‘right and wrong’ should only be meaningful and usable attributions in cases where there is no such native variability where a wrong usage is only wrong because it is not in practice an available variant, and nobody at all ever speaks that way.

Going by this definition of ‘standard English’ one can conclude that both American and British varieties are standard varieties and that Nigerian English also cannot be regarded as wrong because ‘somebody speaks it’. What or which then is the standard at least for pedagogical reasons there can only be one as a model otherwise there will be chaos. A key concern among EFL/ESL teachers and other language professionals in the first decade of the 21st century is how to prepare students for the use of English on a global scale and this is also the concern of this paper, particularly as it relates to teachers in Nigeria.

3.0 Research procedure and methodology

In order to be able to ascertain whether Teacher Talking Time (TTT) and Learner Talking Time (LTT) in the classroom are equitably distributed, an empirical analysis was undertaken in this study. The primary goal of the investigation was to examine if learners have sufficient time to express themselves, thereby acquiring some proficiency. Four Oral English teachers, (in a University in Nigeria) three males and a female were observed during classroom lessons. The observation lasted twelve weeks, with each of them having three classes of an hour each. They taught the same group of students (164 in number) in their second year in the Bachelor of Arts programme. For purpose of analyses, the variables considered were five, namely A-arrival of teacher, IC-Initiation of communication, E-Explanation, R/Q-Response/Questions and F-Feedback. A, IC and E are assumed to be exclusively the teacher’s roles, while RQ and F most of the time, for the learner.

Table 1: A THREE HOUR LECTURE CHART ON THE ASSESSMENT OF TTT VERSUS LTT IN A NIGERIAN UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours in minutes</th>
<th>TM1</th>
<th>TM2</th>
<th>TM3</th>
<th>TF1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st week</td>
<td>2nd week</td>
<td>3rd week</td>
<td>1st week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 10mins</td>
<td>A/IC A</td>
<td>A A/IC A</td>
<td>A/IC A</td>
<td>- AIC A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>R/Q</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd 10mins</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd 10mins</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th 10mins</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th 10mins</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th 10mins</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TTT in Minutes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total LTT in minutes</td>
<td>160 minutes</td>
<td>150 minutes</td>
<td>160 minutes</td>
<td>120 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graphical representation of table

**DISCUSSION ON FINDINGS**
The findings of the study we undertook to validate teacher-input and impact on the oral English proficiency of learners, revealed that, only one out of the four teachers allowed about one third of the total available time for teaching, to be used by students to ask questions and respond to the teaching in their preferred ways. The fact that the female teacher (TF1) among them was the only one who allowed for the highest LTT may be a coincidence as the study did not have sufficient number of Females to be able to establish a pattern. However, since all the male lecturers allowed for 20, 30 and 20 minutes LTT respectively, this seemed to have established a pattern with regard to male/female dichotomy in oral English teaching which may be verified by some other research in the future. The important feature in this study and worthy of note is the relation of TTT to LTT. If a class with 164 students had only 130 minutes (1 hour, 20 minutes) to contribute through speaking to the teacher’s in-put in teaching duration of a total of 590 minutes (twelve hours), there is the likelihood that about 75% of the students never spoke at all throughout the semester and this in an oral English teaching classroom. Allwright and Bailey (1991: 139), confirm that “teacher talk dominates” dominates classroom discourse. Since learners are the intended beneficiaries of education, it is appropriate that appreciable time be reserved to express their “already acquired knowledge”. Brown (1982) discovers that repetition was the most frequent cognitive strategy and although this may be contestable, this study found that it is prevalent in the oral English classroom in Nigeria. According to Wells (1993), the teacher-initiated IRF is clearly predominant and estimated it to occupy 70% of classroom discourse in many secondary classrooms and the findings of this study suggest that the situation is not too different in the tertiary classrooms. This certainly is unhelpful to particularly learners of oral English.

3.2 CONCLUSION

The ESL teacher must be able to attend and formulate policies based on questions relating to groups of students who speak the accent that can be regarded as Standard Nigerian English, compare the English spoken by students with the accent from British American or any other variety and freely observe phonological features in their use of segments. All these cannot be possible until the teacher has given considerable time to students to speak and it is only in this wise that the position of the teacher as knowledgeable and contextually adequate for teaching English as a second language will be incontestable.

Conscious efforts should be made by teachers to talk less and give ample opportunity to pupils to express themselves, irrespective of the very large classes. For effectiveness, the classes
can be divided into smaller groups where students will interact with each other and forward their discoveries and ideas to teachers in both written and oral forms.

REFERENCES


Soneye T.O (2004b) “Phonological sensitivity of selected secondary school teachers in Ile-Ife to elision in English” Ife Journal of Educational Studies (IJES) vol.11, Number 1, pp. 102-114
