Toward a Critical Notion of Appropriation of English as an International

Language

Phan Le Ha Monash University

Biography:
Dr. Phan Le Ha has a BA (Arts) in English, from Vietnam National University, Hanoi BA (Social Sciences) in International Studies, from Vietnam National University, Hanoi MA (TESOL) from Monash University, Australia PhD from Monash University, Australia

Phan Le Ha has been working as a university lecturer and researcher in Vietnam and Australia. She is currently the Editorial Assistant of the Australian Journal of Education. She has also taught in BA (Arts) and MA (TESOL) courses at Monash University. Her research interests are the relationships between language, culture and identity; postcolonial Englishes; Critical Discourse Analysis; and English teacher education.

She has given presentations at international conferences, and published in international journals, such as ELT Journal, Australian Journal of Education, and Asian EFL Journal.

Foreword

Undoubtedly, English has gained itself the status of a world language, an international language, or a lingua franca in almost all settings (Crystal, 1997; Seidlhofer, 2001, 2003; Brutt-Griffler, 2002; McKay, 2003; Llurda, 2004). There are a number of ways to view EIL. Widdowson (1998, pp. 399-400) suggests that EIL can be seen as "a kind of composite lingua franca which is free of any specific allegiance to any primary variety of the [English] language." EIL is also used interchangeably with other terms, such as English as a lingua franca, English as a global language, English as a world language, and English as a medium of intercultural communication (cf Seidlhofer, 2003, p.9). Seidlhofer uses the term 'International English' rather than the short term EIL, arguing that the former is "more precise because it highlights the international use of English rather than suggesting, wrongly, that there is one clearly distinguishable, unitary variety called 'International English'" (p.8). This paper takes Seidlhofer's proposition of 'International English'.

Although users of English, to various extents, have been able to appropriate the language for their own purposes (Canagarajah, 1999; Hashimoto, 2000; Phan Le Ha, 2004), this paper argues that when the native speaker norms are in contact with the norms of other speakers of English, it is often the case that the former are used to make judgements against the latter. Despite its international status, English in different forms of uses is still used to

exclude many of its users, to construct an inferior Other. As such, it celebrates globalisation yet limits integration, and strengthens the power of certain dominant forms of English. As long as these limitations of EIL are not acknowledged and remain unresolved, its users still face discrimination and unfair judgements.

Together with acknowledging the international status of English, this paper aims to re-examine the social, cultural and political aspects of this status so as to obtain an insight into how English is beneficial to most users yet at the same time a "killer language" and a "tyrannosaurus rex" (Pakir, 1991; Swales, 1997; cited in Llurda, 2004, p. 314). Afterwards, the paper will propose the author's critical notion of EIL pedagogy.

It is important to note that although I draw on postcolonial theory and use many of their terms, such as Self, Other, Inner Circle, Centre/centre and Periphery/periphery, I am also aware, like many other authors such as McKay (2003), of the limitations of these terms.

Centre Englishes versus other Englishes

This section examines in what way EIL is still problematic and can still be used to discriminate against many of its users. Discussions are drawn on from the literature about how the Englishes in the Centre are still treated as 'better' and standard Englishes compared to other Englishes.

To begin with, although many authors have argued for the co-existence of a family of 'Englishes' (Kachru, 1986; Brutt-Griffler, 2002) given the widespread use of English and the way people have adapted it for their own uses, this family has not co-existed with equality yet. The notion of a family suggests a sense of support, love and care among its members. However, the Englishes in this family seem to enjoy a fiercely hierarchical relation, in which some members play the dominant role trying to 'support' and at the same time 'bullying' their weaker yet vulnerable 'sisters' and 'brothers'. Although there are varieties of English, such as Singaporean English, Indian English, African English, Australian-English, American-English, and British-English, it is arguable that international norms and rules of the language are not set by all these Englishes, nor even negotiated among them. Only the so-called 'native' speakers of English have a voice in the matter (Pham Hoa Hiep, 2001). We can see examples of this in the norms of English academic writing (Farrell, 1997a, b; Phan Le Ha, 2001), or in the debate of cross-cultural issues (Kaplan, 1966; Ballard & Clanchy, 1991, 1997; Liddicoat, 1997; Phan Le Ha, 2001; Phan Le Ha & Viete, 2002), or in the case of many students who have been using English since they started schooling in their countries (some African and Asian ones) but still have to take TOEFL or IELTS tests for their entrance into universities in the US and UK.

When looking at the English languages, McArthur (1998) examines the forms of Englishes, linguistic insecurities and other related issues. His analysis suggests that Standard English has its own triumphant and decisive status, no matter how many Englishes have come into being. As one example, in the US Black English, also known as Afro-American English, is institutionally considered inferior with low quality, and thus those who speak it are labelled low level achievers (p.197).

Standard English is what Pham Hoa Hiep (2001) criticises. He argues that it is native speakers who set the norms for what is called Standard English. He clarifies his argument by drawing on definitions of 'Standard English' made by a number of authors. For example, Strevens says that Standard English is "a particular dialect of English, being the only non-localised 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" (cited in Pham Hoa Hiep, 2001, p.5). Pham Hoa Hiep also refers to Quirk's discussion of Standard English, which Pham expresses in his own words as "the natural language that educated English native speakers use" (p.5). Thus, according to Pham, it cannot be assumed that English belongs to no particular culture, or is "culture-free" (p.4). Indeed, he argues that the use of English does play an important part in both one's desire to communicate with the world and one's will to preserve one's identity. Put differently, English does affect identity formation, and Pham urges EFL teachers to assist students in achieving these two aims.

Native speakers of English, apart from the pride of owning the language of international communication, may see their language at risk of being 'corrupted' or 'polluted', since it has been modified and promoted everywhere without any control (Marzui, 1975a; Crystal, 1988, cited in Pennycook, 1994). In order to oppose this trend, native speakers of English have found a way to protect Standard English by calling "anything that isn't 'standard' … 'dialect' if lucky and slang if not" (McArthur, 1998, p.200). For example, McArthur shows that the issue of Standard English versus Afro-American English is a matter in educational agendas in the city of Oakland in California, USA. The English Afro-Americans speak is perceived by educators as "a distinct language spoken by the descendants of slaves" (Woo & Curtius, 1996, cited in McArthur, 1998, p.198).

Let me now take a specific look at the forum on EIL initiated and sustained by Widdowson (1997) to examine in more depth what aspects of EIL are still controversial. Widdowson (1997), partly in response to authors such as Phillipson (1992), takes a provocative position in the discussion concerning 'EIL, ESL, EFL: global issues and local interests' raised in World Englishes Journal. Since Widdowson "wanted to raise a number of questions for discussion" and thus made his paper "provocative" to invite debates (p.135), I would like to respond to several points he raises.

Firstly, Widdowson makes an analogy between Englishes and Latin languages, assuming that the evolution of Englishes, such as "Ghanaian and Nigerian [developing] out of English", parallels the development of "French and Italian from Latin" (p.142). Although I understand that Widdowson wants to argue for the independent status of all languages that develop out of English, I still find this assertion problematic. It obviously ignores the fact that French and Italian are separate and independent from Latin, a dead language that was mainly confined to Europe. This is far different from the story of Ghanaian and Nigerian being dependent on English, the language of developing dominance and inherent hegemony. The names Widdowson uses, "Ghanaian and Nigerian", position these languages as other than English. They are not English, so there is only one English, and the question of whose English again comes implicitly onto the scene. I understand that Widdowson does not want his discussion to be viewed this way, but the politics associated with English deny his 'positive' assertion. Evidence suggests that

within the English-speaking world, there is a dichotomy between the superior Self and the inferior Other, and the political aspect of English does play an important role in this dichotomy (Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1998). Thus the question turns to 'power': whose English is the standard? Whose norms are to be followed? At this point, the question is no longer as simple as 'French and Italian developing from Latin.' It becomes a site of struggle between the 'centre Englishes' and the peripheral ones. For example, materials for English teaching and learning in the Periphery are mainly from the Centre (Phillipson, 1992). Moreover, testing systems, such as TOEFL and IELTS, developed by the Centre have been used universally to assess learners' competency of English. This suggests that the centre Englishes and their related pedagogies are generally used as international standards, while other Englishes are for local uses only.

This argument of the relationship between power and English has been challenged by Widdowson (1998) in his reply to authors, such as Brutt-Griffler (1998). He clearly states that he wants to argue for English as "a kind of composite lingua franca which is free of any specific allegiance to any primary variety of the language" (pp. 399-400) including the English from the Inner Circle. He strongly supports his view, asserting that it is because he is aware of the politics of English and its consequences that he attempts to urge English users to look at it as the language "used internationally across communities as a means of global communication" (p. 399), but not as the language owned by the Inner Circle. This implies that he wants to encourage others to see English as politics free. However, many authors have pointed out that English walks hand in hand with politics, and there is always some kind of politics underlying English and ELT (Auerbach, 1995; Pennycook, 1994, 1998; Pennycook & Coutand-Marin, 2004; Edge, 2003). Moreover, as long as there are norms and requirements set by the Inner Circle in cross-cultural communication (Farrell, 1997a, b; 1998) or paradigms of nativeness/non-nativeness still function (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 1999), Widdowson's position is weakened.

Secondly, in an attempt to soften the debate about Englishes, Widdowson (1997) suggests seeing EIL as a composite of registers, such as English for science and English for finance. Put differently, he argues that EIL "is English for specific purposes" (p.144). However, Brutt-Griffler (1998, p.382) points out contradictions and unreasonableness in his suggestion, arguing that "there are no free-standing registers." Thus, "the question inevitably poses itself: Registers of which language?" (p.382). Moreover, I find his use of 'register' unrealistic when he suggests taking ESP (English for Specific Purposes) away from the issues of "community and identity" and viewing it in terms of "communication and information" (p.143). Furthermore, as Widdowson states in his article, it is impossible to control language once it is used. It is thus clear that ESP cannot be taken as the exception.

Although Widdowson tries to avoid Quirk's (1987) view of "the importance of maintaining the standard language" (p. 143) by assuming that we can take a neutral view of English, he once again ignores what lies beneath ESP. Many authors have showed that English embodies political and cultural missions that have made it a non-neutral language (Phillipson, 1992; Brutt-Griffler, 1998; Pennycook & Coutand-Marin, 2004). Also, I argue that EAP (English for Academic Purposes), a register, in cross-cultural settings acts as a harsh gatekeeper to keep many non-native speakers of English out of its game, as EAP

norms are based on the Self's standards (Farrell, 1997a, b; Phan Le Ha, 2001, Johnston, 2003). Johnston (2003) examines the issue of testing/assessment and values in ELT, and he argues that testing is value-laden in many ways. For example, testing compares students to others, and testing in fact reflects the real world surrounding the student instead of being just about the content being tested. He claims that standardized tests, particularly TOEFL, do not consider any individual circumstances of candidates. In other words, these tests are developed based on the Self's standards and ignore the cultural, social and learning realities of those who have to sit for these tests. So EAP obviously empowers the Self and at the same time prevents the Other from participating in many academic events. Thus, even though Widdowson tries to put 'the standard' aside, it cannot stay aside without causing trouble when it is problematic in its own right.

Regarding registers, I agree with Widdowson that many native speakers of English are incompetent in a number of English registers while many non-native speakers are highly knowledgeable in these registers. However, the point here is that the former, in many cases, are still the ones who have the power to imply to the latter that 'I don't like your English because it is not the English I use', and thus 'your English is not valued'. Examples of this can be found in Farrell (1998), Phan Le Ha (2000) and Kamler (2001). These authors explore how English academic writing is assessed in Australian schools and institutions and find out that examiners value a certain way of writing, the "Anglo" style, and if students fail to present their writing in this style, their writing is not acknowledged and valued. At this point, neither English nor ESP could be neutral, in contrast to Widdowson's suggestion.

Thus far it is clear that although English has achieved its international status and been globalised, that EIL is for all and for cross-cultural communication still has many limitations.

Englishes in the Periphery

So far this paper has suggested that Centre Englishes have more power in terms of ownership. Now it is time to consider how beliefs about possession of English affect equality and justice within the Periphery itself. Periphery here includes both the Outer Circle and the Expanding Outer Circle.

In many Periphery countries, English is purposefully used to exclude people from power and social positions, and to create discrimination among people in their societies. Following are examples. India is a highly hierarchical society, where there are clear-cut borders among classes. According to Ramanathan (1999), Indian society is divided into an inner circle and an outer circle of power, and the classes that belong to the inner circle have more access to power and privilege. The middle class belongs to this inner circle. Ramanathan argues that the Indian middle class has used English as a tool to maintain its status and at the same time to lengthen its distance from particular groups of people in India. He finds that even in India, a country of the periphery, "an English-related inner-outer power dichotomy appears to exist" (p.212). This suggests that power and English adhere to each other in this country. In order to consolidate power, the Indian middle class has

intentionally made English a gatekeeper excluding those of lower income and lower caste. Institutional and educational practices with the effective assistance of English go hand-in-hand to keep outer circle students "out of the more powerful circle" (p.218).

Phillipson (1992) argues how discrimination and power distance have been exercised through English in Africa. He observes that although English enjoys high status in many areas of Africa, sufficient access to it still belongs only to a small group of elites. Although both the elites and the masses see the advantage of English and its connection to power and resources, English is still somehow a luxury property owned by the powerful. So English obviously accompanies inequality and injustice in many African countries.

The use of English - the language of power – in many African countries is responsible for silencing other African languages as well, as Phillipson (1992) puts it. "The colonial language [is] still … used in high status activities, a dominant local language … [is] … used for less prestigious functions, and local languages [are] used for other purposes" (p.27). This practice suggests that English really belongs to high-status groups of people, and their achievements are more guaranteed because they have the most access to English. This also suggests the belief in the superiority of English over local African languages, and thus those who have most access to English are assumed to be superior.

Gamaroff (2000) indicates that in South Africa, within the domain of ELT, there arises a major issue which is the controversial distinction between English as L1 and L2. He states that "these notions [of L1 and L2] are so heavily value-laden that there is a danger of the distinction between these two notions being interpreted as a form of linguistic apartheid" (p.297). He cited Young (1988:8) who "advocates that the 'apartheid' labels 'L1' and 'L2' should be discarded because they imply that black 'natives' are not able to assimilate western language and culture" (cited in Gamaroff, 2000, p.297). It is noteworthy to cite Paikeday's (1985, p.76) views on this matter:

> When theoretical linguists claim an innate facility for competence in a language on behalf of the native speaker … it seems like a white South African's claim that he [or she] can walk into a railway station in Pretoria any day, purchase a first-class ticket, get into any first-class coach, occupy a window seat, and travel all the way to Cape Town without getting thrown out at the first stop, as though a black or a coloured could not do it. (cited in Gamaroff 2000, p.297)

Gamaroff observes that many other authors, in their support of the elimination of the apartheid label of L1 and L2, argue that "it is socially and racially discriminatory to compare levels of proficiency between L1 and L2 learners" (p. 297). Given the sociopolitical difficulties in South Africa, for these authors, this practice of ELT is inherently problematic. It suggests that this practice is power related and implicitly used to maintain the discriminatory nature already rooted in the society.

The role of English and its relation to power in other periphery countries, such as Vietnam and Japan, where English is learnt as a foreign language, also needs to be documented. Vietnam and Japan are selected because Vietnam is considered a developing country whereas Japan is a highly developed nation. The dominant status of English also

varies in these two countries. While English is the most popular foreign language among several other ones to be taught in Vietnam, it is a must for all Japanese students in order to enter university. Moreover, English seems to have influenced Japan in a much deeper level, compared to Vietnam. For example, Japanese tend to believe that in order for them to communicate well in English and to be understood in English they have to have a concrete identity as Japanese (Kawai, 2003, Suzuki, 1999). Moreover, Japanese people's ideologies of English also reflect a deep level of influence of English in Japan (Kubota, 1998). This will be discussed on the part about Japan below.

It should be noted that Vietnam has witnessed the rise and fall of a number of dominant foreign languages in its own territory. Chinese, French, and Russian respectively had once enjoyed dominant foreign language status in Vietnam, but English has replaced Russian since the early 1990s, after the Vietnamese government introduced the open-door policy in 1986. The collapse of the Former Soviet Union after that contributed to the welcoming of English and the decline of Russian in Vietnam. English is introduced at almost all school levels and has been present in almost every corner of urbanised areas and has rapidly reached tourist attractions in remote areas. The early 1990s witnessed the explosive growth of the English language, resulting in "an official acknowledgement of the role and status of English" (Do Huy Thinh, 1999, p.2). The Ministry of Education and Training in Vietnam (MOET) conducted its first survey of language needs in late 1993, contributing to the formation of "A National Strategy for Foreign Language Teaching and Learning throughout All Levels of Education" (MOET, 1994c). The status of foreign languages, especially English, then was "reconfirmed by an Order, signed by the Prime Minister (August 15, 1994), in which government officials are required to study foreign languages, usually English" (Do, 1999, p.2). Do (1999, p.2) strongly states that "in contemporary Vietnam, there has never been a stronger, clearer decision concerning foreign language education policy and planning made at the highest-level authority."

Although English in Vietnam does not seem to have anything to do with social classes, it does act as a gatekeeping tool in the society, particularly with employment and educational opportunities. Almost all jobs require a certificate in English, and even work promotion now starts considering English proficiency a criterion (Nunan, 2003). The high status of English has thus resulted in those who do not have sufficient competency in English feeling excluded from positions which may lead to power.

The sudden replacement of Russian by English in Vietnam has caused the society to have negative attitudes toward Russian, and thus made teachers of Russian struggle for their living. Phan Le Ha and Song-Ae Han (2004) has shown that English and ELT have lent a hand in creating distance and even confrontation between teachers of different languages, particularly teachers of Russian and teachers of English in Vietnam. Teaching and learning English is no longer neutral or politics free.

Japan is a country highly regarded by the West (Pennycook, 1998). As an economic superpower, Japan does not suffer from cultural, economic and structural disadvantages of developing countries. However, it is Japan's ideologies of English that are a matter of concern. As observed by Kubota (1998, p.295)

the dominance of English influences the Japanese language and people's views of language, culture, race, ethnicity and identity which are affected by the world view of native English speakers, and … teaching English creates cultural and linguistic stereotypes not only of English but also of Japanese people.

Thus, "through learning English, the Japanese have identified themselves with Westerners while regarding non-Western peoples as the Other" (p.299). This apparently has to do with whom has power, and hence supports Westernisation (which is often spelt out as internationalisation) while turning a blind eye to "global socio-linguistic perspectives" (p.302). Power does matter and English has been inexhaustibly made use of by all parties to gain power. But within the game of power, English is not an equal property for all.

Together with creating inequalities inside a number of peripheral countries, English as an international language is also used by these countries to judge each other's level of development. I remember when a group of Malaysian tourists came to Vietnam in 1996 and they were astonished to find out that Vietnamese students could speak very good English (I was at university in Vietnam then). They commented "You're so intelligent. You can speak English so fluently. How come you can achieve that? We used to think in Vietnam few people could speak English or knew it, so before we came here we were afraid of facing a lot of problems." They, perhaps, subconsciously related fluency in English with "intelligence" and at the same time assumed that knowing English was more civilised, and thus superior.

After all, whether learning English for good and practical concerns or for other reasons, everyone or every country wants to gain power. If the Centre sets communication norms, such as whose English counts, for the Periphery, then peripheral countries judge each other based very much on how possession of English is connected to development, representation and recognition. Not only does English have sufficient power to be regarded as a measure of ability and mentality to communicate with native English speakers, it also plays a key role in facilitating a country's international integration. Because English is used in regional and international conferences and forums, even Japan is afraid they will be "under represented in the international community" if its leaders are not able to speak English "directly with their counterparts" (L'estrange, 2000, p.11).

From the above discussions of the ownership of English, it is clear that English is not yet a global/world property. No matter how much 'good' English has done in the world, its cultural, political and social aspects together with its continual adherence to imperialism have confirmed its guilt and intentional engagement in 'oppressing' speakers of other languages with the assistance of the ELT industry. However, I do not think the story stops here. English users may be better served by proactively taking ownership of its use and its teaching. English users, particularly non-native speakers of English, will then "be the main agents in the ways English is used, is maintained, and changes, and who will shape the ideologies and beliefs associated with [EIL]" (Seidlhofer, 2003, p.7).

A critical notion of appropriation of EIL

Many authors have been investigating the tendency of English to become a world language, and suggesting the establishment of related critical literacy pedagogies (Canagarajah, 1999; Gee, 1999; Pennycook, 2001; McKay, 2003). Examples can be seen in their efforts to appreciate the role of speakers of other languages in spreading and transforming English into a world language (Modiano, 2001; Brutt-Griffler, 2002). Likewise, a critical approach to second language acquisition has been constructed to destabilise the L1 norms (Cook, 1999; Kramsch, 2000, 2001; McKay, 2003). Alternative teaching methods have been proposed to replace the problematic Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), such as the Context Approach (Bax, 2003). Also, some TESOL courses have been re-designed to make students from non-English-speaking backgrounds aware of how their images have been constructed through English and ELT, and in what way their voices can be heard (for example, in the TESOL course for Masters students offered by the Faculty of Education, Monash University, with the subject Language, Society and Cultural Difference, students are exposed to postcolonial theories and have the chance to challenge the dichotomy of Self and Other).

Let me discuss one point raised by Widdowson (1997) to seek a solution for more 'ethical' English and ELT. I agree with Widdowson that "as the language [in this case, English] is used it cannot be kept under your control" (p.136). People do appropriate it. However, on this point, different views have been expressed. On the one hand, Lin et al., (2001) show that no matter how people appropriate it, the Other is still seen as second-class users of English. These authors suggest a quite fixed story about the Self and Other, in which the Other is always inferior, just because they are the Other speakers of English. The word 'Other' in TESOL already carries this dichotomy and implication. On the other hand, Canagarajah (1999) demonstrates that Sri Lankans have been able to appropriate English for their own purposes taking into account local cultural and political factors. He offers an approach that resists "linguistic imperialism in English teaching" as the title of his book suggests. Pennycook (2001, p.71) also supports Canagarajah's view, suggesting change and possibilities of "third spaces" or "third cultures" (italics in the original), notions that are discussed by Kramsch (1993).

Developing her views in relation to how users of English can appropriate English, Kramsch (2001) stresses the importance of how English language teachers can assist students in acquiring their own voices in using English to "secure a profit of distinction" (italics in the original) (Kramsch, 2001, p.16). She contends that language teachers' responsibility is

> to help students not only become acceptable and listened to users of English by adopting the culturally sanctioned genres, styles, and rhetorical conventions of the English speaking world, but how to gain a profit of distinction by using English in ways that are unique to their multilingual and multicultural sensibilities (Kramsch, 2001, p.16).

The views expressed by Canagarajah (1999), Pennycook (2001) and Kramsch (2001) actually challenge and disrupt linguistic imperialism and the postcolonial

dichotomy of Self and Other. However, they do not reject English. Instead, they support the use of English for one's own benefit and equality, but at the same time urge English users to work together to eliminate the discourses of colonialism active in current imperial forms. These views suggest a new and more sophisticated notion of 'appropriation', which consists of resistance and reconstitution.

Therefore, appropriation, as I would argue, necessitates the Other's awareness of resistance and conscious selection to reach reconstitution under one's own control. Hashimoto (2000) provides an example of how a country resists Western globalisation and English dominance. He argues that "the commitment of the Japanese government to internationalisation in education actually means 'Japanisation' of Japanese learners of English" (p.39). Indeed, the use of English plays an important part in both one's desire to communicate with the world and one's will to preserve one's identity (Kubota, 1998, Pham Hoa Hiep, 2001). It also influences one's perception of one's identity (Kramsch, 2001; Lin et al., 2001). Put differently, English contributes to identity formation, which constitutes both dynamics and the sense of belonging. This notion of appropriation, I believe, would somehow facilitate English to serve global citizens and at the same time would not take their sense of belonging away. However, if only the Other takes up this notion of appropriation, part of the effort is still left unsupported. The Self should also adapt its notion of the ownership of English to this idea of appropriation for the sake of all. In the context of English and ELT, facilitating appropriation by learners of English is part of the job that world English language teachers and applied linguists need to fulfill. If this could be achieved, then the issue of power and the politics of language would become less pressing in the arena of English and ELT.

Before closing this paper, I would like to add one more point to McKay's (2003) appropriate EIL pedagogy. She agrees with Brutt-Griffler (2002) that the recent worldwide spread of English is mainly due to "macroacquisition", the term coined by Brutt-Griffler (2002), and thus this nature necessitates alternative pedagogy for EIL. McKay offers a number of features of EIL, such as many learners of English learn the language for specific purposes and use it in multilingual contexts. They also learn English to communicate their cultures and knowledge with others. She calls for a pedagogy which goes against assumptions commonly held in ELT, that the spread of English is because of linguistic imperialism, that the native speaker model is no longer valid for learning and teaching goals, and that the focus on only the native speaker's culture is no longer beneficial to both teachers and learners. I agree with McKay's (2003) points, however, I want to emphasise that when it comes to academic assessment, users of English will normally lose their sense of 'owning the tongue' or at least feel insecure. Still, certain norms are employed to make judgements, and thus certain power is exercised. So the point here is that if we all work hard for an EIL and for fairness in the teaching and learning of EIL but do not have the same attitudes towards academic assessment, then our efforts will be in vain. Likewise, as long as non-native teachers of English "are still anchored in the old native-speaker dominated framework" and "non-native speakers of English are not conscious of being speakers of EIL" (Llurda, 2004, pp. 319-20), EIL will not be recognised and appreciated.

So I suggest, together with encouraging and valuing users' appropriation of English, TESOL workers also need to promote an EIL pedagogy in which the teaching and learning of EIL should involve valuing and nurturing the expression of other cultural voices in English, making explicit the values that support judgements about 'good' English and individual ability, and helping students to construct identities as owners, meaning makers, and authorised users of EIL.

References

Ballard, B. & Clanchy, J. (1991). Assessment by misconception: Cultural influences and intellectual traditions. In L. Hamp-Lyons (Ed.), *Assessing second language writing in academic contexts* (pp. 19-34). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Ballard, B. & Clanchy, J. (1997). Teaching international students: A brief guide for lecturers and supervisors. Deakin, ACT: IDP Education Australia.

Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal, 57*(2), 278-287.

Brutt-Griffler, J. (1998). Comments and reply: Conceptual questions in English as a world language: taking up an issue. *World Englishes, 17*(3), 381-392.

Brutt-Griffler, J. & Samimy, K. (1999). Revisiting the colonial in the postcolonial: critical praxis for nonnative-English-speaking teachers in a TESOL program. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 413-29.

Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002). *World English: A study of its development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, A.S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly,33*(2), 185-210.

Do, Huy Thinh (1999*). Foreign language education policy in Vietnam: the emergence of English and its impact on higher education. In J. Shaw, D. Lubelska and M. Noullet (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourth   International Conference on Language and Development, Hanoi.* Retrieved August 15, 2004 from http://www.languages.ait.ac.th/hanoi_proceedings/proceedings.htm

Farrell, L. (1997a). Doing well…doing badly: An analysis of the role of conflicting cultural values in judgments of relative "academic achievement." In A. Duszak, (Ed.), *Culture and styles of academic discourse*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Farrell, L. (1997b). Making grades. *Australian Journal of Education, 41*(2), 134-49.

Farrell, L. (1998). Back to the future: School examinations, fairness and the question of identity. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 25*(2).

Gamaroff, R. (2000). ESL and linguistic apartheid. *ELT Journal, 54*(3), 297-98.

Gee, J.P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: theory and method.* London: Routledge.

Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Representation: cultural representations and signifying practices.* London: Sage Publications in association with The Open University.

Hashimoto, K. (2000). 'Internationalisation' is 'Japanisation': Japan's foreign language education and national identity. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 21*(1), 39-51.

Johnston, B. (2003). *Values in English language teaching.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kachru, B.B. (1986). *The alchemy of English. The spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Kachru, B.B. (1997). World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 17*, 66-87.

Kaplan, R. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning, 16(1&2),* 1-20.

Kawai, H. (2003). Nihon bunka to kojin. In H. Kaiwai (Ed.), *Kojin no tankyu: Nihon bunka no nakade* (pp. 1-11). Tokyo: Nihon Hoso Kyokai Shuppankai.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (2000). Second language acquisition, applied linguistics, and the teaching of foreign languages. *The Modern Language Journal, 84*(iii), 311-26.

Kramsch, C. (2001). Language, culture, and voice in the teaching of English as a foreign language. *NovELTy: A Journal of English Language Teaching and Cultural Studies in Hungary, 8*(1), 4-21.

Kubota, R. (1998). Ideologies of English in Japan. *World Englishes, 17*(3), 295-306.

L'estrange, M. (2000). Learning is lost in the translation: Lots of Japanese study English. But how many could really be said to have mastered it? Australia: *Education Age*, Wednesday, July 26, 2000, p. 11.

Liddicoat, A. (1997). Communicating within cultures, communicating across cultures, communication between cultures. In Z. Golebiowske, & H. Borland, (Ed.),

Academic communication across disciplines and cultures. Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia.

Lin, A. et al., (2001). *Absent voices: Appropriated language, expanded identities, and re-imagine storylines.* Paper presented in the International Conference on Postcolonialism and Education (University of Queensland, Australia, August 17-19).

Liu, D. (1998). Ethnocentrism in TESOL: teacher education and the neglected needs of international TESOL students. *ELT Journal, 52*(1), 3-9.

Llurda, E. (2004). Non-native-speaker teachers and English as an International Language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 14*(3), 314-23.

McArthur, T. (1998). *The English languages*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McKay, S. L. (2003). Toward an appropriate EIL pedagogy: Re-examining common ELT assumptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13*(1), 1-22.

Modiano, M. (2001). Linguistic imperialism, cultural integrity, and EIL. *ELT Journal, 55*(4), 339-46.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. New York: Longman.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London: Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pennycook, A. & Coutand-Marin, S. (2004). Teaching English as a missionary language. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education, 24*(3), 337-53.

Pham, Hoa Hiep (2001). A second look at the question of the ownership of English. *Teacher's Edition, 7*, 4-9.

Phan Le Ha (2000). *Different voices: Participants' comparisons of Vietnamese and English academic writing*. Paper presented at the LASU Conference (La Trobe University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia).

Phan Le Ha (2001). How do culturally situated notions of "polite" forms influence the way Vietnamese postgraduate students write academic English in Australia? *Australian Journal of Education, 45*(3), 296-308.

Phan Le Ha & Viete, R. (2002). *The growth of voice: negotiating representations of self in research writing.* Paper presented at the 2nd International "Knowledge and Discourse" Conference (The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, June 25-29).

Phan Le Ha (2004). University classrooms in Vietnam: Contesting the stereotypes. *ELT Journal 58*(1), 50-7.

Phan Le Ha & Han Song-Ae (2004). *Two perspectives – Vietnamese and Korean – on English as an international language.* Paper presented in the Faculty of Education Seminar, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Quirk, R. (1987). The question of standards in the international use of English. In P. Lowenberg, (Ed.), (pp. 229-241).

Ramanathan, V. (1999). "English is here to stay": A critical look at institutional and educational practices in India. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(2), 211-230.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 133-58.

Seidlhofer, B. (2003). *A concept of international English and related issues: From 'real English' to 'realistic English'?* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Suzuki, T. (1999). *Nihonjin wa naze eigo ga dekinainoka.* Tokyo: Iwanami Shinsho.

Widdowson, H. G. (1997). The forum: EIL, ESL, EFL: Global issues and local interests. *World Englishes, 16*(1), 135-46.

Widdowson, H. G. (1998). EIL: Squaring the circles. A reply. *World Englishes,17*(3), 397-401.