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Foreword by Dr. Ahmet Acar

Welcome to the first issue of the Journal of English as an International Language. The study of EIL does not cover a single area but it is rather a composite discipline covering the issues of the global spread of English; the impact of native English(es) on local cultures and languages, and the impact of local cultures and languages on native English(es); phonological, lexical, grammatical and discoursal variations in English(es); the perceptions of these variations; intelligibility; corpus studies; bilingualism, multilingualism; language standards; and teaching issues. At one point this research area has made considerable progress and at another it is at its early stage since there is not yet a single definition of EIL. The future, however, seems to be fruitful and we expect to get much benefit from this research field especially for the pedagogical issues. This first issue already covers very interesting and stimulating papers and we hope to receive more papers from researchers and teachers.

The first paper is presented by David Nunan. Task-based language learning is one of the mostly discussed topics in the profession at the present time, more recently within the framework of EIL. In this first issue, David Nunan, in his attempt to examine the teaching of English across the Asian region, argues that “We need to look deeply at times into the specific needs of learners in Asia and the Pacific region who we cannot forget are still very much living in local contexts -not only an evidently increasingly global one”. He contends that task-based learning seems to be a possible approach which can meet a wide range of cross-regional needs.

The other critical concept within the domain of EIL is the issue of competence. Recently we have often witnessed criticisms about the appropriateness of the notion of communicative competence based on idealised native speakers as a teaching goal in non-native English contexts. In this context, Roger Nunn, in his stimulating paper, calls for a need to define competence in relation to English as an International Language. While examining different models of competence in relation to EIL, Nunn argues that “linguistic competence has yet to be adequately addressed in recent considerations of EIL.”

The third article by Zumbarlal Namdeorao Patil aims at presenting a “panoramic view of the nature and role of English in Asia”. The key points addressed in his paper are “the global diffusion of English, perceptions of the new varieties, the issue of intelligibility, features that cause unintelligibility, need for a broader pragmatics, and pedagogical implications”. Patil examines “the traditional, one-sided, native speaker-centred idea of intelligibility and the recent two-sided view of intelligibility that places the onus on both the native speaker and the non-native speaker.”

Phan Le Ha, in the fourth article, argues that “although users of English, to various extents, have been able to appropriate the language for their own purposes, 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.”

My own article presents a re-examination of the theoretical assumptions and practices of task based language teaching and learning within the framework of English as an international language. In my paper, I maintain the traditional distinction between syllabus design and methodology and claim that the specification of learning tasks should be considered as part of methodology and not of syllabus design. Possible features of EIL syllabus design are outlined in line with the need to take EIL competence and learners' purpose in learning the language as a point of reference.

The sixth article presented by Joanne Rajadurai critically re-examines Kachru’s famous Three Concentric Circles model, and “discusses some of its intrinsic and perhaps unforeseen shortcomings, typified in its centre-periphery framework and its geo-historic bases”. Thus Rajadurai presents a different Three Circle model: “While acknowledging the fuzzy distinctions between circles, in principle, the inner circle could comprise all users who are proficient in English and able to instinctively code-switch between international and national or regional varieties to communicate in the most appropriate way. The second circle could consist of speakers who are proficient only in regional varieties, i.e. native and non-native speakers with restricted intranational proficiency, while the outer circle could be made up of learners of the language.”

Leila B. Iyldyz, in her paper “Rethinking Validity of the L2 Proficiency Concept: Lessons for EIL”, responds to Nunn’s article, which calls for a need to define competence in relation to EIL. Iyldyz argues that “before establishing the boundaries and categories for the concept of EIL and developing a proper “EIL competence” framework, educationalists should return to the origins of the “proficiency” concept which has been theoretically debated and empirically investigated for at least half a century.” The paper mainly pursues three aims: “to increase awareness of the debatable issues on the concept of “proficiency”, to attempt to undermine the concept and indicate some specific areas for consideration of the concept of “EIL competence”.”
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We need to look deeply at times into the specific needs of learners in Asia and the Pacific region who we cannot forget are still very much living in local contexts -not only an evidently increasingly global one. That being said, there is much to learn from these studies that can be borrowed and lent across a number of frontiers. Further, it is evident that we must not exclude research into second language learning because of its geographical or cultural source. That has to underlay an important part of the integrity of research and this book is very much devoted to that principle.

One approach, that does seem to meet a wide range of cross-regional needs and to which a number of the authors deal with directly or indirectly is one to which I have continuously been drawing attention and analysis for more than two decades. It is that of task based learning. Interestingly, its popularity is accelerating in East Asia as well as elsewhere. A demonstration of this is the fact that I was asked by the Chinese Government to prepare a new task based publication for the English curriculum. China represents, as Li (2004) states in his included work, the world's largest source of English learners, let alone the largest segment of EFL learners anywhere in the world.

India with its huge population and apparent new boom for English learning as mentioned by Gupta (2005) is also a large beacon of English learning. Just these two countries alone and their appetites for English education give us a new sense of the increased diversity of language ownership; something Phan Le Ha (2005) touches on in her article on the internationalization of the language and non-natives increasing critical role in teaching, development and learning. It signals the reality that those
learning English will be significantly centered around or originating from Asia.

Therefore educators need evermore to recognize the importance and distinctive context based needs of those requiring education in English outside the traditional native speaker contexts. This is not inherently contradictory with those with persistent arguments that many general principles of acquisition should be understood and appropriately applied by educators within their distinctive classroom settings and communities.

In keeping with such thoughts, I believe it can be reasonably well argued that the task based teaching as I have largely described in various publications -more recently, "An introduction to Task Based Teaching", 2004, Cambridge University Press- does provide a flexible, functionally compatible and contextually sensitive approach for many learners, as well as teachers. There may not be a magic approach anywhere for this region or others, but let us look at some of the attractive features of task based learning. It offers the potential for the following:

1. A replacement to or a supportive infusion of more student centered learning to certain single approach based syllabi.
2. Utilizing more authentic experiences and materials as well as principles of constructivism compared to top down teaching.
3. More of a sense of personal and active accomplishment including developing a greater sense of language ownership.
4. Increased student participation when task teaching is well planned and implemented sensitive to learners' learning styles, learning and communicative strategies, personalities, multiple intelligences and the overall local contexts, for example.
5. Making specific lesson goals more evident through movement towards and/or success of task completion.
6. Important and ongoing assessment and "washback" to both teacher and learner.

Tasks, well chosen and developed which are centered around relevant acquisition principles, as well as sensitive to context have also the potential to lessen the need for test cramming and excessive reliance on a result/test based oriented syllabi. Cramming, described by Poole (2003) in the Asian EFL Journal amongst others as part of an "Exam Hell" represents a significant phenomenon in a large part of Asia. Further, a result based syllabus, especially one with a narrow focus on grammar-translation and reading and vocabulary may not provide a full set of language skills needed by various L2 learners including those wishing to become communicatively capable.

Tasks can be also fun and highly student centered when borrowing on effective games and other such activities though task is not a substitute word for games. Where students are conscious of marks, including many Asian high school students, if tasks are not clearly supportive of good grades, they may find such exercises as either irrelevant or even label them as bad teaching. For games may not be always supportive of important curricular goals. Nevertheless, it can be argued that putting fun (back) into learning represents positive motivation that can achieve even worthwhile outcomes in respect to the curriculum. It is really difficult to think of most learners whatever their context as appreciating boring teaching on a sustained basis.
It is also learners’ complaints that that they do not always understand the teaching goals through teacher centered lectures that make task based teaching potentially dynamic for learning. Such task approaches can represent to students not only achieving the better learning of a language item but in organizing time effectively, learning to work cooperatively - an important Asian value- and using a variety of intelligences and skills such as computer mediation. Thus, students can become cognitively and pragmatically more fully engaged which can reduce tedium and make class work more challenging and relevant to their wider needs and interests.

Again, too many students in the region and elsewhere may become overly committed to rote, passive approaches and formulaic thinking associated with certain multiple choice questions that are simply re-stylized from practice tests. Combined within a teacher centered, top down approach, students may simply associate English with a kind of assembly line and formulaic work to be tolerated but not to be enjoyed. The end result is that English becomes firmly embedded within some students thinking as a chore and not really being authentic enough to act as a door to a whole new world of possibilities, career or otherwise -be it in the business world or other sectors. Rather, many students in Asia and elsewhere may, see their own world and future successes in terms of fulfilling tasks especially when the teacher reinforces such a link with practical activities.

It is not to argue against there being merit at times for the grammar-translation, audio-lingual approaches or lexical approaches, many of which remain popular and central to quite a few teachers in the region. Learners' needs, proficiency, teacher competency and confidence, government policy and a host of other factors may determine the validity of how instructors best deal with instructed learning.

In fact, Chew (2005) in her article on reviewing the evolution of syllabi in Singaporean English education, indicates that the single centered approach to a syllabus may be ebbing, increasingly substituted by a more eclectic one. Whether this experience will be replicated in other countries in the region, may be difficult to exactly say. It may be that we are in a period of the "end of methods". But like others in different social sciences who harkened the end of ideology, it may be more prudent to view change as largely evolutionary with recurring ebbs and flows depending upon the current contextual streams of challenges.

However, the attractiveness of task based learning relates not only to the enumerated benefits. It provides rather a useful practice that that can be applied across many approaches, as well as boundaries. Task based learning may provide an enduring legacy that meets the test of time. It may also provide a curricular and syllabus framework of flexibility that logically students and teachers will be drawn to even if it need not be the central leitmotif for certain places.

For example, tasks could include, completing a grammar bingo game after a contrastive analysis, grammar-translation based presentation. Subsequently, task based communicative teaching practices could be supported to incorporate the appropriate grammar into developing two way oral skills through an interview exercise. Again, the task approach does not deny that in some Asian classes - or anywhere in the world for that matter- that certain traditional approaches need to have their day. Rather it is especially supportive of an integrated approach, or even where the needs of the learner may be solely communicative. However, again task selection and development is the key to better ensure specific needs are met. In
doing this, the educator needs to be conscious of principles and aspects of acquisition.

In this respect Ellis, (2005) has so well summarized here with authority and clarity the general understanding in the profession on instructed language learning. We are further faced with the fact that the true task of learning a second language in the many EFL environments that Asian learners find themselves are removed from a lot of "naturalistic", non-classroom, English speaking settings. Such an understanding of these realities and the principles that surround realistic classroom learning can be of service to classroom teachers wondering what methods, approaches and practices to choose at a specific time. It reminds us of the value of the extensive reading programmes to which Helgesen (2005) alludes can be so useful for Asian learners where they are limited in their accessibility to communicative English in a natural environment.

Teachers in such contexts may need to be reminded, at times to extend the task work outside the classroom with proper direction that permits students to develop independent learning skills that facilitate students to do the extensive work necessary to gain fluency. In cultures where top down approaches are in the main, instructors be they native teachers or not, need to be cognizant of these realities and limitations. We can not simply, for example, put all learners on the Internet or through CALL, clap our hands and say "go to it". Again learning context, as related to acquisition can be highly relevant, which Ellis (2005) would seem to imply.

Countries that have ESL environments, some of which appear comparatively advanced in terms of their English education systems such as Singapore and Hong Kong, may for historical or special leadership reasons have cultivated English as a second language. Here students may have to be approached differently in general as they may be better motivated through seeing English on a daily basis in coming to terms as to why they may be spending more than a thousand hours to learn it within the school system. They may also have more opportunities to integrate classroom learning into day to day usage if not immediately then possibly in the relatively near future when they obtain employment. Task work in such circumstances can even draw on giving real world assignments of surveying store managers and others in English that extend instruction quantitatively to a level that helps develop real authentic competency.

Simply speaking, English is not foreign to all parts of the region. This should draw more Asian educators towards thinking about what techniques and experiences within their own region itself that can be borrowed and/or adapted from places like Hong Kong. This is a place I know personally for its significant daily use of English especially in the professional areas.

Whatever one argues is precisely workable, there is no denying that the future of English education, as so well discussed by the likes of Ellis, (2005) Chew, (2005) Helgesen (2005) and many others at the Asian EFL Journal Conference (2005) is well secured in respect to its growth.
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Abstract:
Roger Nunn considers different types of competence in relation to the teaching of English as an International Language, arguing that linguistic competence has yet to be adequately addressed in recent considerations of EIL. The paper first discusses the need to reconsider the scope of 'communicative competence' and then goes on to consider other kinds of competence relevant to EIL including linguistic competence. It critically examines demographic descriptions of World English use in relation to competence and discusses the kinds of competence that are embodied in the corpora that are currently being used for the development of teaching materials. This paper is intended to stimulate discussion in the Asian EFL journal about 'competence' and the teaching of English as an International Language.

Introduction
For English language educators, the most problematic aspect of defining English as an international language remains the notion of competence. This paper, proposed as an introduction to a long term project aiming at defining competence for EIL more fully, will attempt to introduce the issues in order to stimulate debate in the Asian EFL context and particularly, it is hoped, in the pages of this journal on the issue of competence in EIL education.

On the one hand, "international" communication seems to require multiple competences. Studies of pragmatic and discourse competences, that focus on the process of achieving mutual intelligibility in whole spoken or written texts, are assuming increasing significance. (See, for example McKay, 2002, pp. 49-76). In addition, developing the kind of strategic competence that has already been highlighted as an important aspect of "communicative competence" (e.g., Kasper
and Kellerman, 1997, Bachman, 1990), is also inevitably worthy of renewed attention, as international communication seems to require the ability to adjust to almost infinitely diverse intercultural communication situations. Traditionally, however, "communicative competence" (Hymes, 1972) has been used to refer to the adaptation to single and well-established speech communities. Preparing for communication between people from a broad range of backgrounds, who will often communicate beyond their own or their interlocutors' speech communities in some kind of ill-defined third zone, implies the need to have a highly developed repertoire of communication strategies.

Although an increased focus on multiple competences is both necessary and inevitable, a related concern is that there is a danger of "international" becoming a byword for reduced linguistic competence. For language teachers, "knowing" a language has not commonly been a question of pragmatic or strategic competence, yet linguistic competence has still to be adequately addressed in discussions of so-called "International English". Indeed, some would argue (e.g., Acar, 2005) that it has never been adequately addressed throughout the so-called "communicative" era. Considering English as a language increasingly used for international communication is not the same as defining English as an "International Language". To become competent in a language, it has always been assumed that there is a body of linguistic knowledge that needs to be learned, whether this be phonological, grammatical or lexical, often in relation to particular speech communities.

**Communicative Competence for International Communication**

As Kasper (1997, p.345) points out, "in applied linguistics, models of communicative competence serve as goal specifications for L2 teaching and testing." The notion of 'communicative competence' as applied to language teaching theory (Hymes 1972) needs to be reconsidered for the teaching of English for international communication. Richards et. al. (1985, p.48) suggested that a communicative approach foregrounded "communicative competence" as "the goal of language teaching". Working from an ethnographic perspective, Hymes emphasized the way language was used in speech communities, arguing that there were, "rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless." (Hymes 1972, in Brumfit and Johnson 1979, p.14). The change of emphasis in language teaching theory, while not always followed in practice, towards a more "communicative" approach was partly dependent on the influence of this view of language.

An important notion of communicative competence is "appropriateness". Hymes (1980, p.49) argued that "appropriateness" was a "universal of speech", related to the social codes of speech communities, what he refers to (p.42) as "shared understandings of rights and duties, norms of interactions, grounds of authority, and the like." For Hymes, communication is "pre-structured by the history and ways of those among whom one inquires." (p.74) Learning to communicate "appropriately" has sometimes been taken to imply learning to fit into a particular way of communicating in a target community. Learning might, for example, have focused among other things on the appropriate use of speech acts as social functions used in particular speech communities, such as how to give and receive invitations or how to apologize. Students' own norms would then be seen as inappropriate, interfering with successful communication in a target culture.

It is not new for teachers to challenge this view when carried to extremes, resulting in unconscious cultural imperialism in the very situations where the
opposite is intended. In 1984, for example, I found myself in the unreal situation of being required to teach the kind of indirect requests to Bedouin Arab students I could never remember using myself during my Northern English upbringing, but which we British were thought to use, such as, "I wonder if you could direct me to the station?" This approach may have been and may still be justifiable, for example, in language schools where students are learning English in Britain to use in Britain or for professional training. However, in the more varied and unpredictable contexts in which many students will use English in this new century, it is clearly inappropriate to teach language that is only appropriate in limited situations in a target culture that may never be visited by the students. What constitutes making an "appropriate" contribution in international communication cannot be defined in terms of a single speech community and there is no such thing as a global speech community in any definable sense.

Work already available for more than twenty years has not neglected the kind of competences needed for international communication. Canale and Swain's (1980) and Canale's (1983) four-part framework included linguistic, socio-linguistic, discourse and strategic competences. Bachman (1990) and Bachman and Palmer (1996) include grammatical competence, which encompasses vocabulary, syntax morphology and phonemes/ graphemes (See Skehan 1998, pp. 157-164 for a full discussion). In this discussion we can identify an important distinction between what we could term linguistic knowledge and abilities which enable us to better apply or compensate for lacunae in linguistic abilities. (See Kasper and Kellerman, 1997).

Applying linguistic competence involves the activation of a body of knowledge that has been learned and stored in memory for retrieval. Performance will never reflect the full body of knowledge available to a language user, because many other factors from the situation will intervene, whether they be psychological (e.g., stress), physiological (fatigue), social (group dynamics or power dynamics), situational or genre related requiring specialized situational knowledge or non-standard language, (hospital appointments, business meetings), cultural (valuing reduced communication, such as silence or understatement) or task-related (complexity, difficulty). Nevertheless, acquiring a body of linguistic knowledge for use is an essential part of any language learning. In this early stage of the development of our understanding of international English, there is unity in diversity in that there can be no agreed body of standard English available to be taught or learnt. Very diverse arguments about what should be learnt are available. Usable descriptions whether in the form of corpora, grammars, dictionaries are increasingly well-developed for native varieties of English (inner-circle), but there is as yet no notion of how to develop a body of standard grammatical English in the expanding circle countries. Yet competence in a language, whether labelled international or not, does require linguistic competence.

Predicting the Future
McKay (2002, p.127) underlines the inevitability of changes that will naturally occur in "English" as a result of its international role, stating, "those changes that do not impede intelligibility should be recognized as one of the natural consequences of the use of English as an international language." But, there can be no "academy" acting as a "big brother" to regulate and to impose a unified notion of competence on the world's English speakers. A pluralistic notion of "World Englishes" is easier to justify and valuable work is being done to describe different varieties in works such as
Melchers and Shaw (2003) and McArthur (2002) who provide encyclopaedic descriptive evidence of different varieties of English around the world.

It is important to note that broad non-commercial endeavours need to remain extremely modest in the face of the enormity of the descriptive task. Melchers and Shaw (p.x) readily acknowledge that "although we have found all varieties rich and fascinating, it is inevitable that our personal knowledge and experience is not evenly distributed." Importantly, global-minded scholars such as Melchers and Shaw are the first to recognize, as we all must, that in any cross-cultural endeavour we remain "prisoners of our prejudices" (p.x.).

The development of "English" and "Englishes" is more easily seen as a natural organic development, both difficult to predict and impossible to control. For educators, however, the relationship between "intelligibility" and linguistic "competence" remains problematic. Achieving "intelligibility" in particular intercultural speech events depends on important pragmatic and intercultural abilities and is sometimes possible between people using not only different linguistic norms, but also between people with widely different levels of linguistic competence. Pragmatic failure is also regularly observed between people who have excellent linguistic knowledge. (See, for example, Moeschler, 2004, who argues that linguistic competence can actually impede pragmatic understanding in intercultural situations.)

Furthermore, it is difficult to see linguistic competence as just knowledge of an impervious, independent linguistic system when it is applied to use. It is far from easy to dissociate many features of linguistic competence from pragmatic, discourse and even strategic competences. Interlocutors are constantly called upon to make appropriate linguistic choices that are sensitive to the dynamic aspects of context as their communication progresses. An utterance may embody an inappropriate linguistic choice of, for example, article use or modality, without there being any internal structural linguistic problem.

A further aspect of linguistic competence to consider is bilingual and multilingual competence. More than half the world's population is not monolingual. Crystal (2003, p.51) implies that bilingual competence is something less, rather than something more, than monolingual ability.

Definitions of bilingualism reflect assumptions about the degree of proficiency people must achieve before they qualify as bilingual (whether comparable to a monolingual native speaker, or something less than this, even to the extent of minimal knowledge of a second language).

McKay, (2002, pp. 34-47) argues strongly that native competence is inappropriate as a goal of EIL, but does not define native, bilingual or EIL competence. Transitional views of competence are inappropriate in so far as they imply replacing one monolingual competence with another, whereas SL, FL and IL learners are adding to and maintaining existing competences (Baker, 2000 and 2002). For educational settings, Baker (2000, p. 78) makes a useful distinction between BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (Cognitive/ Academic Language Proficiency).

To counter the negative impact of the dominance of English on other languages it is becoming increasingly important to think of trilingual competence as an aim.
Paradoxically, however, EIL use is almost always in monolingual situations, between people who have no other *lingua franca*. The implication is that a learning process is needed that develops bilingualism or multilingualism at the same time as maximizing monolingual input and output.

EIL competence, then, cannot be reduced to a single, limited, monolingual or mono-cultural concept. It is composed of a set of interlocking and interdependent competences that sometimes compensate for each other, sometimes counteract each other and sometimes reinforce each other. A normal human being and even a gifted communicator and linguist cannot expect to possess it totally. However, while acknowledging this reality, linguistic competence is in danger of being sidelined in considerations of EIL pedagogy.

**Statistics and EIL Competence**

While demographic statistics provide the evidence for redefining English as an International language, broad demographic surveys do not provide clear information about competence. The status of English as a "Language of International Communication" is no longer in dispute and rarely attracts the kind of critical scrutiny that an emerging field of inquiry requires. Important conceptualizations such as Kachru’s (1985) three concentric circles, ('inner', where English is used as a first language, 'outer', where it is used as a second official language and 'expanding', where it is still classified as a foreign language) also require further scrutiny in relation to competence. Modiano (1999), for example, importantly suggests that Kachru's circles appear to predetermine competence according to nationality and argues that competence should be determined independently of origin. The key factor is the increase of the relative use of English across non-native settings compared to its use within native settings or between native and non-native settings.

Crystal (1997, p.22) points out that "the speed with which a global language scenario has arisen is truly remarkable". The so-called "expanding circle" of foreign language speakers was said to include more than 750 million EFL speakers in 1997, compared to 375 million first-language speakers and 375 million second language speakers. A critical point of no return has been reached in that the number of English users is developing at a faster rate as a language of international communication than as a language of intra-national communication. The extent to which intra-cultural use has been surpassed by intercultural use is difficult to estimate exactly (See Crystal, 2004, pp.7-10, 1997, pp.53-63 and Graddol, 1999, pp.58-68) on the methods and difficulties of interpreting global statistics. A more recent IATEFL publication even suggests that communication between non-native speakers now represents 80% of global English use. (Finster, in Pulversness 2004, p.9).

Although Crystal (1997) and Graddol (1999) have often been cited on the global dimensions of English, both insist that available statistics represent no more than estimates and that figures alone do not provide a full or clear picture. Melchers and Shaw (2003, pp.8-9) point out that "the EFL category is particularly difficult to pinpoint: it really depends on what level of proficiency a person should have to qualify as a speaker of English".

It is nonetheless important to have some picture of the dimensions in terms of quantity. The U.S. Bureau of the Census, International Data Base [http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/idbnew.html](http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/idbnew.html) estimated the world population at around six billion. (5,844, 270,952 in 1997, to match Crystal's English language
estimates, 6,445,576,554 in the year 2005.) They estimate growth to around nine billion by the year 2050. Crystal (1997, p. 60) estimates that "well over a third" of the world population (2,025 million in 1997) were "routinely exposed to English". Crystal warns that "only a proportion of these people actually have some command of English." Identifying only two broad categories, "native or native-like command" and "reasonable competence", he advises caution in estimating 'competence'.

If we are cautious by temperament, we will add these statistics together by choosing the lowest estimates in each category: in this way we shall end up with a grand total of 670 million people with a native or native-like command of English. If we go to the opposite extreme, and use a criterion of 'reasonable competence' rather than 'native-like fluency', we shall end up with a grand total of 1,800 million. A 'middle-of-the-road' estimate would be 1,200 - 1,500 million ...

This 'middle-of-the road' estimate, means that about 20-25% of the world's population possess 'reasonable competence'. However, 'competence' here is only a vague, sub-theoretical construct with no clear definition. Crystal, for example, assumes "a reasonable level of attainment" (1997, p.55) in countries where English has official status and where it is taught in schools, for all those who have completed secondary or further education and are over the age of 25. Crystal's more recent publications do not radically change these figures. Crystal (2003, p.9) for example, estimates that about a quarter of the world's population (1,400 million, including "600 million or so who use it as a foreign language") have at least 'reasonable' competence in conversation, adding that "no other language is used so extensively - either numerically, or with such geographical reach".

The outcome of both Crystal and Graddol's discussions is that Kachru's three-way classification of inner circle, outer circle and expanding circle countries can only be a starting point in considerations of competence. Although linguists tend to favour acceptance of the notion of competence in relation to varieties of English, of world "Englishes" that extend far beyond an 'inner circle', competence cannot easily be related to linguistic demographics. Within the "outer" circle, there are a wide variety of situations, in which competence is difficult to estimate. Even the amount of English used within multilingual settings is difficult to pin down. In India, for example, a Malayalam speaker from the south may not speak the official Hindi tongue so may use English as a lingua franca with speakers of one of the other sixteen Indian languages. A colonial past may provide hostility towards the language of the former colonialists, but pragmatism often prevails, with English being the most useful tool as a kind of lingua franca (see Gupta, 2005). There are huge variations in the role of English and the number of competent speakers between the fifty or so countries that are classified for convenience in this category.

Most significant for this discussion is the third group of the so-called "expanding circle" of countries, in which English is a foreign language, but with a difference. In many such countries, it is unrealistic to consider that international communication can be conducted only in the national language. Some of these countries have come to accept just one foreign language, English, as the most convenient means of international communication. Crystal (1997, p. 56) points out that Kachru's three concentric circles, while representing a breakthrough in our conception of global English use, can mask some important realities if the notion of competence is invoked. Northern European countries, such as the Netherlands and Scandinavian
countries are classified as expanding circle countries. "There is much more use of English nowadays in some countries of the expanding circle, where it is 'only' a foreign language ..., than in some of the countries where it has traditionally held a special place". Nunan (in Robertson et. al. 2005, p. 8) suggests that in an Asian context too, it makes more sense to refer simply to "learning English" than to EFL or ESL.

Crystal (1997, p.55) was careful to point out the dangers of "hidden assumptions" and underlines the difficulty of drawing firm conclusions from the diverse statistical estimates available. How do compilers of linguistic demographics consider the notion of "competence"? For outer circle countries where English has an official status, we have noted that Crystal considers that those who have completed secondary education will have "a reasonable level of attainment". While useful as a starting point for global estimates, it is still necessary to underline the fact that competence is not rigorously defined in estimates of global English use. Crystal repeatedly affirms (see for example p. 61) the difficulty of acquiring accurate estimates. Careful use of modality is of the essence: "Even a small percentage increase in the number of speakers thought to have a reasonable (rather than a fluent) command of English would considerably expand the L2 grand total. A figure of 350 million is in fact widely cited as a likely total for this category". As Crystal (1997, p.5) points out, "why a language becomes a global language has little to do with the number of people who speak it. It is much more to do with who those speakers are." If all English speakers were located on one continent or in only one geographical area for example, this would reduce the importance of the figures. Only French and English are spoken as native languages on five continents.

As stated above, the main factor in according a 'global' status to English is also highly significant for the notion of competence. This is the fact that non-native use of English appears to be rivalling if not overtaking native use in terms of quantity. Again the statistical evidence needs to be considered with caution. It is not possible to estimate accurately the quantity of English spoken by any particular group of speakers or between any particular groups. Another factor not taken into account is the proportion of non-native English that speakers are routinely exposed to in terms of listening and reading. Here we must consider films, television, books, newspapers and other media sources.

Much is made of the number of non-natives using English surpassing the number of native users, but this masks another reality which is rarely expressed because, while it could be seen as a professional duty to expose local realities as a basis for meaningful curriculum development, it is not considered politically correct to do so. Many nationals of many expanding circle countries still do not possess competence or confidence to communicate in English and are unlikely ever to do so. For the majority, global communication is a potential that is never realized.

There is little that can be done to confront global estimates critically without resorting to anecdotal local experience. However inadequate anecdotal or incomplete local experiential 'evidence' might be, it does help put global figures in perspective. While 'completing high school' is not a criterion for even basic estimates of competence in expanding circle countries, we might expect that a large proportion of those high school students who gain acceptance to university would all have "reasonable" competence in economically developed countries such as Japan. However, a placement test at the author's own university given to all new entrants to
assess their ability to take part in a basic conversation (see Baker's (2000, p.78) category of BICS, cited above) indicates that around 30% of such students can demonstrate no ability to participate in a simple small-group conversation on everyday topics and only around 25% possess usable competence at lower intermediate level or above.

Summary of 2003 University Placement Test Results According to Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper intermediate</td>
<td>29 (6%)</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
<td>34 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Intermediate</td>
<td>141 (28%)</td>
<td>64 (14%)</td>
<td>205 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post elementary</td>
<td>207 (41%)</td>
<td>221 (48%)</td>
<td>428 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False beginners</td>
<td>122 (24%)</td>
<td>168 (37%)</td>
<td>290 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Based on performance rating scales described in Nunn and Lingley, 2004)

While wider scale investigation is needed and we can in no way generalize such findings to the population of the world's expanding circle countries, it is hard to imagine that the figures are unique to one situation to the extent that all other Japanese high school graduates possess basic communication ability in English.

The implications of English as an International Language are extremely varied and have only just started to be seriously considered un-polemically. The emerging reality is that English 'no longer belongs to its natives'. It is not so much that natives are suddenly being dispossessed, but more that non-natives are increasingly becoming 'possessed'. (See Phan Le Han, 2005 for a fuller discussion.) No language per se belongs exclusively to anyone unless political restrictions are imposed on who may use it. A language is part of the identity of anyone who is able to use it and competence also reflects the degree to which we "possess" a language. It still belongs in an essential way to its natives and they belong to it, to the extent that it is their main and inescapable means of communication and a deep and basic part of their cultural identity. However, as Graddol (1999, p. 68) emphasizes, "native" use of English is declining statistically and norms of use can no longer be codified as independent mono-cultural or mono-linguistic units.

Bewildering diversity inevitably leads towards a consideration of what constitutes a teachable standard. McArthur (in an interview reported in Graddol et al., 1999, p.4) underlines the dilemma stating, "we all use it in different ways; we all approximate to something which isn't there, but which we idealise about, negotiate and compromise." McArthur (pp. 4-5) identifies East Asia as an example of an area where "the entire middle class seems to want English for their children as an international vehicle which they can use with the rest of the world - it's not a British or an American thing." Crystal (p.137) puts forward the notion of a "World Standard Spoken English (WSSE)" which is still so much in "its infancy", conceding that it is impossible to predict how or even if a standard will develop or whether fragmentation will become the norm. McArthur suggests that a move towards
"hybridisation" represents a normal process of world languages. For McArthur hybridisation is "infinitely varied" but "the idea of hybrids is stable" in the sense that it is a normal and verifiable phenomenon.

McArthur (p.8) implies that native norms may still dominate but they will also internationalize and blend with the varieties of new Englishes. Crystal argues (p.130) that no "regional social movement, such as the purist societies which try to prevent language change or restore a past period of imagined linguistic excellence, can influence the global outcome." Crystal (p. 137) suggests that competence needs to be considered on different levels. Local varieties "full of casual pronunciation, colloquial grammar and local turn of phrase", which are opposed to formal varieties for wider intelligibility, "full of careful pronunciation, conventional grammar, and standard vocabulary". He refers (p. 135) to a continuing presence of standard written English, in the form of newspapers, textbooks, and other printed materials," suggesting that these show "very little variation in the different English-speaking countries".

To avoid polemics between native and non-native perspectives, Melchers and Shaw (2003, p.39) suggest that we need to consider a user's "scope of proficiency" as an alternative to inclusive or exclusive notions such as "native" or "non-native". (See also Modiano, 1999.) They distinguish four levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internationally Effective</th>
<th>Able to use communication strategies and a linguistic variety that is comprehensible to interlocutors from a wide range of national and cultural backgrounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationally effective</td>
<td>What a South African would need to communicate with other South Africans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Proficiency</td>
<td>The proficiency someone needs to deal with people in his or her area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>The level of the language learner who knows some English but cannot communicate in it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such categories are an invaluable first step in that they allow a speaker of any background access to the highest level. However, they would need considerable refining to be made operational for teachers interested in assessing competence.

**Competence and Corpora**
The question for EIL teachers still arises as to what exactly should be learnt in terms of bodies of linguistic knowledge for use. Graddol (p.68) suggests there is a growing demand for "authoritative norms of usage" and for teachers, dictionaries and grammars to provide reliable sources of linguistic knowledge. The wish for fixed, codified norms of a standard world English reflects an understandable desire for stability, but is it a desire that can or should ever be fulfilled?

At the same time that English is being rather vaguely defined as 'international', some progress is being made in providing more reliable descriptions of linguistic knowledge drawing on large samples of actual use. The "Bank of English" is an ever-
expanding data-base that draws on "contemporary British, American, and international sources: newspapers, magazines, books, TV, radio, and real conversations - the language as it is written and spoken today". At first site, corpora, such as "the Bank of English", seem to provide an excellent opportunity to draw up norms of international use based on the codification of the output of educated users of English. However, a closer scrutiny of the sources used indicates a very broad range of sources, but non-British and American sources are not strongly represented. (See Sinclair, 2002, xii - xiv)

It is difficult to see at this stage how or when an equivalent corpus with a sufficient level of authority could be collected from a wider variety of international sources, although the challenge to do so has already been taken up. One example, the "International Corpus of English" (ICE) is described by Kennedy (1999, p.54) as "the most ambitious project for the comparative study of English worldwide." Compilers of such corpora feel the need to protect the quality of their product by selecting the informants. A full website is available outlining the ICE project. (http://www.ucl.ac.uk/english-usage/ice/) The corpus includes countries in which English is a second language such as India, Nigeria and Singapore, but does not include competent speakers from 'expanding circle' countries. The corpus design page of the website outlines the criteria for inclusion in a particular sample. "The authors and speakers of the texts are aged 18 or over, were educated through the medium of English, and were either born in the country in whose corpus they are included, or moved there at an early age and received their education through the medium of English in the country concerned." We might characterize these users as monolingual or bilingual, native or near-native educated users of the language. The aim is to compile 20 national corpora of a million words to enable comparative studies. Kennedy points out, however, that the samples will be too small for detailed analysis of any but the most frequently occurring lexis and that larger mega-corpora are not likely to be available in the foreseeable future. Meanwhile, extensive grammars and exercises are already available using the extensive, if less international, Bank of English.

There is also a growing consensus that some kind of corpus will be needed that highlights language use between members of the "expanding" circle speakers of English. One such corpus, VOICE (Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English) for ELF, English as a Lingua Franca, aims at codifying the language use of competent users of the "expanding circle". Seidlhofer (2003, p.17) states that, "Its focus is on unscripted, largely face-to-face communication among fairly fluent speakers from a wide range of first language backgrounds whose primary and secondary education and socialization did not take place in English." Inevitably, compilers of such a corpus have to give serious consideration to the notion of competence: the expression, "fairly fluent speakers", raises questions as to how speakers might qualify for inclusion in the corpus in relation to competence. Seidlhofer (2003, p.23) concludes that we should relinquish "the elusive goal of native-speaker competence" and embrace "the emergent realistic goal of intercultural competence achieved through a plurilingualism that integrates rather than ostracizes EIL". She (2003, p.16) draws on Jenkins' notion of a "Lingua Franca Core". Jenkins (2000, in Seidlhofer, p.18) designates "th-sounds and the 'dark I' as "non-core". So-called 'errors' in the area of syntax that occupy a great deal of teaching time, often to little effect such as "dropping" the third person present tense -s" are also considered unproblematic for lingua franca communication.
Conclusion
This paper has attempted to raise some of the key issues in relation to competence and the emerging field of EIL as a stimulus for further debate in the pages of this journal. Proposing what to include rather than what to exclude might prove to be the most helpful approach for promoting the potentially invaluable insights that corpora can provide. Otherwise, a notion of competence that emphasizes "less" rather than "more" might filter down into the world's classrooms as a justification that "anything goes" providing that it 'communicates': a position that has frequently been described to misrepresent communicative teaching in the past.

In spite of concerns about standards that such notions of a reduced "core" might appear to embody, projects that aim at gathering corpora of ELF among expanding circle speakers have an enormous long-term potential for providing invaluable data in several areas. They can enhance our knowledge of intercultural communication by allowing us to examine the operation of intercultural communication in a real-life situation of linguistic equality between participants. They can also provide invaluable linguistic knowledge to draw on for syllabus designers. The problem for most syllabus designers is not what to exclude, but what to include and it is by emphasizing what we can most usefully include that such corpora are likely to provide the most long-term benefits. It has taken many years for now established corpora such as the Bank of English to produce tangible pedagogical results in the form of user-friendly materials designed at improving competence in real language use based on the notion of native-like competence. English used for International Communication involves multiple competences, "more" rather than "less", and English as a Lingua Franca is a reality that is as yet under-researched and merits increased attention in a supportive and non-polemic atmosphere.

At the same time, it is becoming increasingly urgent to consider in more depth what exactly we mean when we refer to competence in relation to EIL education. The long debate over the last thirty years about the role of linguistic competence in so-called communicative teaching has often concluded that linguistic competence has been neglected. This paper has contended that there is an increased potential for neglecting linguistic competence to an even greater extent in the field of EIL.
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Abstract:
The present paper is divided into eight sections: introduction, the global diffusion of English, perceptions of the new varieties, the issue of intelligibility, features that cause unintelligibility, need for a broader pragmatics, and pedagogical implications, and conclusion, followed by the references. Not surprisingly, the global spread of English has generated varying perspectives on the nature and functions of its acculturated varieties. Broadly speaking, the debate has divided scholars into two camps holding diametrically opposing views on the multiple versions of English. On the one hand, some scholars view variations as symptoms of linguistic degeneration and deterioration; on the other hand, some scholars legitimize them as inevitable manifestations necessitated by the demands of the new cultural contexts. The normative view of the former camp stems, at least partly, from the problems the new forms of English pose in terms of international intelligibility. It is in this context that the paper examines the traditional, one-sided, native speaker-centred idea of intelligibility and the recent two-sided view of intelligibility that places the onus on both the native speaker and the non-native speaker. The argument of the latter camp is based on the premise that the new varieties require a broader pragmatic framework, because universal pragmatics is inadequate to describe them satisfactorily. Thus, the camp advocates a need for a language-specific pragmatics, and a comparative pragmatics, in addition to the traditional universal pragmatics. Logically, the debate on phonological, lexical, grammatical, and discourse structure
variations, and their legitimacy has prompted English language teaching specialists to have a fresh look at the goals and objectives of teaching English in the countries of the outer and expanding circles, and accordingly prioritize the teaching of national and regional varieties over that of the so-called native varieties. Thus, the paradigms of independence and centrality of the new varieties are replacing the paradigms of their dependence and marginality.

**Keywords:** native, non-native, indigenization, intelligibility, new pragmatics.

**Introduction**
The present paper aims at presenting a panoramic view of the nature and role of English in Asia. The Asianization of English is discussed against the backdrop of Kachru's (1986) division of English into three concentric circles: the inner circle where English is a native language, the outer circle where it is a second language, and the expanding circle where it is a foreign language. Let me note that I am aware of the drawbacks of Kachru's three-circle model. For example, (1) it fails to differentiate varieties within each circle; (2) it assumes that the three circles represent linguistic reality perfectly; (3) it implies that the outer circle cannot merge into the inner circle; (4) it bases the classification on national identity; and (5) it assumes that the inner circle varieties are somehow superior to other varieties. However, I do not intend to discuss the merits and demerits of this model. Such and other shortcomings of the model have already been pointed out by several scholars such as Tripathi (1998), Yano (2001), and Brutt-Griffler and Samimi (2001). Neither do I intend to elaborate on the alternative models such as McArthur's (1998) circle of world Englishes, Gorlach's (1988) circle model of English (reproduced in McArthur 1998), and Yoneoka's (2000) umbrella paradigm. Nevertheless, I suppose the present paper can be better understood with the three-circle model in the background.

**The Global Diffusion of English**
The spread and indigenization of the English language has been the topic of several conferences and seminars in recent times. Undoubtedly, the "glossography" of English in the present world is both qualitatively and quantitatively unprecedented (Nayar, 1994). It is common knowledge that English first spread to Scotland, Wales, and Ireland; then to North America, Canada and South Africa, Australia and New Zealand. However, the spread of English to these countries is not my concern in this paper. My focus is on the spread of the English language to countries that fall within the outer and expanding circles and resultant changes in the language at phonological, lexical, grammatical, and discourse levels.

Linguists had predicted this phenomenal diffusion and adaptation of English nearly a half century ago. For example, Halliday, MacIntosh and Strevens (1964) and Greenberg (1966) cited in Norrish (1997) had anticipated two changes. First, the ownership of the so-called native English countries and native English speakers would come to an end. Secondly, English would diversify, and consequently local varieties of the language would develop. To use Thumboo's (2001) words, the language would set into new habitations, and re-orientate itself to serve other cultures and, as a result, would acquire new names such as Indian English, Filipino English, South African English, and so on.
Obviously, the forecast has come true and the new varieties require fresh terms to designate the processes that characterize them. Therefore, it is no wonder that critical literature (e.g. Kachru 1983; Pandharipande, 1987; Phillipson, 1992; Crystal, 1997; Pennycook, 1997; Annamalai, 2004; Phan Le Ha, 2005) is replete with a whole bunch of expressions to describe the diffusion and nativization of English: pluralization, diversification, globalization, internationalization, universalization; hybridization, localization, indigenization; decolonization, dehegemonization, liberation of the English language, and so on. In this regard, it is worth considering the questions Horibe (2000) and McArthur (2004) respectively raise: "Is English Cinderella, a kidnapped or adopted child, or Godzilla?" and "Is it world English or international English or global English, and does it matter?" Obviously, none of the labels listed above is wholly satisfactory and neutral. Each nomenclature has its limitations and its specific value, and serves a chosen purpose. Different scholars select different designations to support the perspective they adopt. Each label promotes its own construct, clusters of presuppositions, concepts and approaches that often determine the direction and type of exploration and conclusion. These nomenclatures mould our perceptions and generate world-views and images. Some of these labels connote a patronizing attitude and suggest a mono-centric approach, whereas others imply liberation from bondage and indicate a pluralistic approach. Strong compulsions have motivated scholars to rename the language. Two such compulsions are a need to respond to the postcolonial ambiguity about the globalization of English and a desire to shape a new pedagogical ideology (see Erling 2005).

In addition to the above terms, people describe the multiple new varieties of English as manifestations of a transplanted, indigenized, reincarnated language. In the present paper I call them "twice born varieties", because the language was transported from its native soil (the U.K.), transplanted into an alien soil (India, for example), and indigenized to perform culture-specific functions. Thus, English is a twice born language in the socio-cultural contexts that fall outside the inner circle. Such a language is reborn in the sense that it takes on new forms and functions to carry the weight of new cultural experiences. These so-called non-native varieties of English are characterized with socio-linguistic and pragmatic transfer. That is to say, the so-called non-native speakers and writers transfer to English the rules of use and usage from their own speech communities. Scholars (e.g., Pandharipande 1987, p.155) have classified such transfers into two categories: unintentional and intentional. Thus, on the one hand, we have ESL/EFL learners who unconsciously transfer the rules and norms of use from their mother tongue and apply them to the other tongue. On the other hand, creative writers like India's Mulk Raj Anand, Raja Rao, and Khushwant Singh, and Nigeria's Achebe and Ojaide consciously deviate from the norms of the so-called native varieties of English. Thus, the adoption of English for literary writing is another instance of nativization, which extends the process to expressive domains (Annamalai, 2004). The new users of English exploit the protein potential of English to satisfy their communicative needs. The creative users of English possess it, make it their own, bend it to their will, and assert themselves through it rather than submit to the dictates of its norms. They borrow it, and recreate, stretch, extend, contort, and indigenize it (D'Souza, 2001, p.150).

Needless to say, these linguistic changes are beyond the control of the linguist and the language planner. When English migrates to foreign countries, it diffuses and internationalizes, acculturates and indigenizes, and adapts and diversifies (Honna, 2003). The new users absorb, re-orient, appropriate and transform it. They liberate it to embody the energies of their respective sensibilities. The linguistic, social and
cultural contexts of Asia and Africa necessitate, initiate and propel the development of new varieties of English. Evidently, these speech communities share the medium, but not the messages. The various reincarnations of English share the medium but use it to express native and local messages. The different dialects of English serve as acts of identity. In this view, English is no longer a Western language with Western canonicity (Kachru, cited in Prendergast 1998). The major varieties of English in Asia and Africa have broken the umbilical ties with the language. Thus there is a need to redefine terms such as "speech community", "native speaker", "norm" and "standard" (Kachru, cited in Prendergast 1998) and to question the concept of "native speaker" (Gupta 1999, p.59).

A logical parallel of the above deconstruction of the native variety myth is the justification of the hybridization of the language by non-native creative writers. It would be in the fitness of things to note how some African and Asian creative writers perceive the adoption of English for literary creativity.

The Nigerian writer Achebe (1965, p. 29) feels that it is neither necessary nor desirable for him to use English like a native writer does. He (1975, p. 62) wants the English language to carry the weight of his African experience. Obviously, the native variety in its unchanged form is incapable of serving that purpose. To achieve that objective, it will have to be a new English, still in communion with its 'ancestral home' but altered to suit its new African surroundings. Ojaide (1987, pp. 165-167), another Nigerian writer, professes that the English that he writes and speaks is neither mainstream British nor American, and he cherishes this uniqueness. The sensibility that he expresses is African sensibility, which is different from Western and Asian sensibilities, though a little closer to the Asian sensibility. His writing, though in English, has its roots in Africa, not in England or North America. Being a cultural standard bearer of the African world, not of the British or Western world, he is free to manipulate English to his advantage. Soyinka (1993, p. 88) regards native English as a linguistic blade in the hands of the traditional cultural castrator, which black people have twisted to carve new concepts into the flesh of white supremacy. Sidhwa (2000), cited in Yoneoka (2002), sounds a similar note when he remarks, "the colonized have subjugated the English language, beaten it on its head and made it theirs, and in adapting it to their use, in hammering it sometimes on its head and sometimes twisting its tail, they have given it a new shape, substance and dimension".

Raja Rao (1938) echoes the views voiced by Achebe, Ojaide, and Soyinka. In the foreword to Kanthapura he admits that "a language that is not one's own" is inadequate to express "the spirit that is one's own". He confesses that the various shades and omissions of certain thought-movement look maltreated in a foreign language. Perhaps it is because of this inadequacy that Dasgupta (1993, p. 201) labels English as an alien language, an aunt, not a mother. His contention is that even if Indians have been using and exploiting English, it has not got close to their hearts. It is not one of them although it is an important presence to be respected. Kourtizin (2000), cited in Lee (2005), holds a similar view of Japanese, which is not his first language: "English is the language of my heart, the one in which I can easily express love for my children; in which I know instinctively how to coo to a baby; in which I can sing lullabies, tell stories, recite nursery rhymes, talk baby talk. In Japanese, there is some artificiality about my love; I cannot express it naturally or easily. The emotions I feel do not translate well into the Japanese language, ..."
It is this inadequacy of the other tongue that prompts Raja Rao to use the English language innovatively to make it approximate the Kannada rhythm. In keeping with his theme in *Kanthapura* he experiments with the language following the oral rhythms and narrative techniques of traditional models of writing. He breaks the formal English syntax to express the emotional upheaval that shook the village of Kanthapura. The author's foreword to the novel almost spells out the postcolonial cultural agenda: "The telling has not been easy.... We cannot write like the English. We should not. We can write only as Indians. We have grown to look at the large world as part of us. Our method of expression therefore has to be a dialect, which will some day prove to be as distinctive and colourful as the Irish or the American. Time alone will justify it."

And this seems to be true of all non-native varieties. All non-native writers of English literature write with an accent, as it were, because they have to carry the weight of different experiences in various surroundings. I agree with Nelson (1985, p. 245) who observes, "When one reads a non-native variety text or listens to a non-native discourse, it becomes clear that there are devices and elements that are not the same as those in a native variety text or discourse. From the level of vocabulary to that of stylistic features, discourse arrangement and speech functions, the text or discourse is "marked" as "non-native".

**Perceptions of the New Varieties**

I do not think any other language has earned so many descriptive labels as English has. It has acquired many names (Erling, 2005) because it has many accents (Wells, 1982). As I have said earlier in this paper, each designation carries a load of signification and value. For example, the term "Englishes" assumes that the language is not a monolith, but a group of varieties that are similar and different at the same time. Each nomenclature carries various perspectives: linguistic, cultural, and ideological (Prendergast, 1998). On the one hand, when we adopt a descriptive point of view, we imply that all the varieties have an equal status; on the other hand, when we choose a prescriptive approach, we connote some sort of hierarchy. Like Phillipson (1992), Kachru (1998), cited in Prendergast (1998), feels that the second attitude suggests a kind of linguistic imperialism. He thinks that English language teaching has not yet got rid of the dominant colonialist culture, which has generated paradigms of dependence and marginality. He cites the "English conversation ideology" in Japan as an alarming example of colonial hangover. In his opinion, the Japanese idea of English conversation has two functions. First, it accords a high status to Western culture --- especially US culture. Secondly, it endorses the Western ownership of the English language.

The hegemony of native varieties of English finds nourishment from two sources: the mechanisms created by the West, and the self-nullifying attitude of the non-native speakers toward their own varieties. Native speakers have created certain mechanisms to perpetuate the dominance of native varieties. We can cite the Japan Exchange and Teaching Program (Jet Program) as one of the strategies employed by some "inner circle" governments and their private agencies. The traditional owners of English manage to continue the empowerment of the native speaker model and the native English model through what Nayar (1994) terms as "quasi-diplomatic organizations like the British Council and the USIA" and through what Kachru (1996) calls indirect and subtle "arms of codification" such as dictionaries, lexical manuals, pedagogic resources, media agencies, elite power groups, which generate language attitudes and psychological pressure, and instruments of evaluation. Talking about
the instruments of language assessment, Pennycook (1997) remarks that the forms and processes of accreditation, the exams and tests of English carry a huge institutionalized cultural and economic capital, because a small difference on TOEFL can have tremendous implications for employment, study overseas, and so on. The native speaker teacher who is an ambassador of Nayar's (1994) "linguistic elitism" and Phillipson's (1992) "linguistic imperialism" is yet another mechanism created to perpetuate the native English myth. The dominance of the English of the "inner circle" countries is further consolidated through the discourse of ELT, which is a subtle form of advertising and selling their English (see Pegrum, 2004).

Undoubtedly, the native speaker has been slow in recognizing and accepting non-native varieties of English due to their deviant phonological, lexical, grammatical, and discourse forms (Kachru, 1982, p.43). Cultural and linguistic ethnocentrism has led to the description of these varieties as deficient. Thus, when people compare native norms with the norms of other speakers of English, they usually vote in favour of the former. Scholars such as Phan Le Ha (2005, p. 34) maintain that although native speakers seem to celebrate the global spread of English, they seem to oppose the initiatives to integrate and equate non-native varieties with native varieties. Nevertheless, the above viewpoint is just one side of the coin.

In my view, non-native speakers themselves are to blame, at least partly, because they help perpetuate the hegemony. In fact, quite often it is the case that native speakers are more tolerant of variations and deviations (surprisingly, some scholars, e.g. Bobda 2004, interpret this tolerance as a subtle way to perpetuate and promote linguistic apartheid) than non-native speakers are. Native speakers such as Crystal (2005) have spent their lives attacking language purists many of whom come from non-native backgrounds. Let me elaborate on this issue at some length. For example, most educational institutions all over Asia support the perpetuation of the dominant British or American form of English, thereby implying that their own varieties are "impure", "imperfect" or "substandard". A cursory glance at most English language teaching job advertisements (especially in the Middle East and Japan) will testify to this observation. Let me draw your attention to the two important qualifications these advertisements demand. First, the prospective candidate should be a native speaker of English. Secondly, the applicant should have a diploma or degree from Britain, United States, Canada, Australia, or New Zealand. This means that many Asian employers still look at their own varieties through the glasses of British or American English and think of them as substandard, deficient, and inferior varieties. Moreover, it is an impression still fostered by the examining boards, which dominate teachers' mindsets.

To cap it all, dispassionate observers of language also assist in maintaining the hegemony. I agree with Crystal (1999) that even linguists complain about various usages they do not like. Some onus lies with teachers too. Unfortunately, many Asian teachers of English are pedagogical schizophrenics: they themselves speak their own varieties (Indian, Japanese, etc.) of English, but unrealistically expect their students to speak American or British varieties of English. Kandiah (1991), cited in Yoneoka (2002), points out that attitudes among South Asian speakers to their own forms of English have always been self-annulling. For example, nearly sixty years after independence, Indian English finds it difficult to free itself from the weight of "Received Pronunciation". Chaudhary (1998) rightly observes that the ability to write by the rules of Wren and Martin, and Nesfield and speak by the norms of Daniel Jones is an essential qualification for a good job in India. Many teachers believe that
they speak Queen's English or BBC English. In fact, they seem to be taking pride in this belief. I do not think teachers from other Asian countries are different. Honna and Takeshita (1998) observe that although the stigmatized view of non-native varieties is diminishing, most Japanese teachers and students equate the English language with American English and look down upon their own variety and other non-native varieties just because they differ from American variety. To cut the long story short, the dominant attitude among Asian public in general and in Asian academic world in particular is that American and British people are the owners of the English language and that their varieties are better than Asian varieties.

A corollary of this negative attitude towards non-native varieties is a similar self-abnegating perception of creative writing in English. To cite just one case, Indian writing in English has aroused diametrically opposing attitudes and approaches. Nemade (1985, p. 31) discusses it as a rootless phenomenon. He argues that it will never receive international readership because it falls short of magnificence. Criticizing it as a "parrotry" (p.33) and "mimicry" (p.36) and describing the foreign medium as "suppressive" (p.33) of the natural talent in the Indian writer, he prophesies that no Indian writer in English can ever enjoy the position of eminence because his writings lack national culture and national language. Nemade's viewpoint finds support in Patke's (1986) review of Jussawalla's "Family Quarrels: Towards a criticism of Indian writing in English" in which he is little optimistic about the Indian writer's global recognition because English is not the language of his intellectual and emotional make-up. These critics whose views demonstrate lack of solidarity and loyalty toward their own variety maintain that Indian writers can produce works of first order only in their mother tongues. They hold the view that Indian literature in English is "parasitic" and hence can never reach the excellence of vernacular or regional literatures. Patke (1986, p. 317), although hopeful of finding a good Indian writer in English, argues that the Indian writer in English has no tradition and heritage of the English language, either diachronic or synchronic, to manipulate, and therefore his literary style remains rootless.

Incidentally, the above objections could be easily refuted. First, it should be remembered that English was and is used for national integration in countries like India. Secondly, the classics of Joseph Conrad (who felt that if he had not written in English, he would not have written at all), Samuel Beckett, and Vladimir Nabokov testify to the fact that a non-native writer can write in English as efficiently and effectively as a native writer.

However, a sympathetic and understanding attitude to Indian English and Indian English literature has developed over the years. The world wars led to cultural and linguistic tolerance. People began to accept and recognize new varieties of English and new literatures in English as vital contributions to the mainstream of English language and literature. Kandiah (1991), cited in Yoneoka (2002), feels that speakers of Indian English are now gradually coming to accept their usage as more respectable. Xiaoqiong's (2005) and Jin's (2005) research corroborates this optimism. Xiaoqiong's investigation into Chinese English teachers' attitudes to both the internationally coveted varieties and Chinese English reveals that majority of Chinese teachers think that China English will eventually become a standard variety. Similarly, Jin's inquiry into Chinese undergraduates' preferences shows that Chinese English as a standard variety will stand alongside American English, which is a current national favourite.
This trend is due at least partly to efforts of academics and writers to promote Indian English as a valid and legitimate variety. Walsh (1973a, p. ix) describes Indian literature in English as having a past, a present, and a promising future, and he (1973b, pp. v, 1-27) acknowledges the contribution of Mulk Raj Anand and R. K. Narayan as "significant". Iyengar (1983, p. 3) calls Indian English literature "one of the voices in which India sings". For example, in recent years some Indian authors in English have found a place among the best authors in English (King 1980, p. ix). This recognition was anticipated by some of the literary and critical prophets like Jean Rhys, Claude McKay, Henry Handel Richardson, and Katherine Mansfield (King 1980, p. x). The large number of critical articles and journals on Indian literature in English is another proof that it is "an independent entity deserving serious critical attention" and not a "sporadic, adventitious, abnormal or invalid" phenomenon (Chindhade, 1983, p. 251).

In short, the incredibly galloping spread of English and its new social, cultural and literary functions have led to two major developments. First, using international academic events and journals, scholars have challenged the hegemony of the so-called native speakers of English, and questioned the supremacy of the native varieties. Secondly, they have attempted to legitimize the new varieties and new literatures in English. Their argument is based on the premise that once a language comes to be so wide spread it ceases to have a single linguistic superpower. Though these shifts in perception are not as earthshaking as Darwin's seminal work on evolution, they have resulted into democratization and equalization of the different varieties of English, and have significant repercussions for language acquisition, multilingualism, instructional materials, language teaching and testing, and so on.

The Issue of Intelligibility
Smith and Nelson (1985), cited in Taylor (2003), distinguish between intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability. For them intelligibility has to do with word or utterance recognition, comprehensibility with word or utterance meaning, and interpretability with illocutionary force.

This section examines the relevance of the construct of speech intelligibility in the light of two presuppositions. First, "familiar social context, shared cultural background or schematic knowledge, and insider awareness of linguistic norms", "a willing ear" (Nair-Venugopal, 2003), and paralinguistic and nonverbal features such as intonation, facial expressions, eye contact, physical touch, social distance, posture and gesture (see Miller, 1981 and Pennycooke, 1985, cited in Brown 1989) can facilitate intelligibility. Secondly, intelligibility is not a matter of "either or". In other words, it is not speaker-centred or listener-centred; it is interactional (Smith and Nelson, 1985, p. 333). Non-native speakers have to be intelligible to native speakers; conversely, native speakers need to be intelligible to non-native speakers. In this context, let me mention the decision taken by the civil aviation authorities of India (The Times of India, February 10, 2006). According to this mandate, all expatriate pilots will have to pass a spoken English test, because as the source says, "We do not want to face a situation where these foreign pilots are not able to converse with the ATCs- Air Traffic Controllers. This can cause serious problems." This resolution comes years after a worst mid-air collision between a Saudi Arabian Airliner jet and a Kazakhstan cargo plane, caused by a pilot's poor understanding of English. As Toolan (1997) suggests, L1 and L2 speakers of English accommodate to one another's use of the language and share responsibility for intercultural communication. By the same token, the negotiation of meaning between non-native
speakers of English with different linguistic backgrounds stresses the "cooperative nature of lingua franca communication" (Meierkord 1998). These assumptions will underpin our discussion of the issue of intelligibility of English as a global language.

Crystal (1997, p. 2) characterizes a global language as follows: "A language achieves a genuinely global status when it develops a special role that is recognized in every country." As Graddol (1997, p. 56) points out, English has two main functions in the world: it provides a vehicular language for international communication, and it forms the basis for constructing identities. The former function requires mutual intelligibility and common standards; the latter encourages the development of local forms and hybrid varieties. Given the forecast that English will remain a global language for several decades to come, we may then ask the question "How will English change its form and role as an international link language?" Yano (2001), cited in Yoneoka (2002), predicts three possible outcomes for the future of English as a global language: (i) Acrolect-level local varieties of English may come into existence. (ii) English may diverge into many mutually unintelligible local varieties. (iii) It may diversify into a variety of mutually intelligible dialects except in writing. The first of these outcomes seems to be coming true. Attempts to codify the varieties have accorded them acceptance and prestige. We no longer subscribe to the rigid distinction between "native" and "non-native", and we look at the varieties in the spirit of equality and shared communicative responsibility. In fact, with the diversification of English, we are talking about training the native speaker to develop sensitivity towards intercultural communication.

Cathford (1950), cited in Nair-Venugopal (2003), states that intelligibility depends on its realization of at least four out of five aspects: selection, execution, transmission, identification, and interpretation with an elaboration-effectiveness—which depends on the hearer's response matching the speaker's intent of purpose. As Jandt (2001, p. 29) puts it, the components of communication are source, encoding, message, channel, noise, receiver, decoding, receiver response, feedback and context. When receivers fail to decode a message, communication stops and responses can be quite diversified.

Most of the work done so far discusses intelligibility with reference to native speakers. As a result, non-native learners and speakers are supposed to emulate the native speaker model (Taylor, 2003), because the native speaker is believed to be the sole owner of English. Hence it is the responsibility of the non-native speaker to work towards the native model (Smith 1987, p. xi). Scholars like Bansal (1969) held a one-sided perspective and thought of intelligibility with reference to external norms. They maintained that the non-native varieties of English were not only different but also deficient and unintelligible. They took British and American varieties as standard, correct, prestigious, and intelligible and suggested non-native speakers of English emulate them. However, if English no longer belongs to the native speaker and the native speaker is no longer involved in many English transactions, perhaps this is no longer appropriate. As Nihalani (2000, p. 108) states, "The typical approach in this tradition is to use the native accent selected for comparison as a template, juxtapose it against a non-native accent, and identify the features that do not fit the template." This outlook has two implications. First, the non-native speaker should make effort to approximate the external norm set by the so-called standard variety to understand the native speaker and to be intelligible to him/her. Secondly, the native speaker is free from this responsibility. Thus, only one participant is obliged to make effort because s/he speaks a deviant variety.
The legitimization of new varieties of English has moved the debate on the issue of intelligibility from the one-sided position to a two-sided perspective. The latter perspective looks at communication between speakers of different varieties as a shared activity, a common pursuit to achieve mutual intelligibility. The central argument is that users of English as a lingua franca in international contexts should not look to native speakers of English for norms but should aim for mutual intelligibility among themselves (Jenkins 2000). It is in this context that McKay (2002) talks about standards for English as an international language with reference to intelligibility and examines the lexical, grammatical, and phonological features of varieties of English. As Seidhofer (2003) points out, a "general shift in curricular guidelines has taken place from 'correctness' to 'appropriateness' and "intelligibility", but by and large "intelligibility" is taken to mean being intelligible to native speakers, and being able to understand native speakers."

Features That Cause Unintelligibility
Nihalani (1997) states, "Two foreigners of the same nationality can converse with mutual understanding in English using their own phonetic and phonological systems. They run a serious risk, however, of being quite unintelligible to a speaker of English from the outer or inner circle. The learner must therefore adopt certain basic features of English in his pronunciation if he is to acquire a linguistic tool of international use. It is commonplace knowledge that various native varieties of English differ from each other in major ways, as much, perhaps, as the non-native varieties differ from the native varieties. Nevertheless native speakers of English appear to be mutually intelligible to a degree that does not extend to the non-native varieties. Obviously, there are features that various native accents have in common, which facilitate their mutual intelligibility, and these features are not shared by non-native accents". Incidentally, Nihalani's observation stands the test of validity, although I find it difficult to fully agree with his view that two foreigners of the same nationality can communicate without any intelligibility problems. In this respect, Kenworthy (1987), cited in Walker (2001), proposes the idea of "comfortable intelligibility" as a realistic goal. We could take this criterion to mean minimum general intelligibility or "What all speakers of all varieties have in common, which enables them to communicate effectively with speakers of native and non-native varieties other than their own."

This comfortable intelligibility is what Achebe (1965, p. 30) means when he says, "The African writer should aim to use English in a way that brings out his message best without altering the language to the extent that its value as a medium of international exchange will be lost. He should aim at fashioning out an English which is at once universal and able to carry his peculiar experience.... it will have to be anew English, still in full communion with its ancestral home, but altered to suit its new surroundings."

Brown (1989) classifies language features as (i) features that cause unintelligibility to non-native listeners from the same speech community as the speaker (for example, a Malaysian finds another Malaysian difficult to understand); (ii) features, which make it difficult for native listeners of English to understand non-native speakers (for example, an American finds it hard to comprehend a Japanese speaker of English); and finally, (iii) features, which lead to loss of intelligibility to non-native listeners from other speech communities (for example, a Chinese listener of English finds it difficult to understand a Japanese speaker of English). Brown's second and
third categories are similar to Melchers and Shaw’s (2003, cited in Nunn 2005, p. 70) international intelligibility and his first category resembles their national intelligibility.

Seidlhofer (2001), cited in Burt (2005), observes that quite often it is features which are regarded as the most typically English, such as the agreement between a third person singular subject and its verb, tags, phrasal verbs and idioms, which turn out to be non-essential for mutual understanding. In a subsequent publication, Seidlhofer (2001) observes that certain traditionally serious errors do not hinder English as a lingua franca communication. According to Seidlhofer, these typical errors include (i) dropping the third person present tense -s, (ii) confusing the relative pronouns "who" and "which", (iii) omitting articles where they are obligatory in native English language, and inserting them where they do not occur in English as a native language, (iv) failing to use correct forms in tag questions, e.g., "isn’t it?" or "no?" instead of the ones used in standard British and American English, (v) inserting redundant prepositions, as in "we have to study about...", "we have to discuss about...", (vi) overusing verbs of high semantic generality, such as "do", "have", "make", "put" and "take", (vii) replacing infinitive constructions with "that clause" as in "I want that...", (viii) overdoing explicitness, e.g., "black colour", and "dead body" rather than just "black" and "body". We may add several other features of Indian, Vietnamese, and Japanese varieties of English that do not cause unintelligibility. Such features are generally unproblematic and are no obstacle to communicative success.

As an alternative to inclusive and exclusive notions such as "native" and "non-native", Melchers and Shaw (2003), cited in Nunn (2005, p. 70), suggest international intelligibility (for example, an Indian and a Korean communicating effortlessly with each other), national intelligibility (for example, a Kashmiri and a Tamil interacting without any problem) and local intelligibility (for example, two Japanese people from Okinawa island or from Kyoto city interacting smoothly). Someone who knows some English but cannot communicate in it internationally, nationally or locally is an ineffective user of the language.

However, inaccurate pronunciation that is clearly understandable is forgiven whereas pronunciation that is not understood is, and must necessarily be, perfected if the speakers wish to be understood and if the listeners wish to understand, as this is the fundamental rule of communication (Offner, 1995). Jenkins (2000) classifies the phonological features of EIL into core features and non-core features, essential in terms of intelligibility. According to her, divergences in the areas of vowel quality, weak forms, assimilation, and word stress from the native speaker realizations should be regarded as instances of acceptable L2 sociolinguistic variation. On the other hand, devoicing of consonants ("mug" pronounced as "muck"), omission of consonants from clusters ("six" pronounced as "sick"), confusion between short and long vowels (confusion between "ship" and "sheep"), substitution of the vowel as in "bird" especially with the vowel in "broad", and substitution of consonants and vowels by other consonants and vowels ("TB" for "TV"; "snakes" for "snacks"; "hole" for "hall" respectively). In her opinion, it is these features that play a significant role in international intelligibility.

Poor articulation of words can also affect intelligibility. For example, most Vietnamese and Japanese learners do not articulate words clearly. Vietnamese learners tend to drop word-final sounds. For instance, they will pronounce the
italicized words in the following sentence almost identically, as if they were homophones:

"Mr. Nguyen, why (/wai/) doesn't your wife (/wai/) try white (/wai/) wine (/wai/)?"

Whereas omission is a major problem with Vietnamese learners, substitution is a big problem with Japanese learners (Patil, 2005, p. 7). For instance, there is a strong tendency among Japanese learners to replace /r/ with /l/ and /v/ with /b/. As a result, it is very difficult to distinguish between "This is a grass house." and "This is a glass house." An Arab learner's problems are substitution and insertion of extra sounds. So, "pill" is articulated as "bill" and "text" is pronounced as "tekist". The pronunciation problems of the three groups of learners can be summarily illustrated with the help of the following single example:

"I'm going to dine with six friends. We'll have a pot of fried rice each."

An Arab learner will most probably say:
"I'm going to dine with sikis friends. We'll have a boat of rice each."
A Vietnamese learner will tend to say:
"I'm going to die with sick friends. We'll have a pot of rice each."
A Japanese learner will likely say:
"I'm going to dine with six friends. We'll have a pot of flied lice each."

Another area is vocabulary. One case in point is the use of "come" and "go" in Vietnamese variety of English. In standard variety of English, "go" means moving to a place that is far from the speaker and the listener and "come" means moving to a place that is nearer to the hearer. For example, a student may say to his teacher: "May I come in, Sir?" and "Sir, may I go home now?" In the first case, the student is moving nearer to the teacher; in the second case, the student wants to move away from the teacher. This is the normal use in English. But, in Vietnamese variety of English, the use is reversed. The student usually says to the teacher who is in school with him: "Excuse me, Sir, May I come back home now? And yes, I cannot go to school tomorrow." (Patil, 2002, pp.14-16). Japanese speakers of English also tend to use these two verbs with reverse meanings.

Let us look at one more example. Along the lines of the words "come" and "go", Vietnamese students use the words "bring" and "take" in a reverse way. In British English when I bring something I carry it from another place to the place where the hearer is. Similarly, when I take something, I take it from where the hearer and I are to another place. But Vietnamese students use the two words in an opposite way. As a teacher I often heard my students say: "Excuse me, teacher, I don't have this book at home. Can I bring it for a week, please?" and "I'm sorry, teacher, I forgot to take the book that I brought from you last week. I'll take it tomorrow." Now, the important point here is: how do these readers interpret "come" and "go" and "bring" and "take" when they encounter them in a reading passage? Do they interpret them the English way or the Vietnamese way? My experience is that elementary and intermediate level Vietnamese learners of English interpret these words the Vietnamese way. They need to be told time and again that the usual meanings of "come" and "go" and "bring" and "take" are different.

Let us move on to grammar now. Here, mother tongue interference seems to be a major stumbling block. For example, Arabic does not have copula verb and so many
Arab learners of English produce utterances such as "I student of Sultan Qaboos University Language Centre." Vietnamese does not have relative pronouns; as a result, we hear sentences such as "There are many children don't go to school." Japanese word order is subject + object + verb, and nouns do not have plural forms; consequently, we hear utterances like "I vegetable bought."

However, I think these grammar mistakes do not bother me so much as the pronunciation errors do. From the communication point of view it does not matter much whether the foreign language learner says, "I TV watch." or "I watch TV"; "I have two book" or "I have two books." "This is a girl beautiful." or "This is a beautiful girl." Communication is not affected in any serious way. But, there is certainly a communication problem when a Vietnamese learner wants to say he is going to dine, but says he is going to die; a Japanese learner wants to say he has got just two books, but says he has got just two bucks, and an Arab learner wants to say he bought a pear but says he bought a bear.

**Need for a New Pragmatics**

Levinson (1983) refers to (i) a universal pragmatics and (ii) a language-specific pragmatics. Thumboo (1994) suggests that there is a room for a varieties-specific or variety-specific pragmatics, and (iv) a comparative pragmatics. The varieties of English, and the literatures in them, pose problems and challenges, and offer opportunities for pragmatics. Their settings are so different that it is a daunting task to deal with them. Almost all these varieties are invariably part of a bilingual or multilingual setting. Many of them have not been analyzed yet. We need to describe their grammar, lexicon, syntax and phonology. Obviously, doing that is much easier than developing a pragmatics of each one of these varieties. Needless to say, the pragmatics of the native varieties cannot adequately describe the new varieties. As Thumboo (1991) remarks, they require a much broader pragmatics. It would be fallacious to apply one language-pragmatics, based on one semiotic. The differences in usage between varieties such as Filipino English and British English are more glaring than those between British and American English. As the new varieties grow, the existing paradigms become inadequate. Hence it would not be very fruitful to apply the pragmatics of English to all varieties of the language across the world.


Speech functions, which are specific to speech communities, are a prime area of study for pragmatics. The various speech acts such as apologizing, inviting, requesting, and so on, derive their uniqueness from the socio-cultural norms of the people participating in interaction (Kachru, 1996, p. 127). There are important cross-cultural differences in the way speech acts are performed. Different cultures have
different ways of doing things with words. Asians, for example, have their own ways of saying and meaning things in English. Ma (1996, p. 257) cites an interesting observation: a General Motors manager once expressed his frustration in these words: "I don't understand you Asians. You say "no" when you are supposed to say "yes", and say "yes" when you are supposed to say "no".

There is no common ideal, no common criteria, of politeness for all societies and all languages. For example, the "power principle" operates differently in Europe and America than in Asia. Gumperz (1970, p. 20) illustrates how strategies such as complimenting differ from society to society. For instance, in American society compliments are very brief and concise whereas in Japanese culture complimenting is a prolonged activity involving several exchanges of praise and ritual denials. To a Japanese it seems impolite to accept a compliment with a mere thanks. This cultural difference between American brevity and Japanese prolixity might sometimes cause, to use Crystal and Davy's (1969, p. 5) words, "general confusion, probably criticism and embarrassment as well". Complimenting in Indian English differs from complimenting in British and American English. Unlike compliments in the two native varieties, compliments in Indian English are two-dimensional. The person who offers a compliment maximizes praise of the hearer and simultaneously maximizes dispraise of self or at least minimizes praise of self. Patil (1994) has dealt with some aspects of the pragmatics of Indian English.

Complimenting is a more prolific and prolonged act in Japanese than in many other languages. Another significant aspect of Japanese linguistic politeness is its indirectness. Japanese is an incredibly indirect language. Westerners, known as "straight-shooters", "speak their minds", "make things clear"; but this forthrightness is considered a bit rude in Japanese culture. The real art of Japanese communication lies in being subtle in just the right way. To be indirect is to be polite. People usually steer the conversation without being obvious about the topic of conversation. Requests are also often made indirectly. For example, "I would like to use the phone, but..." is preferred to "Can I use the phone?" another characteristic of Japanese conversation is avoidance of disagreement at all costs as group harmony is highly valued. It would be interesting to see how Japanese speakers of English iron out disagreements.

The gist of the preceding discussion is that theories of politeness, speech acts, and conversational cooperation should include socially conditioned aspects of language use and reflect cultural variability.

**Pedagogical Implications**

While talking about the teaching of English in Asia, we need to bear in mind the psychological and socio-cultural inclination of learners in most Asian countries such as Thailand, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Mainland China, Korea and Japan who aspire to learn British and American varieties of English, because of the social status and prestige that accompanies their use. This inclination is in variance with the attitudes and perspectives that scholars in the field possess and profess. In fact, most of these countries have a policy statement, either explicit or implicit, admonishing teachers and learners to prefer British or American, preferably American variety, for the economic, political and international dominance the countries of the "inner circle" enjoy. Thus the issue is more complex than Honna and Takeshita (1998) and Honna (2003) have portrayed with reference to the situation in Japan. For example, Zhang's (2005) study examines why Chinese teacher trainees endorse the British variety of
English in preference to their own variety and discusses their choice of the native speaker phonological model with reference to the discourse on Phillipson's (1992) "linguistic imperialism".

This state of affairs needs to change and Asian users of English (teachers, learners, etc.) should accept the standard forms of their own varieties. As Llurda (2004, p. 319) remarks, non-native teachers of English need no longer be ambassadors of British or American cultures, values, ideologies, and social conventions. There is no need to impose a foreign model on our learners. Asian teachers of English can use their own respective standardized variety of English as a model for teaching and testing purposes. It is easy to do this, because (i) majority of us are local teachers, (ii) we are in influential, decision-making positions, and (iii) we are the ones who usually set examination papers and evaluate students' answers.

Thus it is the regional variety of English, not an external model that needs to be promoted, because it is the former that people in the region will want to use. A vast majority of Asians, Africans and Europeans learn English to use it as a lingua franca. They do not learn it with the intention to communicate with native speakers but to communicate with other non-native speakers (Kirpatrick, 2004).

Let us examine Japan's current English teaching goals against this background. As we know, Japanese educators intend to train learners to become speakers of American English. This is unrealistic and detrimental to the case of ELT, because as Abercrombie (1956), cited in Brown (1989), says, such a goal would be appropriate if we were teaching prospective secret agents and teachers. A vast majority needs to attain just comfortable intelligibility, which amounts to accent that people can understand with little or no conscious effort. I agree with Honna and Takeshita's (1998) view that Japan's unrealistic goal has resulted into negative attitude to non-native varieties of English, linguistic inferiority complex, slow learning pace, and high failure rate. Japanese students are scared of speaking, because they think they will be poor speakers unless they sound like Americans. To put it differently, their exocentric or exonormative approach embodies Kachru's (1996) interlocutor myth, monoculture myth, and Cassandra myth, or Pennycook's (1997) "arm of global imperialism" empowered with "symbolic capital". However, if students were given a regional variety of English to learn, educated speakers of the standardized regional variety could provide the model (Kirpatrick 2004). Equally importantly, we need to replace the teaching materials imported from the West with materials that are culturally familiar to our learners. I agree with Alptekin (2002) who suggests that teachers of English as an international language should incorporate instructional materials and activities rooted in local as well as international contexts that are familiar and relevant to language learners' lives.

According to Kachru (1992, p. 362) "What is needed is a shift of two types: a paradigm shift in research and training, and an understanding of the sociolinguistic reality of uses and users of English." As Crystal (1999) observes, adopting a dynamic perspective is not just desirable; it is urgent. The reason is that the pace of linguistic change, at least for spoken English, is increasing. As more and more people around the world adopt English, an unprecedented range of varieties has emerged (chiefly since 1960s) to reflect new national identities. The differences between British and American English pronunciation, for example, are minor compared with those, which distinguish these dialects from the new intra-national norms of, say, Indian and West African English. English has gradually developed new local centres for authentication
of its models and norms and has become a pluricentric language with Asian and African norms and models for its acquisition, its teaching, and creativity in the language (Kachru, 1996). Therefore, a valid goal would be to enable our students to view English as the multi-colored rainbow of possibilities that it actually is (Goddard, 2001).

For English to be international means that it has developed to where it is "no longer linked to a single culture or nation but serves both global and local needs as a language of wider communication." (McKay, 2002, p. 24). Hence it is essential that the native speaker fallacy be challenged. As McKay (2002, p. 129) rightly points out, "the concept of thinking globally but acting locally is highly relevant to the teaching of EIL. The evidence clearly suggests that the use of EIL will continue to grow, as an international language that belongs, not just to native speakers, but also to all its users. Given this shift in ownership, the time has come for decisions regarding teaching goals and approaches to be given to local educators so they can take their rightful place as valid users of English." As Offner (1995) points out, "One main incentive to learn a second or foreign language is to convey one's own views as understood in one's own culture, from one's own background, and not to be transformed into a product of the foreign language and its culture."

Several scholars have questioned the need for English in Asian countries to emulate British, American, Canadian or Australian varieties of English, especially in respect to pronunciation. For example, Qiong (2004) argues that such a goal is undesirable and virtually unattainable. Smith (1985, p. 5) cited in Nihalani (2000, p. 112) says: "Non-native speakers must develop a fluency in educated English but they do not have to have native-speaker pronunciation as their target. In contrast, they should be trained to be examples of educated speakers of Standard English, identifiable from their country. A good pronunciation is one that a variety of educated listeners find intelligible." In this context, it is worth noting what Honna, et al. (2001), cited in McMurray (2001, p. 1), observe. They found that Japanese students were comfortable with speaking English with a Japanese accent when they asked high school students "whether they wanted to sound like their American assistant language teacher (an American) or whether they wanted to sound like their Japanese teacher... they all quickly said that they wanted to sound like their Japanese teacher... the Japanese teacher in his class spoke excellent English with an unmistakably Japanese accent."

Conclusion
The present paper is a review of the various issues surrounding the use of English in Asia. It has attempted to capture the salient features and role of English in Asia and drawn into focus some of its significant aspects such as its universal spread and subsequent formal and functional deviations, which have led to concerns about its intelligibility in the global context on the one hand, and a need to develop a wider pragmatics to accommodate its culture-specific functions on the other hand. The paper has also discussed the pedagogical implications stemming from its diffusion and diversification. In short, the paper has made a case for phonological, lexical, grammatical, sociolinguistic and pragmatic codification of the varieties of Asian English. As you can perceive, the general illocutionary force of the paper is that of an admonition to accept and promote the legitimacy of the evolving varieties, and accordingly re-orient the approach and methodology of teaching English in Asia and radically revise the teaching materials used in these countries for both practical and cultural reasons.
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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-Griffier, 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.
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Introduction
The global spread of English has a number of consequences both for the nature of English and its teaching. In many non-native contexts where English is used quite intensively and extensively in the daily lives of people, English has taken various forms reflecting the cultural and linguistic background of the speakers. In the global context, on the other hand, English functions as an international language. At the present time, non-native speakers outnumber native speakers and these non-native speakers use English for a variety of purposes, including, very often, intercultural
communication. One significant feature of such communication is that it mostly occurs among non-native speakers in international contexts. Such being the case, native speaker norms, in such interactions, may not only be unnecessary but also inappropriate. These and the related factors have recently led some researchers (e.g., McKay, 2002, 2003) to re-examine common ELT assumptions and has given way to a new approach characterized as English as an International Language Pedagogy. The consequences of the global spread of English as investigated from local to international contexts raised the issues of models, norms and goals in language pedagogy as key areas of discussion. This paper deals with these issues with respect to both local and international contexts and language pedagogy. Furthermore the assumptions of task based language teaching and learning are re-examined within the framework of English as an international language pedagogy. With the rise of task based language teaching and learning the traditional distinction between syllabus design and methodology becomes problematical. Taking the issues of models, norms and goals for EIL pedagogy as a point of reference, the place of tasks in the curriculum is reframed.

World Englishes
Nelson (1992, p.327) argues that "when approaching a language transplanted to a new cultural and linguistic context- as, for example, English in India- one is brought to various realizations about the notion of language and the varieties that a language may develop."

Indeed, the global diffusion of English has resulted in varieties of English in different sociocultural contexts. Kachru (1985, 1992) presents this sociolinguistic profile of English in terms of three concentric circles: The inner circle, the outer circle and the expanding circle. The inner circle represents the traditional basis of English, where English is the primary language. The countries in this circle are the USA, UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The outer circle comprises the institutionalized non-native varieties of English in such countries as India, Nigeria and Singapore. These countries have a colonial history with the users of the inner circle. English is used quite intensively and extensively in the domestic daily lives of the people and has established new norms shaped by new sociocultural and sociolinguistic contexts. Finally, the expanding circle comprises countries where performance varieties are used. In such countries as China, Israel and Turkey, English functions as an international language.

The studies of institutionalized nonnative varieties of English (e.g., Kachru, 1985, 1992; Strevens, 1990; Nelson, 1992) have argued for the recognition and acceptance of these varieties in their own right, devoid of comparisons with the inner circle native speaker varieties and the term world Englishes is suggested to represent these varieties such as "Indian English", "Nigerian English", and "Singaporean English". Thus, the three concentric circle model brought to the English language in different sociocultural contexts a pluralistic perspective and to its users a variety of speech fellowships. English is no longer the sole property of native speakers but it is, as well, the language of non-native speakers who use and adopt it in their own sociocultural contexts. Among the discussions of the institutionalized nonnative varieties of English several issues have been the focus of attention. These are the status of the innovations occurring in these varieties, codification of these innovations, the issue of non-native and native norms, and the resultant implications for the choice of a pedagogical model.
Innovations, standards, norms and models in world Englishes
Traditionally, the use of English by non-native speakers has been judged by how it approximates native language use. Differences in non-native language use have often been viewed as deficiencies. Thus variations in institutionalized nonnative varieties have been labeled as "mistakes" or "errors" which should be corrected to avoid fossilization. This led largely to the characterization of non-native knowledge of language as "interlanguage" on the path to native speaker competence.

The studies of institutionalized nonnative varieties, however, have suggested different typologies for these terms. The underlying motivation being that the sociocultural context of language use naturally affects the language and the resultant changes in the language would by no means be considered as deficit characteristics. Thus, Kachru (1992) argues for a distinction between the terms "mistake" and "deviation":

A "mistake" may be unacceptable by a native speaker since it does not belong to the linguistic "norm" of the English language; it cannot be justified with reference to the sociocultural context of a non-native variety; and it is not the result of the productive processes used in an institutionalized non-native variety of English. On the other hand, a "deviation" has the following characteristics: it is different from the norm in the sense that it is the result of the new "un-English" linguistic and cultural setting in which the English language is used; it is the result of a productive process which marks the typical variety-specific features; and it is systematic within a variety, and not idiosyncratic (p.62).

As a result, such arguments led "deviations" to be characterized as "innovations", which imply "difference" and not as "errors" or "mistakes", which imply "deficiency". It is this "difference" view which gives recognition to the non-native norms.

The other central issue in these discussions is when a deviation should be considered as "innovation". Bamgbose (1998, p, 3) suggests five factors for deciding on the status of an innovation. These are "demographic" (the number of users), "geographical" (the spread of an innovation), "authoritative" (the actual use or approval of use of an innovation by writers, teachers, media practitioners, examination bodies, publishing houses, and influential opinion leaders), "codification" (in the restricted sense, putting the innovation into a written form in a grammar or pronouncing dictionary, course books or any other type of reference manual) and "acceptability" (the ultimate test of admission of an innovation). Among these factors, Bomgbo argues, codification and acceptability are the most important since without them innovations will still be viewed as errors.

To Kachru (1985, p.18) "codification implies determining the bounds of such innovations or creativity- in other words, 'allowable' deviation from the native norms." Codification is also of great importance since it relates to the establishment of standards for innovations occurring in these institutionalized non-native varieties. In the case of the inner circle varieties, various channels of linguistic regulation like dictionaries, literary works, textbooks and media have led to the establishment of well known inner circle varieties like American English and British English. In the outer circle, however, while innovations are used quite intensively and extensively in the local context of non-native speakers the codification of these innovations has not been well established yet. In terms of pedagogy, the codification and related problems make it difficult to adopt these non-native varieties as pedagogical models.
Codified inner circle varieties are mostly seen as ideal pedagogical models throughout the world, one reason being that pedagogical materials are available in these standard English varieties. In the outer circle, however, hardly any reference material is found to inform pedagogical instruction.

Aside from the codification problem, proficiency tests for the inner circle varieties are well established, which is not the case for the outer circle varieties. This naturally leads to testing non-native speakers according to the norms of inner circle users. These tests, however, hold strict association of English with the western culture and hence learning English means learning western cultural values and communicative norms. Kachru (1985: 21) calls this western cultural spread along with language in pedagogy prescriptivism and argues that

With the spread of English we also expect the learners to acquire the norms of behavior appropriate to the users of the inner circle. The expected behavior pattern characterizes what one might call an educated Englishman (or American). This hypothesis is based on the assumption that language spread entails spread of cultural and social norms, or what has been termed in pedagogical literature an 'integrative motivation' for language learning.

Above all, in most cases, inner circle models are associated with power and prestige, which make them more preferable as pedagogical models. "Quite often, people know of features of non-native varieties and can even see the utility of such features in sociocultural situations, yet they are reluctant to accept the logical conclusion that such recognition implies the replacement of the native norms they have come to adore" (Bomgbore, 1998, p. 5). Thus the native speaker accent is generally found fascinating by non-native speakers though they recognize the viability of their accent and wish to keep it. In short, the speakers of outer circle varieties have a less positive attitude to their own varieties than to inner circle varieties.

While there is general consensus on the fact that language pedagogy in the outer circle should no longer be informed by native speaker models, such factors make it difficult to adopt outer circle models in language pedagogy in these contexts. In the expanding circle, where English functions as an international language, related issues need further examination.

**English as an international language pedagogy**

Beside the emerging reality of world Englishes in different non-native contexts, another focus of attention is the global nature of English, characterized as "English as an international language" (Strevens, 1992; Jenkins, 2000; McKay, 2003), "English as a global language"(Crystal, 2003) or "English as a lingua franca" (Seidlhofer, 2004).

The global status of English has brought with it varied implications both for its development and its teaching. On the one hand, the number of non-native speakers exceed the number of native speakers and thus the center of authority in the development of English is shifting from native speakers. Crystal (1997, p. 137) maintains that "a new form of English, World Standard Spoken English, will arise in international communication in that most people are "multi dialectical" to a greater or lesser extent" (in Yano 2001, p.125).
Though there is not yet a global variety of English, the global spread of English in the expanding circle still has important implications in pedagogy, the most important of which is that most communication in English now occurs among non-native speakers in non-native contexts and these non-native speakers need not adopt the communicative norms of the inner circle users when they use English as an international language. Rather, Smith (1983, 1987) argues that "native English speakers should study English as an international language if they plan to interact in English with non-native speakers who use a different national variety" (in Hassal, 1996, p. 422).

Traditionally, however, learning English as a foreign language meant learning it for interaction with native speakers, achieving native speaker competence in proficiency and learning English to understand cultural conventions of native speakers. This is inherent in the communicative language teaching tradition which adopts "communicative competence" as the ultimate goal for language learners and native speaker norms of use as the only appropriate use of language.

McKay (2002, 2003) successfully questions the legitimacy of such assumptions based on the current status of English as an international language and argues for a new orientation in the teaching of English as an international language. The basic tenets of such an orientation is that as an international language English cannot be linked to a specific country or culture, in other words, English is denationalized. Since learners of English as an international language have specific goals in learning English they do not need to achieve native speaker competence. The cultural content for ELT should not always be native speaker cultures. Western cultures of learning characterizing current communicative approaches are not the most productive way of teaching.

In these discussions, while the validity of the inner circle norms in learning English as an international language is successfully questioned, there arises the issue of what norms and models should be followed in EIL pedagogy.

**Models, norms and goals for English as a international language pedagogy**

The characterization of the actual language content to be taught and learned in teaching English as an international language pedagogy is of crucial importance for curriculum or syllabus design specifications since it will serve as the model to inform pedagogical instruction. In the case of outer circle varieties of English the issue of a pedagogical model seems to be less controversial. By accepting deviations occurring in these varieties as innovations, codifying these innovations, making pedagogical materials like dictionaries and textbooks more available and establishing proficiency tests to assess the learners’ achievements, these countries will no longer need native speaker models in pedagogy. In the case of English as an international language pedagogy, however, there are different views about what characterizes English as an international language. The general consensus, however, is that native speaker norms of use are no longer appropriate for intercultural communication and in international interactions accommodation and mutual intelligibility are the desired goals. Kubota(2001: 50) 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.

"The need for intelligibility in international communication has already motivated the learning of English as an international language" (Yano, 2001, p.125) and there have been several attempts to provide a common standard for mutual intelligibility in international interactions. Seidlhofer's (2001, 2004) corpus based project, Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE), focuses on the collection and analysis of speech samples to determine the characteristics of English as an international language, which would serve as codification and help materials written in it. Gimson's 'rudimentary international pronunciation' (1978 in Jenkins, 2003) aims at devising a model of pronunciation by simplifying the phonemic system of English. Jenkins' 'common core' (1998) for pronunciation focuses on specifying the phonological features that do not cause intelligibility problems and they are included in the common core. Quirk's 'Nuclear English' (1981 in Jenkins 2003) calls for a simplification in morphology and syntax.

However, such attempts, more or less, fall in the domain of prescriptivism in that such ways of standardization ignore the natural development of a language as it is used quite intensively and extensively in the domestic daily lives of individuals. In the expanding circle countries, "for the most part English has no special administrative status, while linguistic creativity is more commonly realized in mass media, advertising copy, slogans and catch phrases, and names for shops and products, for instance" (Berns, 2005: 87). Such a variety of English as an international language has not developed yet and the imposition of standards in a top down manner cannot escape the charges of prescriptivism. Even the empirical efforts, though they seem to have some merit, seem to be an early attempt in the description of English as an international language since English in the expanding circle has not yet been institutionalized unlike the outer circle varieties of English.

For the most part English functions as an international language in such domains as science, commerce, technology, and tourism and those bilingual speakers will use English for cross cultural communication. Widdowson (1997) proposes that English as an international language comprises varieties of English for specific purposes, 'autonomous registers which guarantee specialist communication within global expert communities' (p. 114). Griffler (1998, p.382), on the other hand, opposes such a stance by claiming that "'register' does not supersede the category of language. It subdivides it. As such, registers remain ' registers of a language', and they cannot thereby be called 'autonomous'." Furthermore, Le Ha (2005, p. 5) finds Widdowson's use of the term 'register' "unrealistic when Widdowson suggests ESP (English for Specific Purposes) away from the issues of "community and identity" and viewing it in terms of "communication and information". While Widdowson takes the domain of use of English as an international language as a point of departure in his conceptualization of EIL, he neglects the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of speakers as naturally reflected in their use of English for cross cultural communication. The bilinguals' use of English as an international language shows variations in their pragmatic and discourse competencies (Mckay, 2002, 2003; Nunn, 2005) and the focus of attention is the recognition of these norms in their right without comparison to native speaker norms.

Another possibility is to adopt a prestigious standard English as a model to provide mutual intelligibility in international interactions. Strevens (1992, p. 39) argues that
For throughout the world, regardless of whether the norm is native-speaker or non-native speaker variety, irrespective of whether English is a foreign or second language, two components of English are taught and learned without variation: these are its grammar and its core vocabulary. There may be embellishments in the way of local vocabulary and expressions, and there will certainly be great differences of pronunciation, but the grammar and vocabulary of English are taught and learned virtually without variation around the world.

Strevens argues for the avoidance of the various local grammatical patterns and expressions not because they are "wrong" nor inferior or substandard but because they are used and accepted only in that geographical area and among that community (and hence) they would be unacceptable elsewhere" (p. 40). To the question which English should I learn, or teach? Strevens (1992) gives an answer in two parts: "First, learn educated / educational English; second, if you have a choice of an American or a British model, choose the one that will be most useful" (p.40). Though Strevens' claims are strong on the part of the acceptability of the core grammar and vocabulary of a prestigious educated variety, the language knowledge of the bilingual users of English as an international language remain to be addressed adequately. Adopting an American or British variety at all levels of language would raise the problem of ignoring the bilinguals' full language capacity.

Indeed, Cook (1999) argues for going beyond the native speaker as the model in language teaching. He claims that "because L2 users differ from monolingual native speakers in their knowledge of their L2s and L1s and in some their cognitive processes, they should be considered as speakers in their own right, not as approximations to monolingual native speakers" (p. 185).

Moreover, Rajadurai (2005) criticizing the historical and geographical bases of Kachru's three circle model and drawing on the works of Ramton (1990) and Modiano (1990), proposes proficient English speakers be taken as a point of reference in the representation of English as an international language. Thus, native speakers will no longer be in a privileged position over L2 users in English as an International language.

All these studies prioritizing L2 users and their competence or proficiency indicate the importance and necessity of defining competence in relation to English as an international language. Nunn (2005, p.65) argues that "EIL competence, then cannot be reduced to a single, limited, monolingual or monocultural concept. It is composed of a set of interlocking and interdependent competence's that sometimes compensate for each other, sometimes counteract each other and sometimes reinforce each other." Alptekin (2002) has already indicated that the traditional notion of communicative competence is an unrealistic goal for EIL learners and Nunn (2005, p.65) further argues that "transitional views of competence are inappropriate in so far as they imply replacing one monolingual competence with another, whereas SL, FL, IL learners are adding to and maintaining their existing competences (Baker, 2000 and 2002)". Thus pragmatic, rhetorical, strategic and discourse competences that focus on mutual intelligibility, raise important components of the knowledge of bilingual speakers. Linguistic competence, on the other hand, remains an important issue in teaching English as an international language. Quirk's Nuclear English (1981), which calls for a simplification in the morphology and syntax, aims to provide a common standard in linguistic competence but beside its prescriptive nature, as Nunn (2005, p.62) argues "there is a danger of international becoming a byword for
reduced linguistic competence". Following Strevens (1992) I argue that the core grammar and vocabulary of the educated inner circle varieties (British or American) are the best possible models of linguistic competence for English as international language pedagogy. As Strevens (1992, p. 40) argues "it is not because other varieties are "wrong" nor inferior or substandard but because they are used and accepted only in that geographical area and among that community (and hence) they would be unacceptable elsewhere". Having a larger linguistic repertoire EIL learners will naturally reflect the characteristics of the linguistic competence of their L1s and this would be better considered as a natural language transfer much in the case of code mixing and code switching. The same is true of the pragmatic and discourse competences. However, it is difficult to establish standards for these variations since cross cultural communication occurs among non-native speakers from a variety of linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

Yet linguistic competence remains an essential component in EIL competence. Acar (2005) argued that linguistic competence has largely been neglected throughout the communicative era and Nunn (2005, p.72) "contends that there is an increased potential for neglecting linguistic competence to an even greater extent in the field of EIL."

Thus the concept of competence holds an important place within the discussions of EIL pedagogy. This issue, along with the others, necessitate a re-examination in the common assumptions of one of the most commonly discussed ELT traditions, namely, task based language teaching and learning. The issues that remain to be addressed are; what should be the place of tasks within the curriculum, should tasks be viewed as the center of the syllabus or as methodological procedures, and what should tasks emphasize in teaching practice.

**English as an international language pedagogy and task based language teaching and learning**

Task based language teaching is generally characterized as a development within the communicative approach. It takes tasks defined in a variety of ways as central elements in syllabus design and teaching, in other words, task based language teaching advocates the view that syllabus content might be specified in terms of learning tasks. Thus, the focus is on the process rather than product. "However processes belong to the domain of methodology" (Nunan 1989, p. 12). Thus with the rise of task based language teaching the traditional distinction between syllabus design and methodology becomes problematical.

Traditionally syllabus design is concerned with the selection and sequencing of content and methodology relates to how learners will learn. In my reconsideration of task based language teaching within the framework of English as an international language pedagogy I maintain this traditional distinction and claim that the specification of learning tasks should be considered as part of methodology and not of syllabus design. The main reason for this claim is that replacing methodological procedures with the language content, along with other syllabus elements, would be problematical in English as international language pedagogy.

EIL pedagogy prioritizes the L2 user, bilingual or multilingual competence and mutual intelligibility as a goal in cross cultural communication. Thus any EIL syllabus design should be informed by the nature of such a competence along with the learners' purpose in learning the language. Taking EIL competence as a point of
reference would necessitate a consideration of linguistic, pragmatic, rhetorical, discourse and strategic competences of these bilingual speakers. One essential point to be noted is that bilingual speakers will add up to their existing competencies rather than replacing them. Thus syllabus design won't be transitional in nature, that is, aiming to replace the learners’ L1 competence with native speaker competence. Native speaker norms of use, native speaker context of language use, native speaker cultural topics, native speaker discourse strategies and authentic texts should no longer inform syllabus design and teaching. Altogether what is authentic for native speakers may not be authentic for non-native speakers. Essentially, in terms of pragmatic and discourse competencies, English users will reflect their own cultural norms of appropriateness. The notion of appropriateness will remain a relative term and concept in international communication. Thus, the domain of language use, various cultural topics, and cross cultural encounters in international contexts, seem to be important determinants in EIL pedagogy and hence topic, text and context selection, along with language content, seem to be important factors in EIL syllabus design. Taking learning tasks as a point of reference in syllabus design would then mean ignoring such determinants in EIL pedagogy.

Indeed, neglecting essential language content in task based syllabus design, the issue of focus on form, has caused problems in task based language teaching itself and the attempts to solve this problem did not go beyond the terminological changes. The most important characteristics of a task is its communicative purpose in which the focus is on meaning rather than form. However, some researchers (e.g., Estaire and Zanon, 1994, pp. 13-20) distinguish between two main categories of task "'communication task', in which the 'learner's attention is focused on meaning rather than form', and 'enabling tasks', in which 'the main focus is on linguistic aspects (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, function, and discourse')" (in Littlewood, p. 320). However, Ellis (2003) calls for a distinction between "tasks" and "exercises". He classifies tasks as "activities that call for primarily meaning focused language use" and "exercises" as activities "that call for primarily form focused language use" (Ellis, 2003, p. 3). Thus, what Estaire and Zanon classify as 'enabling tasks' are 'exercises' for Ellis. Such terminological changes in the definition of tasks do not seem to fill the gap in the treatment of language content in task based language teaching. Furthermore, Ellis emphasizes that "the overall purpose of tasks is the same as exercises, learning a language- the difference lying in the means by which this purpose is to be achieved" (Ellis, 2003, p.3). Thus within the framework of EIL pedagogy it would be inappropriate to replace tasks with some important reference points like EIL competence, topic, context and aim in learning the language. This would, then, lead us to consider tasks as methodological procedures to practice the specified content for a specific aim (such as tasks aiming to develop strategic competence to enhance accommodation and mutual intelligibility). Thus I recognize the value of tasks as useful methodological procedures in EIL pedagogy since they promote meaningful language practice. However, tasks would best be viewed as a means to an end rather than an end itself.

Conclusion
With its global spread, English has now gained the status of an international language. The number of non-native speakers exceed the number of native speakers and most communication in English now occurs among non-natives. In terms of pedagogy, this reality of English has resulted in a re-examination of the traditional ELT assumptions which take native speaker competence as a point of reference. Thus L2 users or bilingual users have been increasingly recognized as English users in their own right, which necessitates a focus of attention on these English users'
knowledge of language as well as their aim in learning the language. This paper re-examined task based language teaching and learning within the framework of EIL pedagogy. The consideration of the above factors necessitates taking EIL competence and learners' purpose in learning the language as a point of reference in EIL pedagogy. Thus, it is suggested, the place of tasks in the curriculum be reframed. Tasks are still valuable pedagogical tools but they should be best viewed as methodological procedures to practice the specified content.
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Abstract
The Concentric Circles Model promoted by Kachru has had a tremendous impact on the teaching and research enterprise, as its underlying tenets have demanded a reappraisal of dominant concepts, models and practices in sociolinguistics, SLA and TESOL. However, this paper takes on a critical re-examination of the model, and discusses some of its intrinsic and perhaps unforeseen shortcomings, typified in its centre-periphery framework and its geo-historic bases. It also highlights certain drawbacks that have become salient in the face of globalization, and these are explored in terms of changing norms, contemporary patterns of language use and the rise of EIL. In response, it is suggested that for a model to be relevant, it must focus on individual speakers, their communicative competence and patterns of interaction. In particular, the paper draws attention to the 'glocal' nature of English: the need for speakers to be able to function effectively both in local and global contexts of use. The discussion concludes by considering how a reconstituted model can impact attitudes and inform classroom pedagogy.

1.0 A brief description of the Three Circle model
In a seminal article, Kachru (1985) drew attention to the global diffusion of English and resultant innovations around the world. Describing the sheer magnitude of the spread of the English language as unprecedented, he pointed to the changing demographic distribution of the language, as well as its new roles in terms of range of functions and depth of societal penetration. This, he went on to argue, had rendered the traditional dichotomy between native and non-native speaker unsightly and linguistically questionable. Instead, he proposed the use of the term
World Englishes to symbolize "the functional and formal variations, divergent sociolinguistic contexts, ranges and varieties of English in creativity, and various types of acculturation in parts of the Western and non-Western world" (Kachru, 1992, p.2).

Furthermore, Kachru (1985) described the spread of English in terms of three concentric circles: the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle and the Expanding Circle. These circles represent "the types of spread, the patterns of acquisition and the functional domains in which English is used across cultures and languages" (Kachru, 1985, p.12). The Inner Circle comprises the traditional bases of English, dominated by the mother-tongue varieties, that is, where English is the primary language of a substantial, often monolingual, majority. Countries in the Inner Circle include the USA, the UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The Outer Circle is primarily made up of countries where English has a colonial history, and where the language has developed institutionalized functions. Although English may be accorded an important status by language policies, it is only one of two or more codes in the linguistic repertoire of the speakers, who are usually multilingual, or at least bilingual. Hence, English typically exhibits an extended functional range in the Outer Circle and is used in various social, educational, administrative and literary domains. In addition, the language displays a significant depth in terms of users at different levels of society, resulting in a cline of competence manifested in educated to bazaar sub-varieties of English. Most of the countries placed in the Outer Circle are former colonies of the UK or the USA, such as Malaysia, Singapore, India, Ghana, Kenya and others. Finally, the Expanding Circle includes the rest of the world, where performance varieties of the language are usually used, essentially in restricted contexts. In general, English plays a role here as a foreign language for international communication and for specific purposes as in the reading of scientific and technical materials. Countries in the Expanding Circle include China, Egypt, Indonesia, South Korea, Saudi Arabia and others.

Kachru (1985) also distinguished speech fellowships with reference to the circles and described them as norm-providing, norm-developing and norm-dependent. The Inner Circle was seen as norm-providing, but within these Inner Circle Englishes, the British variety, and more recently, the American model seem to form an elite, preferred group. In the norm-developing speech fellowships of the Outer Circle, a tension may be observed between linguistic norm and linguistic behaviour, resulting in divided attitudes towards endocentric norms. Finally, norm-dependent varieties were said to be used in the Expanding Circle countries, and these norms are essentially external (usually American or British).

2.0 The value of the model
When it was first proposed, the concentric circles paradigm proved to be extremely useful as it raised awareness of and appreciation for the contexts and varieties of English worldwide, and also provided a framework for the study of World Englishes. According to Kachru (1985), using the concept of speakers of English from the Inner, Outer and Expanding Circles is preferable to the traditional native, ESL, EFL labels because the latter maintains the native-nonnative dichotomy between us and them, whereas the former emphasizes WE-ness. Moreover, the idea that English is someone's second language, implies that it is someone else's first language, and this, it is argued, creates problems. It gives the impression that English belongs to the native speaker who owns it as his first language; as for the rest, "it is almost unavoidable that anyone would take 'second' as less worthy" (Kachru and Nelson,
1996, p.79). In contrast, the Three Circle model helps promote varieties of English by drawing attention to their systematicity, robustness, creativity, communicative potential and relative prestige. In this way the model has provided the impetus for processes of codification and legitimization, resulting in, for instance, the recognition of literary works and pedagogical models and materials beyond the traditional norm-providing varieties. In short, the strength and impact of the model reside in its ethos that emphasizes pluralism, linguistic diversity and inclusivity.

It has to be said, however, that Kachru (1985) himself noted that the concentric circles may be an oversimplification and that fuzzy areas exist, the difficulty with the status and placement of countries like South Africa and Jamaica within the circles being a case in point. The fact is that the categories are not necessarily mutually exclusive, as Kachru himself has acknowledged, and grey areas exist between the circles. Moreover, he has pointed out that languages have life cycles, particularly in multilingual communities, and the status of a language may shift overall, or even within a given locality. Bolton (2005, p.75), for instance, expresses the view that "the Kachruvian model of the three circles was never intended to be monolithic and unchanging, but was formulated in the 1980s as a potent rewrite of centrist orthodoxies of that time". There is thus an implicit acknowledgement that because the situation is dynamic, changes are only to be expected. These caveats and sentiments taken together bolster the plausibility of the construct.

However, I feel that as revolutionary and valuable as the model has been, the pace with which English has spread, the power and politics associated with it, and the sweeping consequences of globalization have made a review of the Kachruvian circles timely.

3.0 Centring of the Inner Circle
The first unfortunate product of the model is that it locates native speakers and native-speaking countries of the Inner Circle right in the privileged position at the centre. The very term 'inner circle' conjures up a host of connotations, and a quick cross-reference to the Wordnet dictionary 2.0 reveals the following descriptions: "confined to an exclusive group", "privy to inner knowledge", "inside information", "privileged information", "exclusive to a center; especially a center of influence". Undoubtedly, this representation played a part in ushering in Phillipson's (1992) influential and critical conceptualization of the unequal relations between the 'core English-speaking countries' (situated at the centre of the model) and the 'periphery-English countries' (the Outer and Expanding Circles).

Graddol (1997, p.10) points to the positioning of native-speaking countries as a drawback of the model as it seems to imply that the Inner Circle should be viewed as "the source of models of correctness, the best teachers and English-speaking goods and services consumed by those in the periphery". Modiano (1999, p.24) too criticizes Kachru's Inner Circle as presenting a Eurocentric frame, and points out that it "re-establishes the notion that the language is the property of specific groups, and that correct usage is determined by experts who speak a prestige variety". It is ironic then that the tri-circle model inadvertently reinforces the concept of the native speaker as the centre of reference, thus promoting a form of linguistic imperialism and language hegemony that Kachru was determined to avoid.

All this has contributed to other drawbacks, such as the emergence of conflicting attitudes. This may be exemplified in the bipolar views expressed among scholars
about the spread of English. Some have taken a less politically-charged stance, treating the spread of English as a function of aspirations to modernity, social mobility and economic opportunities. Such views are, of course, paralleled by the emphatic calls for English language competence and increasing support for English language education in both countries of the Outer and Expanding Circles, where a very high premium is placed on the language. On the other hand, there are scholars who have vigorously criticized the relentless propagation of English and its gatekeeping roles which create and perpetuate socioeconomic factions in societies, such that competence in English becomes a crucial divider. Pennycook (2003, p. 519-521), for instance, denounces the "descriptive inadequacy" of the Three Circle model, and its "exclusionary tendency", as its principal focus appears to be on national, "codified varieties ... spoken by a small elite". The paradigm as a whole is soundly criticized for its political naiveté that ultimately serves to promote global capitalism.

A second area that illustrates the adverse effects of the positioning of traditional varieties in the centre of the model is the growing ambivalence between linguistic norms and actual behaviour of users of English in both the Outer and Expanding Circles. Despite ongoing efforts to recognize the new varieties and elevate their statuses, there remains widespread perception among non-native users that Inner Circle norms are somehow superior, and their own varieties somewhat defective. Such schizophrenic attitudes are captured in a number of studies in which speakers express pride in their own accents and varieties, and yet at the same time, espouse a preference and yearning for the native-speaker accent and for traditional old variety norms (see Dalton, et al, 1997; Timmis, 2002; Jenkins, 2005). One may point out, of course, that the Circles model merely captures and describes such discordant and paradoxical views among speakers. But, equally, it may be argued that by locating speakers in specific circles, the model is divisive, creating linguistic conflict and insecurity as marginalized groups of speakers continue to wrestle with issues of legitimacy and ownership of the language.

4.0 Norms of English use
Another change that has gradually taken place involves the role of the three speech fellowships. From an initial three - norm-providing, norm-developing and norm-dependent, Kachru (1996) himself later re-conceptualized the speech fellowships, making only a dual distinction between norm-providing users which include L1 and L2 norms (e.g. USA, US, Australia and others, together with Singapore, Nigeria, India, etc.), and norm-dependent users (e.g. China, Egypt, Iran, South Korea, Taiwan, etc.). Kachru claimed that as a result of the development and establishing of local norms and models for the acquisition, teaching and creativity in Englishes, the countries of the Outer Circle may well be considered norm-providing as well. However, this modification brings about an undesirable divide between norm-providing and norm-dependent varieties and creates an us and them dichotomy, which the Kachruvian model sought to abolish in the first place. Furthermore, it reinforces the idea that the centre, in particular, provides the standards and norms of English to which others, especially Expanding Circle countries, need to conform.

While the grouping of L1 and L2 norms into one norm-providing speech fellowship draws into question the need to maintain the rigid distinction between the Inner and Outer Circles, it also moves the spotlight onto the excluded Expanding Circle. Clearly, several countries of the Expanding Circle are increasingly moving away from
dependency on traditional varieties, and scholars like Seidhofer and Jenkins (2003) have argued for the legitimization of Expanding Circle Englishes. A number of countries of the Outer and Expanding Circles have developed their own standards that not only provide norms for internal consumption, but are also 'exported' to other countries via textbooks, training programmes, ESL/EFL teachers and literatures in English. Strevens (1992, pp. 43-44) observes that "India has supplied teachers of English to China, Belgian teachers teach English in Morocco; while in the Arabian Gulf States, many teachers of English are from Pakistan ...". Similarly, Honey (1989) describes India as the third biggest publisher of books in the English language and a major exporter of graduates of various disciplines, from medicine to education, to Western Europe, Africa, the Gulf States, and North America. Graddol (1997) notes that Malaysia has become a regional exporter of educational goods and services, including an early learning kit designed to help pre-school children in Thailand, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Indonesia learn English. Furthermore, in line with aspirations of becoming a regional hub of educational excellence, Malaysia and Singapore continue to attract students from all over the world desiring to gain proficiency in English and thereafter embark on courses conducted in English. Ironically, even the countries of the Inner Circle have sought to employ teachers from the other circles in schools and in universities, as attested to by the growing presence of international staff in many English departments across the world. As Braine (1999, p. xvii) observes "a fairly recent phenomenon in Western academia is the increasing presence of foreigners as teachers, researchers and scholars in almost every discipline including ELT."

Nevertheless, some may argue that no matter how we conceptualize the spread of English and its consequences, it is still founded on Inner Circle norms. This may still be true with respect to formal varieties of English, best captured in the written form, but the existence and growth of distinct yet internationally intelligible spoken varieties of English attest to the viability of alternative patterns of use in certain linguistic areas without communication being adversely affected. Although still under-researched, this would point towards a core English essential to maintaining mutual intelligibility, but one that is not necessarily and exclusively tied to Inner Circle norms. The move away from dependence on traditional Inner Circle norms will continue as English spreads and acquires more first and second language speakers from diverse countries, and as globalization paves the way for increased interactions in English between speakers of the other circles. In fact, Jenkins (2000) goes a step further, suggesting that because most interaction in English today takes place between non-native speakers, any attempt to establish new models and norms must take these speakers and their varieties of English into account.

5.0 Changing patterns of language use
Changes, both gradual and dramatic, in the use and users of English around the world call attention to what may be regarded as a critical shortcoming in the Kachruvian model: its historical and geographical bases. Not only does the Three Circle model draw heavily on colonial pasts, it is also constituted on specific geographical locations. Modiano (1999) takes exception to the fact that the model represents the spread of English as being the consequence of the historic exploits of certain groups of people, thus establishing their superiority, whilst further marginalizing the peoples of the Outer and Expanding Circles. Bruthiaux (2003, p.161) declares that Kachru's Three Circle model is severely limited because it is "a primarily nation-based model which draws on specific historical events and which correlates poorly with current sociolinguistic data". Bruthiaux's claim that the model
encourages broad-brush descriptions and leads to a tendency to gloss over variations in the Expanding, Outer and Inner Circles is now examined in the discussion below.

Clearly, as Kachru himself highlighted, there is tremendous variation in proficiency levels among speakers within the Outer and Expanding Circles, ranging from little or no competency to full 'native-like' competency. Firstly, there are people in the Expanding Circle who have acquired proficiency and a range of use in English, and are more appropriately placed in one of the other circles. Graddol (1997) presents a list of nations in transition from EFL to L2 status, which includes countries as diverse as Argentina, Norway and United Arab Emirates. Additionally, there are countries in the Expanding Circle like Denmark and Germany which have been using English domestically, intensively and extensively, for quite some time. Does Germany belong to the Expanding or to the Outer Circle? Berns (1995) argues that the use of English in Germany displays qualities that make it more similar to Outer Circle countries than to those of the Expanding Circle. Although English does not have institutionalized status, it is difficult to keep Germany in the Expanding Circle given its central position within the European Union, and "the functions it [English] serves in various social, cultural, commercial and educational settings" (Berns, 1995, p.9).

By the same token, it is obvious that there are Outer Circle speakers with minimal command of the language, and who rarely use English outside the classroom. Furthermore, it is also important to consider the phenomenon of nativization of English (Kachru, 1992). While the process of nativization has enabled English to adapt to new contexts in which it was transplanted and to take on localized identities, it has also resulted in varieties distinctly different from each other and from the traditional varieties from which they were derived. While these developments have been lauded in many quarters, they have also raised serious concerns about the communicative value of these new Englishes outside their local communities. Research has uncovered the fact that there are vast segments of the population in Outer Circle countries who are familiar only with a highly localized form of English. Should a person who is fluent only in colloquial, basilectal or pidginized English count as a proficient speaker of English?

Then, of course, there are people in the Outer and Expanding Circles who may use an internationally intelligible form of English, claim English as their first or preferred language, and thus 'deserve' to be placed in the Inner Circle. In many of the countries of the Outer Circle, it is not uncommon to find English adopted as the language of the home, particularly among the professional and middle class members of society. This led Richards and Tay way back in 1981 to declare that the native speaker of English need not be identified only by virtue of his birthright, nor does he have to be from one of the traditionally native-speaking countries. Instead they redefined the native speaker of English as "one who learns English in childhood and continues to use it as his dominant language and has reached a certain level of fluency in terms of grammatical well-formedness, speech-act rules, functional elaboration and code diversity. All three conditions are important" (p. 53, italics in original). Such a characterization makes it possible for native speakers of English to be found anywhere in the world, making the demarcation between Circles less significant. As Graddoll (1997, p.11) puts it, "English is thus acquiring new first-language speakers outside the traditional 'native-speaking' countries". Crystal (2003a) calculates that there are over 329 million speakers of English as a first language, including Creole, in over 50 territories around the world, ranging from
Antigua and Barbuda, to Malaysia and Singapore. All this only makes it increasingly difficult to sustain the strict geographical distinction between the circles.

Another area that is being challenged is the traditional description of Inner Circle speakers as possessing a model that is largely endonormative, displaying the norms of correctness. This depiction ignores huge dialectal variation that is evident throughout Inner Circle communities. As Bruthiaux (2003, p.162) points out, "the model reinforces the perceptions of Inner Circle varieties of English as largely monolithic and standardized because it offers no account of dialectal variation within each of the varieties that it lists". In Inner Circle Britain, for instance, Trudgill (1999) records that only about 9 -12 percent of the population speak Standard English, and even then with some form of regional accent, whilst Crystal (2003b) notes that Received Pronunciation (RP) in its pure form is spoken by less than 3 percent of the British population. Today, it is not uncommon to hear anecdotes of English-speaking visitors to the UK baffled and bewildered by the near incomprehensible speech of many of its speakers, thought to be paragons of correct English.

Furthermore, the countries in the Inner Circle are not spared from changes in the use and users of English, due to increasing diversity primarily as a result of immigration. Referring to countries of the Inner Circle, McArthur (2001, p. 8) points out that in the past they were presented as if they were language monoliths. The reality is quite different: "in such territories, one can find intricate language mosaics, including hybridization, as for example in the US, New Zealand, South Africa, and Wales, and in such 'world cities' as London, New York, Sydney and Montreal". According to the US Census Bureau, the percentage of foreign-born people in the United States doubled between 1970 and 1995 from 4.8 percent to 8.7 percent, and the 2000 Census indicates that more than 17% of US residents speak a language other than English at home (Source: US English Foundation). Yano (2000, p. 122) quotes a newspaper report indicating that the number of non-native English speakers in the US will soon exceed that of native speakers in certain areas like California, Hawaii and Texas. The prevalence of speakers not typically considered native speakers in the Inner Circle countries is further attested to in the problems faced by researchers on the International Corpus of English (ICE) project who had to grapple with the issue of defining who should count as a native speaker, and thus be allowed to contribute towards the corpus. Working in New Zealand, Holmes (1996, p. 164) asks, "At what point does an immigrant become a New Zealander?" The researchers in New Zealand, for instance, finally decided that New Zealanders who had spent extensive periods of time overseas were ineligible, as were people who had lived in New Zealand only after the age of ten. This dilemma and the resulting criteria only underscore the difficulty of claiming that Inner Circle countries represent native speakers of English. Similar changes on demographics are occurring elsewhere as well, prompting Yano (2000, p. 122) to declare that "such internationalization of community components in Britain, the US, and other countries in the inner circle may make it necessary to redefine what the inner circle is".

The rise of EIL

Another contentious issue that should be taken into consideration is the fact that the speakers of the Inner Circle for whom English is the first or dominant language may not always be the models of correctness when it comes to English as an international language (EIL). Informal varieties of the Inner Circle rarely perform well on the global stage, and, moreover, Modiano (1999, p. 24) points to the fact that many speakers of regional varieties in the US and UK are not intelligible to other speakers
Burgess (2004) writing in the Guardian says, "I've observed Australian kids in Japan having huge problems communicating in English because they have no notion of how much their own speech works only in an Australian context". Similarly, global fans of the English Premier League are often subjected to doses of unintelligible dialectal speech from some British footballers, whilst ironically, some of their European and African counterparts in the EPL come across as speaking very clear, highly comprehensible English. I shall return to the notion of EIL again, but for now, the point is that it is difficult to justify the central position occupied by speakers of the Inner Circle whilst many proficient speakers of the language are strictly assigned to function outside this privileged circle.

7.0 Alternative approaches
What then is an alternative model that better reflects present day sociolinguistic realities? Rampton (1990) moots the idea of replacing the concept of nativeness with one of competence, and argues for the notion of expert speaker to be used, rather than native speaker to denote accomplished users of the language. This, I would concur, is probably the best way forward. Thinking along similar lines, Modiano (1999) proposes a centripetal circles model in which the inner circle is not formed by native speakers of English, but by excellent communicators of English as an International Language (EIL). Modiano (1999, p. 25) excludes from the inner circle native speakers of English who have "excessive regional accents and dialects" and who are incapable of switching to EIL when the context demands it, as he feels that they are not efficient communicators in an international context. He places such native speakers of regional dialects into the second circle, alongside non-native speakers who speak internationally incomprehensible indigenized varieties, and speakers of Creole, whose language is not intelligible to speakers of EIL. The third circle then comprises those who are not yet proficient in any variety of English, be it a native variety, a regional variety or an indigenized one. While, Modiano's proposal is not without its weaknesses (the discussion of which is outside the scope of this paper, but see English Today, 58), his model gets rid of the notion of native speakers being in a privileged group and responsible for defining the language; instead the responsibility is shared. A similar principle is used by Melchers and Shaw (2003). Using speakers' scope of proficiency as a criterion, they distinguish four levels: those who are internationally effective, nationally effective, locally proficient and ineffective. In this way, categories defined in terms of nativeness, history and geography are discarded in favour of individual competence.

At this juncture, it is perhaps prudent to confess that I have used the term international English or EIL as if it were an unambiguous and unproblematic concept. In reality, it is still a subject of some controversy and despite a steadily growing number of advocates, the notion remains rather nebulous. For starters, English as an international language (EIL) has been variously defined, and it is often used interchangeably with English as a lingua franca (ELF), English as a global language, and English as a world language, and Burt (2005) points out that it is often unclear exactly which groups of speakers are included and which excluded in these terms. In particular, ELF has been the focus of considerable research, and appears to be associated especially with non-native speakers' use of the language for international communication (Seidlhofer, 2004; Llurda, 2004). Yet another thorny issue is the temptation to continue to use L1 norms to describe and regulate EIL. As Phan Le Ha (2005, p. 33) notes, current practices suggest that "the centre Englishes and their related pedagogies are generally used as international standards, while other Englishes are for local uses only". Other scholars, too, have opposed this stance, and have argued for a relinquishing of native-speaker competence as the yardstick, and
for EIL to develop without reference to Inner Circle Englishes (Brutt-Griffler, 1998; Seidlhofer, 2001). A third area of contention is the nature of EIL. With preliminary findings characterizing it in terms of a simplified lexicon and grammatical structure (Seidlhofer, 2001), concerns have been raised about neglecting linguistic competence in attempts to promote EIL. Nunn (2005, p. 63) provocatively asks if "there is a danger of "international" becoming a byword for reduced linguistic competence". On a more critical note, Hadley (2004) argues that by not emphasizing linguistic competence, learners of EIL are "returned to a system of dependence and conformity... creating the need for experts to come in to assist in the process of clear communication" (p. 47).

It is not the intention of this paper to resolve these burning issues. Allow me, however, to reiterate my working conceptualization of the term EIL. I use this term broadly to refer to English used across national boundaries, and as such it may be used by both native and non-native speakers. Furthermore, EIL is not equivalent to Inner Circle varieties, and so native speakers cannot assume the role of custodians of it. In fact, as Widdowson (1998, p. 399) argues, EIL must be allowed to develop without reference to any of the circles: "notions of the Inner and Outer Circles are irrelevant". There is no role for or allegiance to the specific varieties of English used within regions in any of the circles. I also concur with Widdowson's (1998, pp. 399-400) argument that English "cannot be national and international at the same time", for Englishes adapted to "local communal requirements are not qualified as a global means of communication". This is exactly the point, and it paves the way for bidialectalism, an idea also promoted by Crystal (2003b, p.185) who describes the practice of switching between an informal variety, spoken at home or in the local community, and another dialect used in situations removed from the familiar. The former may be "full of casual pronunciation, colloquial grammar, and local turns of phrase" and the latter "full of careful pronunciation, conventional grammar and standard vocabulary", signalling the development of World Standard Spoken English. This view of bidialectalism accommodates the idea of speakers actively using a regional sub-variety that provides access to a local community and another sub-variety which provides access to the world community, and it can be applied to all speakers of English, regardless of the circle with which they are associated.

Briefly then, a more sociolinguistically-sound perspective to variation in varieties of English needs to preserve a division between learners who have not acquired competence in English and proficient users of the language, be they monolinguals or bilinguals. The language of the former may be characterized by inaccuracies and learner errors, whilst that of the latter is best described as a stable regional form wielded by proficient speakers. A second fundamental dichotomy is that of intranational and international ways of speaking. As a reflection of intranational and international imperatives, to be communicatively competent in today's increasingly borderless world, a speaker must be able to switch, when necessary, from a private voice to a public voice (Kramsch, 1999), and thus embrace both "local appropriation" and "global appropriacy" (Alptekin, 2002, p. 63). I would suggest that such accomplished users of the language may be monolingual or bilingual, and that terms like 'multicompetent language user' (Cook, 1999) and 'successful user of English' (Prodromou, 2003), which were hitherto restricted to L2 or non-native speakers, may be reconstituted to aptly describe these speakers.

Such a conceptualization would give rise to a different Three Circle model. While acknowledging the fuzzy distinctions between circles, in principle, the inner circle
could comprise all users who are proficient in English and able to instinctively code-switch between international and national or regional varieties to communicate in the most appropriate way. The case has already been made earlier that this need for proficiency in EIL and for skills in code switching concerns equally both native and non-native speakers, thereby establishing a democratic basis for language development and reinforcing the notion that English belongs to all its users. The second circle could consist of speakers who are proficient only in regional varieties, i.e. native and non-native speakers with restricted intranational proficiency, while the outer circle could be made up of learners of the language. This reconfigured three-circle model also allows for those who have mastered EIL to move into the inner circle, and so the first circle expands. However, in preserving the outer circle for speakers who are content with competence of a restricted or regional kind, and have no need for communication on a more global scale, it creates space for localized identities. In that sense, the model is able to accommodate notions of social mobility, economic ambition and individual identity, and so presents a view that is more in keeping with a democratic ideology of linguistic diversity.

I grant there is some oversimplification here and the proposed model probably raises more questions than it answers. For example, what characterizes the proficient speaker of English, or what level of proficiency should one have to qualify as a competent user of English? Is it possible to lack linguistic competence, and yet be an internationally successful user of English, drawing perhaps on intercultural competence? Can linguistic competence actually impede international communication on occasion? The questions and complexities derive partly because, as Nunn (2005, p. 66) suggests, "EIL competence cannot be reduced to a single, limited, monolingual or mono-cultural concept. It is composed of a set of interlocking and interdependent competences that sometimes compensate for each other, sometimes counteract each other and sometimes reinforce each other". Clearly, there are no easy answers, but the fact that communicative competence in EIL has yet to be unambiguously defined should not warrant a dogged insistence on norms being exclusively and often unreasonably linked to monoglot native-speaker competence and thereby to matters of residence, inheritance or affiliation. Instead, it is hoped that the issues raised in this paper will contribute to the debate and spur further investigations on the question of competence and norms with respect to EIL.

8.0 Pedagogical considerations
The arguments and tentative model presented in this paper offer several pedagogical points for reflection. First, it would mean that there is little need to continually look to certain countries that play host to the traditional native speaker for standards, reference points and approval. Instead, the focus shifts to the proficient speaker, and clearly, expert users of English may be found anywhere in the world. It potentially allows for a Malaysian and an Australian, for example, to be placed on equal footing, and encourages the dismantling of paradigms and hierarchies built on superiority, imperialism, exclusivity and bias. It also helps draw attention to the fact that the competent non-native speaker is in many ways the more appropriate role model for most learners of English.

Second, the proposed model acknowledges the impact of globalization, the reality of the interdependent world and seeks to respond to the growth of EIL by privileging internationally articulate, intelligible English. It also recognizes and even celebrates the fact that this variety of English will necessarily be characterized by diversity and vibrancy. This in turn should act to promote less judgemental attitudes towards
emerging World English varieties, as classrooms seek to raise awareness of language attitudes and cross-cultural communication, and students learn to adjust their expectations to accommodate to diversity and different interlocutors. Such a stand would have important implications for the development of the curriculum, instructional materials and classroom practice. To illustrate, McKay (2003, p. 19) points out that "the de-linking of English from the culture of Inner Circle countries also suggests that teaching methodology has to proceed in a manner that respects the local culture of learning". Although it must be admitted that the whole area of EIL is still in its infancy, progress has been noted (Jenkins, 2000; McKay, 2002) and should inspire further research.

Third, the model recognizes the fact that English is increasingly used as a global language, even while it is rooted in local contexts. Therein lies the challenge: English serves both global and local communicative needs, a fact that led Pakir (1999) to refer to it as the "glocal" language. Rajadurai (2004) for instance, analyses this dual role of English in her description of the different faces of English in Malaysia. It may be likened to the two faces of the Roman god, Janus, facing in opposite directions. When engaging in global interaction, English points us outwards as a language of wider communication, but when used within the community, it points us inwards into our very being, our sense of individual and social identity. These two faces of English establish a tension that learners and users must come to terms with. As for educators, they must grapple with the uses of English for global communication, without losing sight of how it is embedded in local contexts.

9.0 Conclusion
I would like to conclude by first acknowledging the invaluable contribution Kachru's Concentric Circle model has made to our appreciation of the spread and development of English worldwide. However, the thrust of this paper has been to critically re-examine the fundamental features of the model in the light of current sociolinguistic realities, and here it is found to be wanting. Moreover, by being grounded in historical and geographical factors, it tends to reproduce, perhaps unwittingly, some of the unequal relationships it purports to critique. Instead, it is proposed that a model of variation in English be founded on the concept of proficiency and communicative competence of individual users; after all, it is not countries but people who speak languages. It prioritizes competence as a critical criterion, recognizes the growth of EIL as a consequence of globalization, and acknowledges the 'glocal' nature of the language. It is hoped that the issues raised in this paper will challenge current thinking and pedagogical practices, and provide an impetus for continuing research.
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Abstract
There might be considerable consensus on the models of “proficiency” among L2 education specialists but there is currently no empirically validated description. The more fundamental concept of “communicative competence” and an ongoing debate towards a more detailed analysis of communicative activities have overshadowed the concept of “proficiency.” The concept seems to be understood and be a useful reference point in the discourse of L2 professionals until it is questioned and further explored. Defining “proficiency” is a more complex topic than is generally assumed. In this article, the author attempts to explore the validity of the concept of ‘proficiency’ in L2 education and indicate some aspects useful for careful consideration when constructing the “EIL competence” framework.

Keywords: Proficiency; Communicative Competence; Proficiency Tests; Native Speaker; EIL

Introduction
In this article, I outline different angles for looking at the criticized concept of “proficiency” which might usefully be considered when debating the concept of English as an International Language competence. I begin with the impetuses which led me to write this paper; then I state the aims and discuss the evolution of the concept from the point of view of proficiency tests and scales. Speculations on the native speaker concept bring us back to the concept of EIL competence. I conclude with a summary of my arguments for undermining the concept of proficiency and proposing ideas for consideration in the development of the concept of “EIL competence”.

Justification
The first impetus which led me to write this paper is the myriad of intricacies around
the concepts of “proficiency” and “competence”. The concept of “proficiency” occupies a curious position: theoretically it is full of ambiguity and may be treated not as a single concept but as a combination of concepts. On the one hand, it is widely used; on the other hand, it is argued to be invalid in L2 education. Based on this ambiguous situation, I suggest that weaknesses be clarified and taken into account when constructing the concept of “EIL competence”.

This thinking has brought me to consider “proficiency” within the situation in Kazakhstan. Mottos to achieve “proficiency” in Kazakh are common and L2 education is becoming one of the priorities in educational developments due to the contentious nature of language issues in the Kazakhstan context. Unfortunately, the term appears to be widely used but without attention being paid to its actual meaning. This has served as another impetus to consider the issues below. An overview of the public discourse has prompted me to conclude that there seems to be little understanding in regard to the general complexity of the concept. It is not a secret to state that there has not been a validated description of “proficiency” and/or “competence” yet.

A curious fact from the etymological perspective comes across at this point. This might also be the case in some other contexts. Due to the natures of Kazakh and Russian languages only one word is used interchangeably for “proficiency” and “competence,” which adds to confusion in understanding the concept. The word “proficiency” simply does not exist and is given the same translation as the word “competence” and might not raise awareness of a possibility of two different concepts. One may feel confusion regarding the entire concept of “proficiency”, proficiency-based teaching, and proficiency testing; for some the notions of communicative competence and language proficiency are used interchangeably. Given these and similar circumstances, a desire among professionals and scholars to develop a unitary “proficiency” theory in clear categories with unambiguous relations is understandable. Such a framework would make pedagogical knowledge and educational activities more manageable but at present identifying proficiency/competence categories is problematic (North, 2000).

Finally, the growing global interest toward the EIL concept has prompted a revision of the “communicative competence” concept. Educationalists are now formulating procedures and priorities for EIL which will challenge native speakers and L2/FL speakers of English to learn how to communicate in cross-cultural settings (Richards, 2002). The most problematic aspect of defining EIL remains the notion of “competence” (Nunn, 2005). In the light of this complexity, a meaningful concept of generic “EIL competence” cannot exist. Therefore, careful analysis of every problematic aspect of the dilemma is requested. Nunn (ibid.) warns that there might be potential for neglecting “linguistic competence” in the field of EIL.

My belief is that before establishing the boundaries and categories for the concept of EIL and developing a proper “EIL competence” framework, educationalists should return to the origins of the “proficiency” concept which has been theoretically debated and empirically investigated for at least half a century. “Proficiency” and “competence” are different, at the same time related and merge into one another and can reflect the issues of interest and concern in relation to “EIL competence”. Previous experiences cannot and should not simply go away and it would not be reasonable to disregard all valuable work to be applied in efficient research agenda to address the weaknesses and limitations that have already been identified.
This paper will pursue three aims: to increase awareness of the debatable issues on the concept of “proficiency”, to attempt to undermine the concept and indicate some specific areas for consideration of the concept of “EIL competence”. It is hoped that this work will address some issues of interest to our readers who may happen to be not only professionals but also students and parents. Some issues discussed might have been further elaborated and considered in more depth. For the present purpose, however, the paper will attempt to raise some of the key issues that must be taken care of when discussing the concept of “EIL competence”. Our concern in this paper is not to provide a final clear definition of “proficiency” but to underline specific angles for further investigation.

Problematic Sides of “Proficiency”
Over time theoretical linguists have made a number of attempts to construct frameworks of “proficiency/competence.” Given the complexity of the issue, a general background on the views on “proficiency/competence” to see how they have changed over time and influenced L2 education is provided to contribute to the reader’s understanding of the foundation for the debate.

One of the initial theoretical frameworks for linguistic competence is derived from the structuralist school of linguists who maintained the view that learning a second language involved mastering its elements or components (Fries, 1966). Early models distinguished listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills and knowledge components, but did not clearly indicate whether skills manifested knowledge or whether they had different relations with knowledge components. L2 education at that time was based on the postulation that skills and knowledge components could be taught and tested separately.

The structural linguistic theory, along with behaviourist psychology theory, influenced L2 education producing the audio-lingual teaching method that assumed that speech was primary and each language was to be viewed within its own context as a unique system. In this view the speaker did not have to acquire knowledge ‘about the language’, although he/she could be capable of using it. According to Lado (1961), the approach which influenced L2 education development implied learning a new language was viewed as a sequence of activities leading to ‘habit formation.’ Audiolingualism focusing on the sequence of introducing the ‘four skills’ made this perspective popular in the 1960s. Nonetheless, Stern (1992) argues that the four skills remain useful expressions of proficiency in modern L2 education.

Chomsky (1965) started the evolutionary process by postulating a fundamental distinction in his theory of transformational generative grammar. Hymes (1971) put forward the concept of communicative competence to include not only grammatical competence but also sociolinguistic competence. (For instance, Campbell and Wales (1970) suggested that appropriacy of language is even more important than grammaticality). The two approaches have caused the major debate as to whether “communicative competence” included “grammatical competence” or not. Whilst early researchers paid more attention to the formal characteristics of language, Oller (1976, 1979) made an assumption that pragmatics was fundamental. He proposed one underlying factor – “global language proficiency” / “expectancy grammar,” thus presenting “proficiency” as a unitary construct.

Communicative Language Teaching came to replace Audiolingualism and the Structural-Situational Approach. The 1980s saw a new stage when the discussion of “proficiency” reflected more communicative terms. The emergence of the constructs
of “communicative competence” and “proficiency,” led to major shifts in conceptions of syllabuses and methodology, the effects of which continue to be seen today. Another set of concepts, psychological or behavioural, viewed “proficiency” as “competence” and determined it in intralingual and crosslingual terms. Savignon (1972) admitted the need for communicative functions. Cummins (1980; 2000) made a distinction between two components of “proficiency”: “basic interpersonal and communicative skills” (“BICS”) and “cognitive/academic language ability” (“CALP”).

I would like to consider in more detail the concept proposed by Canale and Swain (1980). Whilst there has been a lot of discussion as to the nature of the concept, they are the first scholars to present an extended concept of language components to facilitate such issues important for L2 education as language testing and curriculum development. Turning our thoughts to the introduction of this framework, we observe that it does not exemplify a perfect view of “proficiency,” as attempts to prove this framework empirically failed. However, it has opened a new era through the introduction of new components of “communicative competence” and extended language testing theory and facilitated test development by giving attention to communicative testing. This framework, later refined by Canale in 1983, distinguished four principal types of “competence”: “grammatical” (emphasis on language code), “sociolinguistic” (emphasis on appropriate use and understanding of language in different sociolinguistic contexts / appropriateness of both meanings and forms), “discourse” (emphasis on combination and interpretation of meanings and forms as well as the use of cohesion devices to relate forms and coherence rules to organize meanings), and “strategic” (emphasis on verbal and nonverbal strategies to compensate for breakdowns in communication).

Canale and Swain abstractly interpret “proficiency” as “communicative competence” and include “linguistic competence” within “communicative competence” to point out their indivisibility by putting forward an argument that grammar rules do not have meaning without rules of use. In their view, the grammatical component is as important as the sociolinguistic. Indeed, they view “grammatical competence” as knowledge of the rules of grammar and “sociolinguistic competence” as the knowledge of the rules of language use. A distinction is made between knowledge of use (“communicative competence”) and a demonstration of this knowledge (“performance”). “Performance” in their view is regarded as the realization of “competencies” and their interaction in the production and understanding of utterances. It can be assumed from the framework that “communicative competence” can be observed indirectly in actual “communicative performance.”

Bachman and Palmer (1982) also argue that language is not a simple enough a phenomenon to be described by only one general factor. They empirically support “linguistic,” “pragmatic” and “sociolinguistic competences” as the components of so-called “communicative proficiency.” Bachman and Palmer suggest that a model should include both a general factor and one or more specific factors to provide a better description for the concept of ‘proficiency’. Taking empirical evidence as a foundation, Bachman (1990a and 1990b) describes “proficiency” in terms of competence in a redefined way, suggesting organizational competence that includes morphology, syntax, vocabulary, cohesion, and organization and “pragmatic competence,” that includes Bachman and Palmer’s “sociolinguistic competence” and abilities related to the functions that are performed through language use.
The world has witnessed theories which sparked both proficiency-oriented teaching and teaching for “communicative competence.” The “proficiency” concept was said to guide teachers in regard to course objectives and course content and help determine outcomes. How to “prepare students for advanced and competent use of a foreign language both within and outside an academic setting” was one of the predominant themes in language teaching (Freed, 1989, p. 57). Now professional teachers have started to express concern about various aspects of proficiency standards, proficiency-based teaching, proficiency tests, and proficiency texts. For instance, sharp criticism focused on the US oral proficiency interview and the ACTFL proficiency guidelines and emphasized their being too teacher- and test-bound, lack of validity, inappropriate emphasis on grammatical accuracy, narrowly conceived views of communicative language use and failure to acknowledge adequately the underlying notion of “communicative competence.” These problems have been acknowledged due to a lack of a unitary theory.

Whilst the natures of “proficiency” and “competence” are complex, theorists see “proficiency/competence” in various views and arrive at different frameworks undermining the concepts. The step toward solving the problem would be to define the terms stemming from a plethora of viewpoints and raising a myriad of questions. Is “proficiency” the same as mastery of a specific language? Knowledge? The four skills? Is it simply “competence” which can help students to develop functionally useful foreign language skills? Is “proficiency” the same as “competence”? What constitutes both? The terminology for describing these notions has not, of course, always been the same.

It would be easier to propose a term “communicative language proficiency” to provide a more comprehensive definition of language use, but the relationship between “competence” and “proficiency” is a complex subject related to the distinction between theoretical and operational models (North, 2000). On the one hand, “proficiency” may also be considered a part of “competence”; on the other, it may serve as an umbrella term. Vollmer (1981) points out that the term “proficiency” tends to stress the competence or performance aspects. Although “proficiency” is commonly associated with knowledge, Ingram (1985) puts forward that “proficiency” is more than knowledge – rather the ability to apply it in specific communication contexts. Taylor (1988) suggests the term “communicative proficiency” and sees “proficiency” as “the ability to make use of competence” and “performance” as “what is done when proficiency is put to use.” Davies (1989) points out that it is shapeless and defines “proficiency” as a part of communicative competence, along with innate ability and performance. Kasper (1997, p.345) points out, “in applied linguistics, models of communicative competence serve as goal specifications” in L2 education. The most applicable general approach would be expressing “proficiency” as “communicative competence.” But in this case the goal is a comprehensive but unspecified command of L2 (Stern, 1992). A part of the problem is in the construct of communicative competence itself as theories have not yet provided a theoretical basis for a satisfactory description of the components of “proficiency” or their boundaries but it has been believed that a formalized theory of communicative competence should eliminate the concept of “proficiency.” In any case, a satisfactory validated clear theory would serve as a foundational background for efforts to construct EIL competence but at the time being a diverse foundation complicates the work of EIL theorists.
Proficiency Tests and Scales
Although there might be considerable consensus on the models of “proficiency” among L2 education specialists, there is currently no empirically validated description. Stern (1983) maintains that a concept of “L2 proficiency” has had several interpretations but has not achieved a satisfactory outcome. In the same vein, Lantolf and Frawley (1988) point out a lack of even approaching a clear reasonable and unified theory.

As it has been outlined, Canale and Swain have played an important role in developments in L2 education by stressing the relevance of “communicative competence” to both L2 teaching and testing as they developed their framework when they faced the issue of language test development. With regard to testing, we infer that communicative testing deals not only with knowledge and ways of using this knowledge, but the demonstration of this knowledge in performance. It is clear that a theory of “communicative competence” is required to approach the challenge of language proficiency testing. The theory of “communicative competence” is a theory of “knowledge” and “proficiency,” as outlined by Spolsky (1989). In his view, a test should make it possible to describe “proficiency” “as the ability to perform some defined tasks that use language.” But such a test would have limitations concerning “the ultimate possibility of a direct translation from functional to structural terms.” Spolsky noted that, “the problem of determining which of the many functions which language fulfils should be included in a test of language proficiency.”

Literature reviews show that most current texts focus on proficiency tests rather than on the concept of “proficiency” in general. “Proficiency” as a term appears in the most famous renowned language examination – the Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency in English. Proficiency tests are an important field for L2 education: as we teach we think about measuring the progress of our students and monitoring their success but the description of “proficiency” has been dominated by a psychometric principle although it is questionable whether “proficiency” can be scaled.

We arrive at the most important theoretical issue in proficiency testing. According to Bachman (1990a), if tests are to have value and importance in L2 education, they should be valid, reliable and practicable. Lantolf and Frawley (1988) argue that “proficiency” will be valid as a concept when it becomes independent of psychometrics, and saliently remark that the theory must be proven and consistent with empirical research. How valid are the scores in determining one’s proficiency? Learners demonstrate various performances on different tasks they are asked to perform. From my personal teaching experience, I have found that one may demonstrate a high performance outcome on one task whilst failing a task of a different nature. At this point a question arises whether one, according to various degrees of performance, has different proficiencies or a single proficiency which is used to varying degrees, subject to a number of factors such as familiarity with similar tasks, the topic, the complexity of the task, time limitations, etc. (North 2000). It is difficult to judge which view should be used – performance-related or competence-related.

The lack of theoretical consensus on what it means to know a language and what language components should be tested and assessed have caused problems in the development of tests which partially cover what constitutes “proficiency” (Stern, 1983). Here we regard knowledge or skill; implicit or explicit knowledge of discrete items or of larger linguistics units; any selected functional skills, whether academic
or communicative, receptive or productive. Current reality displays that academic skills may be tested but proficiency tests are not able to assess communicative or creative components. Due to dependence of tests on theoretical frameworks, there is some danger of making inappropriate estimates of students’ language abilities that may serve as potential threat to L2 education. The validity and reliability of tests based on an EIL competence framework must be addressed.

Existing proficiency testing methods are a concern for L2 education and will become a concern for EIL education. The problem is obvious: testing is associated with exactitude and outcomes are only represented by figures, which is inappropriate for communicative testing. Tests have face validity but do not provide proper feedback for instruction and learning because of difficulties in the interpretation of scores. A score may be interpreted as a learner’s proficiency level relative to others, and it may predict future achievement but may not guarantee it. We surely have come across students who have reached high levels on tests but are still unable to use language in academic or even communicative situations.

Frameworks for tests should be validated but as North (2000) argues, the attempt to validate any framework will be obstructed by problems of isolating and operationalising the desired construct in test items and dangers of the data reflecting characteristics of a particular learner population. What is measured through taking into consideration generally accepted views on the nature of ‘proficiency’ should be made clear. Instead of asking whether the test is valid, we should ponder the utility of such a test, which brings us back to the faults of proficiency tests. Some teachers demonstrate a negative view of tests and favourable attitudes toward various exams. However, this might not be true in all cases. Shohamy (1992) outlines benefits of testing: achievement and proficiency assessment multi-dimensional diagnostic information; teaching and learning connections; norm-referenced and criterion-referenced information, etc. Bachman (1990a) justifies tests for their most prevalent use of language tests is for purposes of evaluation in educational programmes. Certification is crucial for various purposes such as placement in overseas universities, employment of better qualified staff, etc. But again we arrive at the question of how assessment for certification can be carried out as we still must assess “proficiency.” What do we need to measure? The concern of certification must be carefully considered from a theoretical point of view and mutual understanding must be sought.

Problems related to the development of proficiency tests are in turn, related to the development of proficiency scales. Various scales of proficiency may serve as rating scales, examination levels, or stages of attainment. They are outcome oriented in terms of what and to what degree learners can perform and thus are behaviour oriented. Since proficiency scales concentrate on behaviour, they tend toward a functional view of proficiency and, therefore, should be effective. Brindley (1998) argues that some proficiency tests and scales seem to have acquired popular validation due to their longevity. If we try to understand the essence of scales we realize that what happened is that test grades were assigned descriptors and levels. Attempts to find out how descriptors were developed may be a complicated issue. Some descriptors were developed for use in certain specific contexts but other scales ‘borrowed’ the descriptors for adaptation to different contexts. Each set of scales of proficiency is based on a different theoretical view on “proficiency.” North (2000) points out that “it is intended to give meaning to numbers at a very general level, primarily to help students orient their learning. A purely numerical scale like the TOEFL scale can mean a lot to insiders, but does not say much to someone
unfamiliar with the test. Scales of proficiency provide us with levels of attainment in L2 education and people may interpret them, but in reality the descriptions provided may not be valid because what happens is that descriptions of levels represent an inevitable and possibly misleading oversimplification of the language learning process.

We may extend the list of problems related to proficiency scales but would still have to admit that if “proficiency” were a unitary concept, proficiency scales would influence L2 education positively in terms of direction and organization of language learning. The considerations of the “EIL competence” framework should not exclude the possibility that properly established scales may have positive influences on professionals in terms of producing curricula and textbooks and applying methods and strategies appropriate for various language levels of learners.

Native Speaker Concept
The discussion of “proficiency” will not be complete without consideration of native speaker “proficiency” which is seen as the ultimate comparison point in L2 teaching, development of proficiency tests, and construction of proficiency scales. Although this notion is not the primary focus of this work, a review of angles will be provided for casting the validity of this criterion into doubt. Lee (2005) employs a wide range of arguments for evaluating appropriacy of the native speaker model in L2 education. In Kazakhstan students, parents and even some teachers believe and do not doubt the native speaker as an ideal standard and a reference point; thus questioning linguistic potential of local teachers. Theoretically, the notion of the native speaker could have clarified the views on “proficiency” but literature reviews indicate that this concept is dubious. Some may argue that it is a unitary concept; however, Lee (2005) encourages the quest for a better understanding which has been critically discussed in recent times.

To put the idea simply, I will ask a few questions. Is one proficient because one can be compared to a native speaker, or, because native speakers think of themselves as being proficient? A reference or comparison is usually made to the notion of the native speaker of English due to the increasing popularity of L2 English teaching and learning. According to our everyday experience, one of the aims of L2 learners is to be able to communicate with native speakers of their L2. Native speakers are the people with whom L2 learners can practice their language skills in a variety of settings and situations. Classroom practice demonstrates that with regard to language proficiency learners try to match themselves, teachers and others against mysterious native speakers.

Numerous scholars have made recent attempts to explore and define this popular notion in L2 education. A review of literature (e.g. Coulmas, 1981; Davies, 1991, 2003; Medgyes, 1992; Phillipson, 1996; Ramptom 1990; McArthur, 1992; Maum, 2002) outlines such criteria for a native speaker as early childhood language acquisition, its maintenance, intuitive knowledge of the language, abilities for fluent, spontaneous discourse, creative use of the language, abilities to communicate within different social settings, accent, etc.

Tests claim to use native speakers as the standard of measure, but some native speakers do not demonstrate linguistic and cognitive patterns attributed to the ideal level that L2 learners strive to attain. The ACTFL scale, for example, adopted the notion of the ‘educated native speaker’ from its origins in the government oral proficiency interview. The 1980s noted “a special place to the native speaker as the
only true and reliable source of language data” (Ferguson 1983: vii). This is not always true and we can doubt the concept of the native speaker because native speakers vary from each other in their command of different aspects of language.

Nayar (1994, p.4) argues that native speakers are not “ipso facto knowledgeable, correct and infallible in their competence.” Judging from our own L1 experience, we can say that various factors such as age, education, social class, dialect, etc. can disqualify the native speaker as being the best point of reference. A specific study (Hamilton et. al., 1993) conducted research, which tested groups of people by means of the IELTS assessment battery, and discovered important differences between the performances of even well-educated native speakers. Hamilton found that variability was due to the level of education and work experience and concluded that native speakers should not be taken as a criterion.

International schools recruit native teachers of EFL/ESL are recruited from all over the world. The concern stems from the discussion of the development of “English” and “Englishes” (Nunn, 2005). This issue in fact goes beyond L2 education boundaries as attempts to establish ideal English to some specific area in the world may even raise political issues, especially in the context of the changing international status of English. Students and local teachers might wonder whether a British teacher should be considered the ideal standard? What about an American, an Australian, a Canadian, or a New Zealander? What about such English-speaking countries as India which absorbed the language due to historic reasons. An ongoing debate in Kazakhstan establishes a specific dichotomy of British English and American English. But the following argument is worth considering: American English is different from British English; therefore, other “Englishes” should be considered different but not inferior (Singh, 1998).

The theoretical debate about native speakers may be unresolved, but in the daily practice of language teaching and testing resolution is necessary and agreement on a model and a goal required. The global expansion of English has been widely discussed (e.g. Crystal, 1997; Graddol, 1999). Graddol (p. 68) challenges language educationalists: ‘large numbers of people will learn English as a foreign language in the 21st century and they will need teachers, dictionaries and grammar books. But will they continue to look towards the native speaker for authoritative norms of usage?’

We can doubt the concept of the native speaker for many reasons but the simple way of expressing this would be to say that native speaker proficiency is not homogeneous and cannot be considered a perfect criterion and reference point in L2 education. The notion used as a reference point to the concept of proficiency is dubious and difficult to define and might have already become a label which needs revision and reevaluation. The implication here is that the time has come to negotiate clear formulations of the concept as it is also important for the future of “proficiency” as a concept. At the time being the native speaker concept remains ambiguous and the issue of theoretical description of “native speaker proficiency” is open to question.

Conclusions for EIL
The search for solving the dilemma of native-non-native speakers bring us to the EIL concept. What can we learn from the history of “proficiency” debates? What are the lessons for us in regard to EIL competence? The debate has shown that various
viewpoints and separated efforts have undermined the concept of proficiency and, moreover, caused criticized approaches to L2 teaching and testing. EIL research should foresee issues which can represent dangers to the validity of the concept, the pragmatics of the development of tests and the application of language scales. Inappropriate decisions with regard to language testing, curricula and materials development will not simply undermine the concept but disadvantage learners. Taking into account the difficulties with the concept of proficiency, a warning is for the “world” of theoretical linguists, the "world” of tests developers and the "world” of teaching practitioners to unite their efforts.

A worrying point comes from the fact that a body of research on English as an International Language is growing, yet it has already indicated the widespread inconsistency in terms and differences in terminology, which recalls a never-finishing debate discussed above. Seidhlofer (2004) points out that in addition to the plural terms "Englishes" (Kachru, 1992) and the term "World Englishes" (Crystal, 1997), confusion is caused by "English as an International Language" (e.g. Modiano, 1999a, 1999b; Jenkins, 2000, 2002), English as a Lingua Franca (e.g. Gnutzmann, 2000), English as a global language (e.g. Crystal, 1997; Gnutzmann, 1999), English as a World Language (e.g. Mair, 2003) and English as a Medium for Intercultural Communication (e.g. Meierkord, 1996).

The panacea represented by the concept of English may also cause drawbacks. Each proposed concept bears advantages and disadvantages. A range of approaches such as “the traditional foreigner”; “the revisionist foreigner”; “the other native” as well as “English as a Lingua Franca,” “International English” / “English as an International Language” (e.g. Davies 1989; Kachru 1985; Medgyes, 1999; Mohanan 1998; Paikeday, 1985; Seidhlofer, 2000; Singh, 1998; Smith 1983) has suggested a way out from the sensitive and complicated situation with the native speaker concept, including issues beyond the scope of linguistics and language teaching. Although the movement has started recently, there has not been a consensus as to which approach offers the best solution. It has been argued that some proposed approaches suggest similar core ideas, whilst others stipulate contradictions (e.g. Kachru, 1985, Smith (1983), Davies (1989). Problems concern the order of language acquisition of considered languages (L1; L2; L1 and L2; FL, etc.), “Circles” of language use (Kachru, 1992), language status in the country, etc. For instance, the English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) concept is a remedy which does not differentiate between L1 and L2 speakers (Seidlhofer, 2000 and 2004).

The confusing point in regard to “EIL competence” is whether we are contemplating “EIL proficiency” or “EIL competence.” Is the “competence” we are talking of viewed from the perspectives of L1 or L2? The understanding of “proficiency” becomes more complicated as not only L2 competence is variable but also “native competence.” The concept of “proficiency” could have provided a valuable basis; however, due to its ambiguity and lack of agreement among theorists, questions are raised with regard to “EIL competence.” How will interrelationships among the components be addressed? The issue is not only to identify components but also find how competencies interact and are acquired. Will “basic interpersonal and communicative skills” and “cognitive/academic language ability” be accounted for? Will the practical use and ability for use be considered? The idea is not only to identify a theoretical framework to illustrate what components “communicative competence” may include without establishing a model to show how competencies interact and become acquired. Is “linguistic competence” viewed within “communicative competence” to point out their indivisibility? What is the view for
grammar rules without rules of use? Is the grammatical component as important as the sociolinguistic? As it has been noted, efforts of theorists and test developers should be united to arrive at a sound framework. But whilst aiming at a theory, one should not forget about assessment methodologies and testing issues.

The routes are numerous but my point of view is that the above discussed concepts and research they engendered may provide tremendously valuable assistance for articulating “EIL competence” problems and suggesting possible solutions. The development of the EIL concept requires strong research considering already learnt lessons to provide a better sound construct for “EIL competence.” This leaves abundant space for research and contemplations for further discussion. I hope that the article has been able to indicate the most appealing to further stimulate the Asian EFL discussion in order to outline the entire set of issues for further consideration.
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The complex relationship between language and culture is the topic of this slim volume. Like the other volumes of this series, Kramsch divides the text into a 4-fold structure, common to the series: Survey, Readings, References and Glossary. The largest section is the Survey, divided into 7 chapters and this structure results in a readable, uncluttered map of the topic, unencumbered by citations and references aimed at “stimulating thought and invite critical participation in the exploration of ideas”(pg viii). The other sections of Readings, References and Glossary are distributed between page 85 to 132 and help focus the topics discussed and support the author’s thesis by amplifying the readings with examples and are thus particularly useful for students or beginner linguists.

In the first chapter, Kramsch delineates the term culture and explores the relationship between language and culture by indicating three verbs. These verbs are “expresses, embodies and symbolises”: that is, languages “expresses, embodies and symbolises” cultural realities. She sustains her argument by drawing reference to one poem by Emily Dickinson(1) which she considered a metaphoric stylised reference to the relationship between language, nature and culture: underlining a socialisation/acculturation role of language by its Community of Practitioners (CoP). She then draws the readers’ attention to the fact that the standards and norms of this CoP help create its “culture” both in the perception and in the reception of language, used in context. The author spends considerable space (4 pages) on this definition of “culture”, and describes the roles of practitioners within this community and thus delineates the hegemony and power relationships between them. The historic contributions of Heider, Von Humboldt, Boas, Sapir and Whorf are briefly described and the reader is directed to the Readings and References sections.

Chapter 2 defines “meaning as code” by describing the pragmatic uses of code as in linguistic semiotics. In this chapter, she draws a picture of how language “embodies culture” and in a particularly felicitious definition of culture, she holds that in any one language, linguistic signs may denote, connote or represent (iconicity) a semantic representation and this is embodied in code. Thus the semantic relation between code and its meaning is created and is not arbitrary- since it is guided by factors such as desire for recognition, influence and power as well as social and cultural survival. A “native speaker” views the relationship between code and its meaning or object as natural - and is thus part of the “culture”. Such a defining role of socio-cultural conventions is particularly important in translation studies, given that translation deals with questions such as equivalence and context.

The question of contextualisation- in the Malinowskian sense- is taken up in Chapter 3 and Kramsch draws our attention to the necessity of communicating
meaning, taking care to define the pragmatic context: as in the example she gives: freedom-fighters vs. guerrilla forces vs. rebels. The context of situation as frames or schemata and context of culture, the role of participants in communication acts- both in oral and written language are then examined briefly and the major schools of thought are briefly mentioned- Grice Co-operative Principle and Pragmatic Coherence.

Chapter 4 is devoted to oral communication and culture. After a brief excusus defining the features of orate language, she emphasises that there is a continuum between the orate and written medium and suggests that it is cultural and historical contingency that has given predominance to literacy over orality. She suggests that this is because technological development is tied to literacy and thus to power in literate societies. Nevertheless, power relationships are present in oral communication as in social deixis, positioning and codeswitching as well as frames in discourse, face and inter-actional behaviour.

The literature culture is the title of Chapter 5 and here the author gives a historical perspective on the written word and its role in the development of culture- from biblical exegesis to modern-day texts such as legal documents or education testing standards. She claims that literacy is a social construct and is related to power within the CoP, which is the dominant culture of research and scholarship. Current practise is to view a written text as a stable finished product – for the consumption of a hypothetical reader while at the same time, a written text may be considered as a highly inferential process of communication between the writer and reader. This communication view of a written text as discourse results the creation of standards or norms for commonly used genres which become accepted by the CoP. Thus the CoP acts both as the creator as well as the guardians of culture and literacy presumes the ability to function within this CoP.

Socio-linguistics is the topic of Chapter 6 and the author’s thesis lies in her affirmation that language is the most sensitive relationship between the individual and his social group- it permeates his thinking, and is the battleground between the individual and his allegiances and loyalties. In a delightful passage, the author suggests that “the same use of a given language can index both indenture and investment, both servitude and emancipation, both powerlessness and empowerment” and that “the linguistic semeiotic capital of humankind remain as rich as possible” (pg 77). This plea for rich linguistic diversity is left hanging but an interesting issue of belonging is all too briefly raised in the last chapter on the Politics of Recognition.

In this concluding chapter, Kramsch raises the issue of belonging – linguistically speaking- by addressing the twin issues of – what is a native speaker, how far native-ness should go, the concept of cultural authenticity in a cross-cultural, multicultural and intercultural milieu such as are now common in a modern urban societies. She indicates that linguistic debate in such urban societies must necessarily address cultural issues of the individual and his culture but she limits her issues to questions of cultural hegemony. There are many issues that she could have raised - especially in terms of “social recognition” of “I” and “you”, about schooling issues such as teacher training, or the language of instruction, about code-switching in class, about local and regional “accents”, about language use in international academic conferences and many other issues also related to varieties of language or to world languages.
Evaluation

This is a short text which would make good pre-class reading for a module of teaching on sociolinguistics. It is wide in scope and raises many wide-ranging topics and those sections of the book dealing with Readings and References would be quite useful in consciousness-raising. However, I would have liked a bit more depth in treating the topics which are all too briefly raised. In Chapter 1, the term CoP was first applied to linguistics by Lave & Wenger (2), who are uncited as are the term “frames” by Fillmore (3). A more profound description of Chapters 4 on oral and Chapter 5 written communication would have added to a more scholarly treatment, by citing for example, the contributions of Halliday & Hasan on text, texture and context (4) and Swales on Moves analysis (5). Reference to Bhatia on Genre (6) or Speech-Act theory (7) would have added to this text. Current linguistics issues such as Metaphor analysis as a cognitive process by Lakoff & Johnson (8) or APPRAISAL (9) methods in Critical Discourse Analysis could also have been amplified the reference section of these two chapters. Despite these shortcomings, I would certainly recommend this volume as a pre-course reading text since it serves to whet students’ or readers’ appetite for the vast area of socio-linguistics.
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