The Journal of English as an International Language

ISSUE 1   MAY 2011

Asian EFL Group

Published by Academic Publishing House Press

The Journal of English as an International Language
A Division of Academic Publishing House International Ltd
Academic Publishing House International
Australia
http://www.eilj.com

Publisher: Dr Paul Robertson
Chief Editor: Dr Sivakumar Sivasubramaniam
Production Associate Editor: Dr Su-Hie Ting

The JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AS AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE

The JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AS AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE

ISSUE 1 MAY 2011

Foreword

Welcome to the May 2011 Issue 1 of the Journal of English as an International Language (EILJ). This issue signposts a new direction, vision and ambition for the journal. As a sister journal of Asian EFL Journal (AEJ), EILJ has been putting out its issues on a yearly basis until now. Given the current currency and appeal the English language enjoys as an international language, we couldn't be asking for a more propitious time to promote our journal as a forum for democratizing and dehegemonizing its use across the cultures of Asia and farther afield. Rather than publish a lengthy issue with ten or more papers once a year, we felt that it would be highly beneficial to EILJ if we published five or six papers and a review per issue twice a year. I sincerely believe that such a scheme can enhance the identity of our forum manifold and put us well within the noticeable range of scholars desirous of sharing their scholarship with us. Accordingly, EILJ will have two issues, one in May and another in November as of now.

EILJ's new vision encourages us to look upon ourselves as an expanding community of humane language practitioners and researchers, who are amenable to promoting or popularizing a diverse range of research issues and interests that underlie our pedagogies and practices in the teaching of EIL. The ensuing philosophy of EILJ entreats us to view English as an international language and its users as "a heterogeneous global English speech community, with a heterogeneous English and different modes of competence" (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 211). Such a realization can go a long way in conferring voice and agency to EILJ, which exists as a venue for disseminating locally appropriate, culturally sensitive and socially aligned methodologies and materials in EIL as pointed out in the opening paper, "Constructivism in EIL: Issues and Insights for Teaching and Research". To this end, the current issue presents its readership with an engaging array of papers, which we believe, could serve as interesting fault-lines or focus points for cutting edge research into EIL (given its paucity) in our respective work environments.

Roger Nunn's paper, "From *Defining* to *Developing* Competence in EIL and Intercultural Communication" presents a coherent framework for understanding the commonalities and complementarities that operate between competence in EIL and competence in Intercultural Communication. He uses this as a basis for proposing culturally appropriate conceptualizations of competence in EIL. In light of this, his paper makes a bold attempt to examine the implications for teaching and the learning applications and activities that accrue from it.

Sardar Anwaruddin's paper, "Hidden Agenda in TESOL Methods" alerts the readership as to how the prevalence/preference of "native speakerism" underlies TESOL's agenda of inequity and hegemony. Citing this as a "neo-colonial enterprise", the author voices a plea for a more locally-situated approach to TESOL pedagogy, which he believes could engender a diversity that we need in global TESOL education for the 21st century.

Adcharawan Buripakdi's paper, "Thai Journalists' Views on the Notion of World Englishes" studies the dynamics and fall-outs of a World Englishes concept in Thailand through the perceptions of ten Thai journalists affiliated with two of the most prestigious English newspapers in Thailand: The Nation and Bangkok Post. The author presents a well sequenced narrative in order to come to grips with the ideological and political issues that underpin the use of Standard English in the Thai media contexts and its far-reaching ramifications for the prevalence of a local variety of English, which would have a distinct quality of "*Thainess*" in it. Picking up on the findings of the study, the author calls for a rapid disavowal of the colonial construct, which she believes would make it possible to initiate a culturally sensitive and locally appropriate pedagogy for EIL teaching practices in Thailand.

Eoin Jordan's paper, "Japanese English Pronunciation – Issues of Intelligibility, Achievability and Perception in the Context of World Englishes" uncovers the problematic nature of teaching English pronunciation to Japanese learners and its not-so rewarding outcomes. He uses his study to channel a bold argument in favour of a distinct Japanese English pronunciation standard that can be used as a basis to inform oral English teaching practices in the Japanese school system. The ensuing advocacy calls for a shift away from the native speaker as a model for the Japanese school students learning to speak English. The proposed framework of pronunciation guidelines will go a long way in ushering a locally aligned approach to the teaching of English pronunciation in the Japanese schools. Needless to say that the author has proposed an edifying set of guidelines for research into this "powder-keg domain of teaching spoken English", we entreat our readers to voice their reactions to it and do further research into this domain.

Last but not least, the book review done by Phillipa Mungra serves as a fitting finale to this issue. Her review of Shalini Advani's ***Schooling the national administration: Education, English and the Indian Modern*** (published by Oxford University Press, 2009) informs how the teaching of English language in the Indian educational system has affected the construction of nationalism, self-identity and modernity in independent India. Further to this, the review signposts the Indian sociolinguistic realities that permeate the transnational language policy and its implications for the teaching of English across the urban and rural, elite and non-elite settings across the country.

In closing, I wish to note that the papers in this issue would serve as an eloquent testament to the agency and voice of our contributing authors. Their dynamism and humanism, I am certain, would serve as a lamp to those of us who are stranded in an otherwise "methodological wasteland of EIL". Read on!

Sivakumar Sivasubramaniam
Chief Editor

Constructivism in EIL: Issues and Insights for Teaching and Research

Sivakumar Sivasubramaniam

Petroleum Institute, Abu Dhabi, U.A.E

The narrative presented in this paper signposts the new dynamism that has come to characterize the teaching of English as an international language (EIL). The ensuing discussion of educational and social issues is primarily meant to alert those of us who teach English to the pressing need for a change of direction and focus with respect to our pedagogical practices and procedures in our classrooms. To this end, the paper makes a bold attempt to propose a constructivist orientation in EIL. It is my belief that my readership will look upon the issues raised as a basis for an alternate route of inquiry into language teaching, which will further our understanding of the centrality of social and cultural dimensions in the educational practices of EIL.

Keywords: agency, intersubjectivity non-essentialist view of culture, participation, problematization, pluricentric view of English

Introduction

At the outset, I wish to point out the need to discuss the educational and social concerns that underpin this paper. It is hoped that the ensuing discussion will act as an awareness-building exercise for the prevalence and role of constructivism in the teaching and learning of English as an international language (EIL) and its implications for research. Therefore, I entreat my readership to view this paper as an informed narrative of understanding, which signposts an alternate route of inquiry into the teaching and learning of English.

How do we come to terms with EIL?

As a preamble to this discussion, I wish to focus on the umbrella term ELT (English Language Teaching) and the pluralistic conceptualizations that characterize it. Those of us who have been teaching English, understand that the term ELT not only encompasses the teaching of English as a foreign language or a second language, but also the learning of English as a foreign language or a second language. In this regard, the explanations offered by Mitchell and Myles (1998, pp. 1-2) can shed some light on the acronyms such as EFL (English as a Foreign Language), ESL (English as a Second Language), ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) and EAL (English as an Additional Language) that have gained popular currency in our field. According to them, a language that is learned by a learner "sometime later than the acquisition of the first language" (Mitchell & Myles, 1998, p. 1) can be defined as a foreign language or a second language in that it is a language other than the learner's native language. Therefore, according to them "it is sensible to include 'foreign' languages under our more general term of 'second' languages, because we believe that the underlying learning processes are essentially the same for more local and for more remote target languages, despite differing purposes and circumstances" (Mitchell & Myles, 1998, pp. 1-2). If the process of foreign language learning (FLL) and second language learning (SLL) are the same, then ELT as an umbrella term should be viewed as one that encompasses the plethora of conceptualizations offered by different Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theorists along with its pluralistic implications. However, the prevalence of the umbrella term ELT has failed to account for the new dynamism that has come to characterize the teaching of English as an international language. Regrettably, the term has failed to examine the far-reaching ramifications of "the specific structures and hierarchies of the TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) profession, built around uneven resources and uneven relationships with English" (Holliday, 2005, p. 1).

Given the dominance of the ideology of native speakerism in the current TESOL professionalism, we have been led to believe that "native speaker teachers represent a Western culture from which spring the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology" (Holliday, 2005, p. 6). The ensuing ideology of native speakerism appears to have strengthened the assumption that native speakers have a special claim to the language and that it is fundamentally their belonging. It is in challenging the untenable nature of this assumption that one can come to realize the meaning and merit of the term EIL, which is an antithesis to terms such as ESL and EFL operating within the umbrella term ELT.

As observed by Widdowson (1998):

> How English develops in the world is no business whatever of native speakers in England, the United States or anywhere else… The very fact that English is an international language means that no nation can have custody over it… But the point is that it is only international to the extent that it is not their language. It is not a possession which they lease out to others, while still retaining the freehold. Other people actually own it. (pp. 244-250)

The position mentioned above entreats us to view English as an international language rather than as one, which is a specific cultural derivative of the English speaking West (Jenkins, 2000). If we accept this theoretical stance along with its social and cultural implications, the term EIL, can then characterize the use of English between L2 speakers of English, either from the same or a different culture in addition to L2 and L1 speakers of English. Such a characterization upholds "a heterogeneous global English speech community, with a heterogeneous English and different modes of competence" (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 211). While this position has many positive and beneficial implications for the pedagogies and practices that typify EIL, it might subject the very notion of EIL to a host of controversies, among which the most important is: the issue of its compatibility with Standard English and the notion of "othering" (Palfreyman, 2005), and the notion of the non-problematic native speakerism and the problematic non-native speakerism (Holliday, 2005), in the use of English. However, if we accept a non-essentialist view of culture, especially the one that offers a constructivist characterization of culture (Roberts, Byram, Barro, Jordan, & Street, 2001), we will be able to "act as creators of discourses, institutions, and culture, socially construct the norms and conventions of society" (Holliday, 2005, p. 24). Such a position can help undo the chauvinistic attitudes and discourses that militate against our aspirations for promoting EIL as an umbrella term to signify a pluricentric view of English, which can challenge any view that supports one standard form of English against which all the others are to be measured. This can further help mitigate issues of "acquisitional inadequacies" (Kachru, 1983, pp. 140-143), and "associated power differentials" (McKay & Bokhorst-Heng, 2008, p. 128) that assume prominence in comparisons and contrasts between native and non-native varieties of English. Therefore, the umbrella term EIL, which assumes centrality in this paper should be seen as one that signposts "World Englishes" as opposed to the prevalence of a standard form of English acting as a reference point.

Critiquing the three dominant educational value systems

In order to understand the role and efficacy of constructivism in EIL, we need to revisit and critique the three dominant educational value systems: Classical Humanism, Reconstructionism and Progressivism. Rightly as observed by Widdowson (2003, p. xi), "a knowledge of how they figured in the past can provide insights that can be drawn upon in their new-found reformulation in the present". The accruing appropriation of issues and insights is meant to not only support my intuitions, beliefs and value-systems but also to sustain the intellectual continuity of our field of inquiry. By doing so it can well act as a "considered pathfinding" (Widdowson, 2003, p. xi) for proposing new theoretical possibilities and the promises that can accrue from it.

Classical humanism

Classical humanism views knowledge as a set (something external to the mind) of given truths and requires the trained intellectual capacities of a teacher to transmit it. Therefore, knowledge is given and not constructed through perceptions. Such a position supports a transmission model of learning in which the teacher is the custodian of knowledge and the student a passive recipient of it. The emphasis on a rule-based application of knowledge results in the use of rote-learning and accurate understanding of facts. By assigning a reverential status to the teacher, classical humanism ensures that standards are maintained in the dissemination of knowledge and cultural values (Clark, 1987). This is to suggest that students are subjected to rigorous examination procedures and discriminated on the basis of their intellectual strengths and critical abilities. Such a practice is meant to retain the intellectually sound students and reject those students whose intellectual capacity falls short of the prescribed norm. (Those retained by the system are sent to a higher level of education where intellectual capacities would be developed and expanded to safeguard cultural standards and traditions. Those rejected by the system are provided with vocational education aimed at fulfilling different occupational demands and expectations.)

The transmission model of teaching, the grammar-translation approach, the norm-referenced testing, and the discriminating method of functioning – all these have made classical humanism an unprogressive educational ideology in the present time. Because of this, it has come under attack. As present day educators are concerned about maximizing educational opportunities rather than minimizing it to a select population of the elite, they have rejected classical humanism and along with it the elitism that has been associated with the teaching of English (Clark, 1987; Freire, 1973).

Viewed in light of the current dynamism that characterizes the teaching of English as an international language, classical humanism has no relevance to my narrative in terms of its aim, scope, attitude and beliefs. This is to suggest that the current dynamism of EIL does not believe that the mastery of the English language is contingent on a mastery of its grammar and vocabulary as claimed by the grammar-translation approach of classical humanism. By the same token, it does not believe that English is best learnt through an inviolate adherence to the arbitrariness of the linguistic signs that operate within it (Kohonen, Jaatinen, Kaikkonen, & Lehtovaara, 2001). Most importantly, the educational practices that underlie EIL are opposed to objectifying the English language as a body of objective truths as they do not treat knowledge of the language as something external to the learner.

Reconstructionism

Reconstructionism, as Clark (1987) notes, is an educational ideology, which believes in an egalitarian approach to socio-economic progress through education. By stressing parity of opportunity and esteem, it proposes a system of education that realizes its goals through planning and intervention. This is to suggest that reconstructionism follows an outcome-based approach to learning and in doing so directs all its focus and energy to relating ends to means (Clark, 1987; Nunan, 1988). As a result, it envisages the need to establish supervisory bodies that would formulate educational goals and devise curricula to realize them. The ensuing matrix thinking and lockstep ideals that characterized language teaching in the last twenty years or so have sought to overstate the primacy of communicative language teaching (CLT) methodologies as a panacea for the malaise in EFL/ESL(Holliday, 2005; McKay & Bokhorst Heng, 2008).

In order to realize its goals, reconstructionism used the curriculum as an instrument of intervention. Furthermore, it assumes that the curriculum intervention could account for a linear progress towards the declared goals or outcomes of learning (Clark, 1987; Nunan, 1988). Such a position is meant to enslave the teacher and the learner to the curriculum and lead them to believe that anything outside the curriculum is not worthy of knowledge. In this respect, reconstructionism is similar to classical humanism as it looks upon knowledge as an end product of learning. The overemphasis of predetermined outcomes and performance criteria leads the learner to believe that "knowledge is a closed set of truths, rather than a series of hypotheses borne of our current perceptions, serving transient contemporary purposes" (Clark, 1987, p. 34). Such a position contradicts my approach to knowledge stated earlier. I believe that knowledge is internal to the learner, that is, something which grows in the learner as he/she responds to the need to read the world and matches their understanding of it in multiple ways (Freire & Macedo, 1987).

It is argued that language-learning experiences are beyond the predetermined goals of a language curriculum. Viewed in light of reconstructionism, a language curriculum formulates its objectives in terms of communicative use of language. The preoccupation with the communicative use of language can result in language use being seen as a set of transactions. This serves to explain how communicative language curricula trivialized their courses "into a total diet of tourist objectives such as finding the way, buying tickets, getting ice-creams and other such restricted concerns, since such objectives are easily listed" (Clark, 1987, p. 35).

Furthermore, while it is easy to list predetermined objectives for operationalizing transactional use of language, it is difficult to list such objectives for operationalizing expressive and creative use of language. It is not possible to predict the expressive and creative uses of language as they vary from individual to individual and as they depend on the individual's depth of involvement with the interpretative experiences. It is for this very reason that CLT, especially the weak version of CLT, is deemed unsuitable to the prevalence and promotion of EIL. It is further argued that the value of language education lies not in its predictable use of language, but in its unpredictable outcomes related to creative and expressive use of language (Clark, 1987; Nunan, 1988). It should be stressed that in the educational practice of reading and writing, especially, the use of English in higher learning and thinking process, a transactional use of language such as the one that CLT touts, can reduce reading and writing to mere arbitrary transactions. As EIL aims to foster creative and expressive use of English in students' engagement with it, I view reconstructionism as an unsuitable educational ideology to what is being proposed.

Progressivism: A 'lead-in' to constructivism

Progressivism, as Clark (1987) observes, is a learner-centred educational ideology. It is different from classical humanism and reconstructionism in that it views education as a way of empowering learners to teach themselves how to learn. Such an ideology articulates the centrality of experience to learning and the outcome of that learning as growth. Viewed in light of this ideology, knowledge assumes speculative and perspectival attributes. So, it cannot be value-free and close-ended as seen by classical humanism and reconstructionism. As an open-ended approach to knowledge, progressivism makes for emotionally and socially enriching learning experiences, which help the learners to view themselves as whole persons rather than fragmented individuals. Such a process is important to my inquiry as it opposes homogenizing students on the basis of norm-referenced learning and assessment (Clark, 1987; Nunan, 1988). In light of this discussion, process curricula assume prominence and substance in EIL settings. It is argued that such a position is in keeping with the main concerns of progressivism as pointed out by this discussion. Therefore, personalizing learning through a personalizing approach to English becomes the most important priority for EIL.

A personalizing approach to the use of English necessitates the learners' active involvement with it, so the learner becomes an active participant in the learning process. This is in contrast to the passive role assigned to the learner in classical humanism and a subservient role demanded of the learner in reconstructionism. The active role envisaged for the learner encourages the learner to react to and reflect on the learning process. Such a role can help both the learner and the teacher to take an associative or negotiative view of learning and assessment. In this regard, the learner finds it an educating experience to voice and share his/her perceptions of what has been learned. As a result, learning and assessment become a learner-centred undertaking. This is not to suggest that the teacher will assess the learner as the learner wishes to be assessed. But it is to suggest that the participatory role of the learner can make him or her take responsibility for learning and take control of how the learning tasks and strategies proposed by the teacher should be handled (Clark, 1987; Nunan, 1988).

The concern for learner involvement and autonomy expressed by progressivism can be matched with its similar emphasis on empowering teachers into becoming reflective practitioners. Very often teachers carry out the choices and pre-determined objectives of a curriculum designed by someone else. Because of this they do not critically examine the role of the curriculum and their role in deploying it. An uncritical engagement with the curriculum reduces their teaching role to that of a perfunctory task. As a result teachers become "curriculum clerks carrying out other people's decisions about subject matter and classroom management" (Delawter, 1992, p. 101). In light of this point, the progressivist emphasis on teacher empowerment leads teachers to believe that they need to voice their professional beliefs and concerns in order to consider and construct new perspectives on their role as teachers. It is argued that metaphors in current educational use liken educational practices to those followed in the fields of business, computer industry and the military. Such a likening projects educational practices as prescribed systems to be followed with utmost care. As a result the teachers' role gets basalized (Smith, 1988). It is further argued that there is an urgent need to discard the teacher–as–curriculum clerk metaphor and put in its place the teacher–as–explorer metaphor. Such a metaphor can reinforce the progressivist concern for teacher empowerment through reflective teaching practice. By voicing their beliefs and concerns, teachers can experience a sense of freedom. This sense of freedom can alert them to new alternatives to perspectives on their teaching practices. Thus they can become explorers of knowledge through reflective teaching practice (Smith, 1988).

At this juncture, it should be stressed that promotion of literacy in society through language teaching is contingent on the teachers' belief in its educational and social values to their students. In light of this point, when teachers empower themselves into becoming questioning professionals, they will encourage their learners to empower themselves into becoming questioning citizens. Such a perspective is vital to this study in the light of the educational and social concerns raised in the *Introduction*. However, I am aware of the criticisms leveled against progressivist practices in EFL/ESL settings. The progressivist de-emphasis of tutored learning, received knowledge, predetermined learning objectives, goal-based assessment have come under attack as the devotees of matrix thinking and lockstep ideals find it threatening to their reverential positions. Similarly, the progressivist emphasis of learner autonomy and teacher empowerment has been likened to an edifice which lacks strong foundations to sustain itself (Howatt, 1984).

These criticisms can be countered with reference to the issues that I have voiced earlier to point out the detrimental ramifications of a rationalist approach to language learning. Viewed in light of the attitudes and beliefs underlying this narrative, pre-determined learning behaviour, tutored learning in the guise of focused instruction and norm-based assessment of goals are believed to be detrimental to current educational practices. The following views of Skilbeck (1982) support my rejection of classical humanism and reconstructionism:

> Externally imposed syllabuses, text books, and examinations all define educational values and set certain standards which are important from the standpoint of the individual as well as for national and social purposes; however, they make the spontaneity, flexibility and diversity which are an equally important part of education much more difficult to achieve. (p. 20)

It is argued that spontaneity, flexibility and diversity can accrue only through a process-centred pedagogy of response. Such a position throws up a new emphasis, which has come to be known as constructivism (Applebee, 1992, pp. 12-16).

Constructivism

Constructivism can be looked at metaphorically and philosophically. As a metaphor, it means understanding knowledge and learning through experience. As a philosophy of learning it emphasizes the premise that by reflecting on our experiences we construct our own understanding of the world we live in. In doing so, we make sense of our experiences by constructing our own mental models to interpret new experiences (Pelech & Pieper, 2010; Reagan, 1999; Osborn, 2000).

Constructivism as a philosophy of learning eschews behaviourist and transmission-based approaches to learning. As it owes its identity and character to a large extent to the many principles of progressivism, it is fundamentally concerned with the empowerment of both the teacher and the taught. In this regard it challenges the tenets of classical humanism and reconstrustionism. In a constructivist model of learning, learners personalize their experiences in order to construct knowledge and they do this by constructing a narrative of their lived through experiences of learning English.

The lived through experience and the telling of the story of language learning serves to exemplify the two strands of the constructivist perspective: 1) radical constructivism and 2) social constructivism. Radical constructivism relates to knowledge as an outcome of the learner's active mental effort emphasized by the living through experience. Social constructivism relates to knowledge as an outcome of the learner's personal effort in a social cultural context where telling of the story of reading unfolds as a social event (Pelech & Pieper 2010; Reagan, 1999; Rosenblatt, 1995; Osborn, 2000). It is believed that by synthesizing the two strands of the constructivist perspective we can facilitate a constructivist-learning environment for its deployment of pedagogy of response. Therefore, it will be helpful to articulate the eight characteristics proposed by Jonassen (1994, pp. 34-37) that describe a constructivist-learning environment which aim to synthesize the two strands of the constructivist perspective. Constructivist learning environments:

- encourage multiple representations of reality;
- avoid oversimplification to represent the complexity and diversity of the real world;
- view knowledge as 'constructed' not as 'given';
- emphasize authentic activities and meaningful contexts;
- focus on real world settings and non-linear instruction;
- provide stimulus for reflecting on experience;
- articulate context-bound characteristics of knowledge; and
- acknowledge collaborative construction of knowledge through inter-personal associations/negotiations.

It is believed that these eight characteristics not only serve to reinforce all the key theoretical issues raised herein, but also necessitate an understanding of a problem-posing model of education situated in a constructivist approach to literacy education proposed by Freire (1973). In order to understand the problem-posing model we need to look at its antithesis, the banking-model of education, which was the mainstay in the pedagogies and practices that typified classical humanism to the fullest extent and reconstructionism to a large extent given its unhealthy preoccupations with lockstep teaching ideals and matrix thinking. According to Freire the banking-model of education is one where the teacher's primary objective is to deposit information into students as they would deposit money into a bank. Such an approach as mentioned by Freire (1972, pp. 46-47) has the following characteristics:

- The teacher teaches and the students are taught.
- The teacher knows everything and the students know nothing.
- The teacher thinks and the students are thought about.
- The teacher talks and the students listen.

- The teacher disciplines and the students are disciplined.
- The teacher chooses and enforces his choice and the students comply.
- The teacher acts and the students have the illusion of acting through the action of the teacher.
- The teacher chooses the program content and the students adapt to it.
- The teacher confuses the authority of knowledge with his own professional authority, which he sets in opposition to the freedom of the students.
- The teacher is the subject of the learning process, while the pupils are mere objects.

These characteristics envisage an order of learning in which students are discouraged from finding out how and why they are being asked to do certain learning tasks because the teacher imposed them to be done. So it is unlikely that they will feel involved or engaged with the learning tasks. Thus they pick up on a survival orientation, which directs them to believe that passing a course is the primary objective of their learning. Such a belief not only defeats the purpose of education but also feeds into a culture of illiteracy.

The problem-posing model of education, to the contrary, enforces a dialogic nature of learning. This means that the teacher and the student interact with each other as "knowledgeable equals in a situation of genuine two-way communication" (Freire, 1972, pp. 52-59). Therefore, the lecture-based learning dominant in the banking model is replaced by a model in which teachers and students discuss issues of concern in their lives in a non-threatening encounter. The use of themes in the form of open-ended language practices and texts provides unrestricted scope for discussion and problematization of the issues seen in the texts. The open-ended questions encourage students to elaborate and hypothesize on what they see in these texts. Viewed in light of the issues discussed so far, the process discussed here can reverse the culture of illiteracy by teaching students to read the world. Such an outcome is not only vital to literacy education but also central to our understanding of literacy as an educational and social process (Freire, 1972, 1973). Therefore, the problem-posing model of education and its constructivist underpinnings assume centrality in our EIL educational ideology. In addition, the model and its underpinnings can serve to consolidate our stance in the educational practice of EIL.

Constructivism in EIL: A bonding of commonalities and complementarities

Our endorsement of constructivism should help us challenge the main stream SLA's preoccupation with the development and measurement of proficiency in language as a linguistic code rather than a phenomenon in which the learners cross the border of their first language into a second in order to reconstruct their selves and world. Regrettably, the

> acquisition metaphor (AM), which conceptualized language learning in the scientific/experimental studies of the last forty five years or so becomes untenable in the face of constructivist orientation in that it likened learning to computers and containers. Such a metaphorical projection compelled us to think of knowledge as a commodity that is accumulated by the learner and to view the mind as the repository where the learner hoards the commodity.
>
> (Sfard, 1998, p. 5)

The current acceptance and popularity of the participation metaphor (PM) "as the prevailing metaphor of learning defies the traditional distinction between cognition and affect, brings social factors to the fore, and thus deals with an incomparable wide range of possibly relevant aspects" (Sfard, 1998, p. 12). This necessitates a shift in our focus from "language structure to language use in context, and to the issues of affiliation and belonging" (Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000, pp. 155-177). A constructivist account of language is then understood as representational and therefore, figurative (Gibbs, 1994; McRae, 1991), dialogical and therefore, expansive (Bakhtin, 1981); immanent and therefore, semiotic (C. S. Peirce, 1955). To know a language, then, is how one learns to use it or to live in it like a bird in a nest. In this sense, a computational or container view of language as touted by the classical humanists and reconstructionists is not language at all as our bilingual students of English can employ their own linguistic repertoire to signpost their discourses, personal identities and social relationships.

The notion of "semiotic budget" (van Lier, 2000, p. 252) is valuable to constructivism in EIL since it invites us to view the learning opportunities for meaning constructions far beyond the traditional notion of input and its comprehension by the learner. Semiotic resources such as expressions of appreciation, empathy, understanding, and a host of other meaning making activities that represent students' creative and critical thought are unwelcome to traditional SLA theorists. This can irk many university level language teachers with a Western traditional mind-set, who demand a blinkered compliance from their students to the rhetorical patterns that are used by native speakers in their academic writing. In this regard, they appear to be biased in favor of their students producing writer responsible texts, wherein their students take the responsibility as writers to promote effective communication by voicing their intentions directly (Hinds, 1987). Regrettably, the teachers have failed to take into account the various cultural approaches that their students must have followed in their learning and writing of academic texts. While many stipulate that their students' academic discourse should match the norms of the academic discourse of the West in order for them to be successful in a western context, they fail to realize that asking their students to adhere to western cultural patterns of textual development, especially asking their students to use a linear deductive thinking is tantamount to colonization of minds.

By ordering these students to use our signals so as to match it with our expectations, we are not viewing language to be "a system of abstract grammatical categories"; instead we at least implicitly understand "language conceived as ideologically saturated, language as world view" (Bakhtin, 1981, pp. 181, 271). Therefore by asking "our ESL students to share and reproduce in their writing our world view, one to which they are, of course, alien" (Land & Whitley, 1989, p. 289) constitutes an act of colonization rather than an attempt at academic composition. Given EIL's thrust on "denationalized discourse" (Mckay & Bokhorst-Heng, 2008, p. 78), our students should be encouraged to propose and mediate patterns of rhetoric common to their culture and blend that with their semiotic resources.

Human beings can create signs to direct or control their behavior instead of being controlled by their environment. In this respect, only human beings can use signs to initiate response or to refer to other human beings or objects (Wertsch, 1985a, 1985b). If this position is accepted, then it should be encouraging for our students to act as promoters or mediators of discourses, institutions, culture, propagators of social norms and conventions of their respective society. This demands a different view of social interactions in language learning contexts, one that is diametrically opposed to a simplistic or reductionist view which traditional SLS theorists operating under a rationalist paradigm have touted and couched in asocial metaphors. Current metaphors in SLA such as "association", "manipulation", "conditioning", "treatment" and "system" characterize it as an asocial enterprise in that human beings learning have come to be viewed as laboratory-based objects that have no agency and subjecthood (van Lier, 2001, p. 90).

Interactions in language-learning contexts are complex sociocultural processes and they should be looked at in a more inclusive rather than an exclusive way. Such a need is well represented in the prevalence of metaphors such as "communication", "negotiation of meaning", "co-construction", "cooperative learning" and "responsive teaching", in our current practice of language education.

If students in an EFL/ESL class believe that completing an academic assignment is mainly intended for scoring a pass grade, then they would view their assignment as a tool to get the task done. As a result, they would believe that there is nothing more to their assignment in terms of learning needs. This position is reminiscent of "survival orientation" (Breen, 1987, p. 26), which students get accustomed to for want of motivation to go beyond the instrumental purpose of completing the given task. To the contrary, if the students view their assignments as a sign, which can be interpreted and related to other signs, it would influence a multiple creation of texts besides contributing to a dialogic atmosphere in class thereby influencing a diversity of utterances or interpretations (Bakhtin, 1981). This is one of the key tenets of a constructivist EIL pedagogy, which aims to foster voice, agency and intersubjectivity in the language classroom. By the same token constructivist EIL pedagogies and practices (Holliday, 2005; McKay, 2002; McKay & Bokhorst-Heng, 2008; Pelech & Pieper, 2010; Widdowson, 2003) encourage students to:

- view the signs of a text as discursive and dynamic meaning making elements which can be changed or replaced by their signs;
- focus on the semiotic context of the original text, read their personal life experiences, their roles as readers, reviewers, critics and promoters of their readings and writings;
- look at the texts they read not only indicatively but also symbolically; and
- identify the worldviews of the texts they read and how their reactions to the texts could point out the provisionality rather than the fixity of the writers' positions on their respective worldviews.

Implications for teaching and research

Our preoccupation with collecting evidence for language learning has led us to view language learning as a reaping or harvesting act. In doing that, we have not paid any attention to the sowing that precedes reaping. As pointed out by Bronfrenbrenner (1979) our focus has been turned away from person, process, context and time in that our preoccupations have centred on reaping statistical analyses and numerical measures (Bakhurst, 1991; Wittgenstein, 1980). Closure-focused students have come to be seen as idealized human beings by researchers in the rationalist or positivist tradition as they believe that learning is a closure-focused task aimed at producing determinate or fixed meanings, which are not only atemporal and universal but are also measurable and quantifiable and therefore, justifiable. It is only by moving away from the unhealthy preoccupations with calculable thinking and closure-focus in our educational practice of English language teaching can we get to understand the power and promise of constructivism in EIL. Needless to say that both constructivism and EIL are mutually supportive of and complementary to each other, we as language practitioners need bring in a host of new sociolinguistic sensibilities and sensitivities to enrich our classroom practices and procedures. The following insights (Holliday, 2005; McKay, 2002; McKay& Bokhorst-Heng, 2008; Pelech & Pieper, 2010; Widdowson, 2003) can be very beneficial and helpful not only in our classroom practices but also in our research agenda.

First of all the teachers need to treat language as communication. This position will encourage their students to view their reading of a text as an exercise in two-way communication by which they will receive the writer's communication and respond to it. In doing so, they would have expressed their lived through experience of reading, which would go far beyond the semantic encodings of the text. Likewise, their writing would come as response to what they have read and internalized. This can serve as a venue for fostering discursivity and intersubjectivity in their meaning making endeavors.

Secondly, the teachers need to optimize their students' existing communicative competence. Students exercise their "initial competence", "expectations" and "changing needs" to make their contributions (Breen & Candlin, 2001, p. 15). In order to accomplish this, teachers should develop a subjective appraisal of the kind of teaching they do, which will give them a "sense of plausibility" (Prabhu, 1990, p. 172). Given that most course books and other textbooks based on CLT are published in countries where English is the native language, many non-native teachers of English believe that optimum student oral participation is a reliable measure of a good lesson and success in it. Further to this, they equate their students' oral output as a reliable measure of approximation to the English speaking West, which has been referred to as "CLT attitude" (Bax, 2003, p. 279) in the current language teaching literature and one which uses this attitude prescriptively to measure the degree of advancement or retrogression against a non-problematic, all-encompassing Standard English. However, in light of the EIL principles discussed so far, such a belief and expectation can have a pernicious effect on the morale of the students apart from signaling insensitivity to local culture where English is taught as it can be seen by the students as a hostile challenge to their conception of appropriate language behavior and their cultural expectations in their classroom setting. Given EIL's thrust on sensitivity to the local cultural context, a sense of plausibility can help teachers adapt the materials for use in pedagogy of appropriation (Kramsch & Sullivan, 1996, pp. 200-211). Furthermore, it can strengthen the teachers' sense of tolerance and sensitivity with which they can come to terms with new lexical variations, new grammatical standards and pronunciation patterns that typify the sociocultural and sociolinguistic contexts where a particular variety of English is used. Most importantly, it will help the teachers to identify and reckon with these forms of Englishes as World Englishes rather than pigeonhole them in denigrating terms such as, "errors, interlanguage, or fossilized forms of incomplete acquisition of Standard English" (McKay & Bokhorst-Heng, 2008, p. 182).

Thirdly, the teachers need to foster cross-cultural sensitivity though their EIL pedagogies and practices. Given that the fear of the other is what has been perceived to be the most convincing reason for the varying levels of stress, reticence and demotivation experienced by second language speakers of English, helping students to see their encounters with the English language as an open dialogue (Lehtovaara, cited in Kohonen et al, 2001, pp. 141-176) rather than as an act of approximation to an inviolate linguistic code, can have far-reaching benefits for the learner. More importantly, this can help the learners to see their progress in learning English as a voyage of understanding, which moves from their native culture (C1) to the target culture (C2) and eventually to a destination (C3) that blends the best of C1, C2 and C3 (Kramsch, 1993, pp. 236-255). The experiential understanding of the nuances that play out in the students' efforts to construct their narratives of becoming and being bi-lingual users of English will contribute immeasurably to their intercultural understanding and how an element of interculturality permeates their understanding of their competence in the use of EIL.

Last but not least, the teachers need to foster an atmosphere for classroom based social research (B. N. Peirce, 1995), which would entail the classroom community doing collaborative research with the support and encouragement of the teachers. Such endeavors can provide ample opportunities to the students to gain firsthand experience of how English is used and features in the local sociocultural context and how that impacts their sociocultural practices. More importantly, the research projects will equip them with a substantial understanding of how their use of English can serve as basis for nurturing L2-L2 interactions and L2-L1 interactions. As pointed out earlier, the research projects will empower the students and the teachers into becoming agents of discourse, propagators of culture and proposers of social conventions as an antidote to the dominant discourse of native speakerism. Such an outcome will nurture a strong sense of social autonomy and social authenticity (Holliday, 2005) in the students with which they will be well placed to initiate constructive social change through their use of English in addition to enhancing their identity and agency.

Constructivism in EIL is well poised to promote facilitative and negotiative and associative relationships between the teachers and students. Under its influence, the classroom community will be encouraged to view their handling of English language as an open or expansive system, which can facilitate expression of human activity in all its variety and illogic, thereby enriching manifold the sociocultural involvement of and by the human user (Polkinghorne, 1988). Furthermore, the prevalence of a constructivist orientation in the EIL practices can encourage and support a vibrant perspective to research into the teaching of English as an international language.

For many years now, SLA/ELT has been hegemonised by a psuedo-scientific paradigm that has conceptualized research into its practices as an objectivity of inputs and outputs, much to the detriment of the social foundations of FLL and SLL. The unhealthy preoccupations with the issues of generalisability and replicability has had far-reaching unhealthy consequences in our filed as it has failed to account for the prevalence of agency and voice that operate in our classroom settings. In light of this, the dynamism and the humanism of constructivism can empower us – the language practitioners to challenge the positivist or rationalist persuasions of the past and demolish the very notions of atemporal knowledge, value-free knowledge in favor of contextualized knowledge and value-loaded knowledge. To this end, the following research agenda can enhance our affiliation to EIL and our affirmations of its efficacy in the current educational practice of English language teaching:

- Learner accounts of language learning
- Teacher accounts of language teaching
- Ethnographies of reading and writing
- Narratives of affiliations and identity construction
- Learner strategies and learning outcomes
- Non-formal modes of assessment
- Role of affect, attitude, and intuition
- Alternate explanations of classroom discourse
- Qualitative microanalysis of learning tasks and projects

The agendas listed above can help us view research as an unequivocally subjective and dialectical undertaking. Furthermore, it can serve an exemplary agent for promoting a well-informed understanding opposing perspectives of the same phenomenon could be used as a basis for investigating position, voice and representation. Consequently, research into EIL will be seen as a narrative for linking individual human actions and events into interrelated aspects of an understandable composite.

Conclusion

The various theoretical possibilities examined and discussed along with their attendant insights and issues so far have served as an interesting basis to signpost my intuitions, beliefs and value-systems in my attempt to articulate a case for the prevalence and promotion of constructivism in EIL. In light of this, I wish to reiterate my belief that the educational and social values of EIL cannot be and will not be realized through an approach typical of the traditional SLA theorists operating under a psuedo-scientific and pseudo-rationalist paradigm (Kohonen et al, 2001). To the contrary, the true merit and efficacy of EIL can only be realized through a constructivist orientation discussed in this paper. In this respect the prevalence of constructivism in EIL can facilitate and support a hermeneutic or phenomenological understanding of EIL as an educationally and socially empowering enterprise. The following lines from T.S. Eliot's (1936) *Choruses from the Rock* echo my beliefs and concerns voiced in this chapter in addition to strengthening my resolve to function responsibly and professionally:

> The endless cycle of idea and action,
> Endless invention, endless experiment,
> Brings knowledge of motion, but not of stillness;
> Knowledge of speech, but not of silence;
> Knowledge of words, and ignorance of the Word.
> All our knowledge brings us nearer to our ignorance;
> All our ignorance brings us nearer to death,
> But nearness to death no nearer to GOD.
> Where is the Life we have lost in living?
> Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge?
> Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?

References

Applebee, A. N. (1992). The background for reform. In J. A. Langer, (Ed.), *Literature instruction: Focus on student response* (pp. 1-18). Urbana, Illinois: NCTE.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination.* (translated by Emerson, C., & Holquist, M). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhurst, D. (1991). *Consciousness and revolution in soviet philosophy. From the bolsheviks to evald ilyenkov.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bax, S. (2003). The postmethod teacher. Unpublished paper, Department of Language Studies, Canterbury Christ Church University College.

Breen, M. P., & Candlin, C. N. (2001). A communicative curriculum. In D. Hall and A. Hewings (Eds.), *Innovations in English language teaching* (pp. 9-29). London: Routlege.

Breen, M. P. (1987). Learner contributions to task design. In *Language learning tasks* (Lancaster Working Papers in English, Language Education, Vol. 7. (pp. 26-30). London: Prentice-Hall.

Bronfrenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Canagarajah, S. A. (2006). Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 26, 197-218.

Clark, J. (1987). *Curriculum renewal in school foreign language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Delawter, J. (1992). Teaching literature: From clerk to explorer'. In J. A. Langer, (Ed.), *Literature instruction - a focus on student response,* (pp. 101-130). Urbana, Illinois: NCTE.

Eliot, T.S. (1936). *Collected poems,* 1909-1935. London: Faber & Faber

Freire, P. (1972*). Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: The Continuum Publishing Corporation.

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Corporation.

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the* world. Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey.

Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind*, *figurative thought and language and understanding.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: anew typology. In U. Connor and R. Kaplan, (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text*. (pp. 141-152). Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language: New models, new norms, new goals.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Jonassen, D. H. (1994). Thinking technology: Toward a constructivist design model. *Educational Technology.* 34(4), 34-37.

Kachru, B. (1983). *The Indianization of English: The English language in India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Kohonen, V., Jaatinen, R., Kaikkonen, P., & Lehtovaara, J. (2001). *Experiential learning in foreign language education.* Harlow: Longman.

Kramsch, C., & Sullivan, P. (1996). Appropriate pedagogy. *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 199-212.

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

Land, R., & Whitley, C. (1989). Evaluating second language essays in regular composition classes: Toward a pluralistic U.S. rhetoric. In D. Johnson and D. Roen, (Eds.), *Richness in writing (*pp. 284-293*).* New York: Longman.

McKay, S. L., & Bokhorst-Heng, W. D. (2008). *International English in its sociolinguistic contexts.* London: Routledge.

McRae, J. (1991). *Literature with a small 'l'.* London: Macmillan.

Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (1998). *Second language learning theories.* London: Arnold.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centered curriculum.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Osborn, T. (2000). *Critical reflection and the foreign language classroom.* Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey.

Palfreyman, D. (2005). Othering in an English language program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(2), 211-233.

Pavlenko, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Second language learning as participation and the (re) construction of selves. In J. P. Lantolf, (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 155-177). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Peirce, B. N. (1995). Social identity, investment and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly,* 29(1), 9-32.

Peirce, C. S. (1955). Logic as semiotic: The theory of signs. In J. Buchler, (Ed.), *Philosophical writings of Peirce.* New York: Dover Books.

Pelech, J., & Pieper, G. (2010). *The comprehensive handbook of constructivist teaching.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Prabhu, N. S. (1990). There is no best method-why? *TESOL Quarterly* 24(2), 161-176.

Reagan, T. (1999). 'Constructivist epistemology and second/foreign language pedagogy'. *Foreign Language Annals,* 32, 413 - 425.

Roberts, C., Byram, M., Barro, A., Jordan, S., &. Street, B. (2001). *Language learners as ethnographers.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Rosenblatt, L. (1995*). Literature as exploration.* New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher,* 27, 4-13.

Skilbeck, M. (1982). School-based curriculum development. In V. Lee and D. Zeldin, (Eds.), *Planning in the curriculum* (pp. 20-21). Sevenoaks: Hodder and Stoughton.

Smith, F. (1988). Misleading metaphors of education. In F. Smith, (Ed.)*, Joining the literacy club* (pp. 93-108). Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books.

van Lier, L. (2000). From input to affordance: Social-interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In J. P. Lantolf, (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning (*pp. 245-259). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Lier, L. (2001). Constraints and resources in classroom talk: Issues of equality and symmetry . In C. Candlin and N. Mercer (Eds.), *English language teaching in its social context* (pp. 90-107). London: Routledge.
Wertsch, J. V. (1985a). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
Wertsch, J. V. (1985b). *Culture, communication and cognition. Vygotskian perspectives.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Widdowson, H. G. (1998). The ownership of English. In V. Zamel and R. Spack. (Eds.), *Negotiating acadmeic literacies* (pp. 237-248). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Widdowson, H.G. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wittengenstein, L. (1980). *Culture and value.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Note on Contributor

Sivakumar Sivasubramaniam is an Assistant Professor of Communication at the Petroleum Institute in Abu Dhabi. He serves the EILJ Editorial Board as Chief Editor. He also serves the Asian EFL Journal Editorial Board as Associate Editor. He has been a foreign language/second language educator for over thirty years now and has taught English in India, Ethiopia, Thailand, Bahrain and Armenia. He holds an MA in English Literature from the University of Madras, India, an MA in (Linguistics) TESOL from the University of Surrey, U.K and a PhD in English Studies from the University of Nottingham, U.K. His research interests include response-centered reading/writing pedagogies, second language advocacy, narratives in language education and genre-based approaches to reading and writing in EAP. Email contact: sivakumar49@yahoo.com

From *Defining* to *Developing* Competence in EIL and Intercultural Communication

Roger Nunn

Petroleum Institute, Abu Dhabi, U.A.E

Designing learning to develop competence in English as an International Language (EIL) has much in common with designing learning to develop competence in Intercultural Communication. In this paper I synthesize in one publication a number of studies published within the Asian EFL Journal Group and introduce a forthcoming Asian EFL/EIL journal book which addresses the learning applications of papers that have appeared in the EIL Journal on the meaning of EIL competence (Acar, 2007; Nunn, 2007a, 2007b; Sivasubramaniam, this volume). After summarizing key aspects of EIL and intercultural competence, the implications for teaching and learning are addressed, and learning applications and activities are illustrated in detail.

Keywords: EIL, competence, intercultural communication

Introduction

While much has been written about English as an International Language (EIL) and about Intercultural Communication, these two areas may sometimes appear to be separate fields in the literature. However, I will argue in this paper that designing learning to develop competence in EIL has much in common with designing learning to develop competence in Intercultural Communication. Another purpose of this paper is to synthesize in one publication a number of studies published separately over a number of years within the Asian EFL Journal Group and to introduce a forthcoming Asian EFL/EIL journal book which addresses the learning applications of papers that have appeared in the EIL Journal on the meaning of EIL competence (Acar, 2007; Nunn, 2007a, 2007b; Sivasubramaniam, this volume). I will first consider the learning and teaching implications of the detailed characterization of EIL competence provided in those articles by listing and briefly discussing some of the different aspects related to both EIL and intercultural competence which need to be addressed in planning learning experiences. In the second part of the paper, I will consider types of learning applications and activities that have been developed to enhance intercultural EIL competence mainly drawing on articles published within the AEJ journals.

Aspects of competence to address

The following topics have been identified as important for developing competence through EIL learning and teaching:

Knowledge of World Englishes

While it is impossible to cover all possible sources in one program, students need to obtain exposure to a broad variety of world Englishes. This is addressed below in several sections. Al-Jarf (2006), for example, exposes her students to intensive international communication online with other EIL students who learnt English as a second language. Nguyen (2007) suggests inviting foreigners from a variety of cultures into the class as a live alternative. Naturally broadening the scope of teacher recruitment to involve a broad range of cultural backgrounds will further expose students to intercultural communication as part of their daily routine and support the development of intercultural expertise within the department. In this respect rather than emphasizing national origin, recruitment might consider what Heuser (2007) refers to (citing Bochner, 1986) as "mosaic multicultural individuals".

1. Adapting to different types of 'communities'

EIL users do not operate in homogenous, single speech communities. Students need to be able to communicate within different kinds of communities. Some of these – such as communities of practice – will be semi-permanent, others will be temporary. (See Nunn 2007a for a full discussion of the notion of 'community' in relation to EIL use.)

2. Reconsidering 'standards'

As Alan Bennett suggests in the *Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*, "standards are always out of date. That is what makes them standards" (cited in Knowles, 1991, p. 29). Sivasubramaniam (this volume) argues that the notion of standards needs radical rethinking for EIL use. Competence in International English is a rapidly developing construct, but it is already clear that it is not definable as one standard. Baker (2000, p. 78) makes a useful distinction between BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency). In practice, the division between CALP and BICS is not just a question of choosing one or the other. The two may overlap. BICS may be needed by all students but CALP may only be needed by students pursuing academic goals. Standards for either type of competence cannot be defined for all contexts, so some kind of interplay between BICS and CALP needs and between local and external international standards is always needed.

3. *Developing enabling skills and attitudes*

- Adaptation and transferability: The ability to adapt to new situations is partly a question of attitude, tolerance and openness to differences but exercises that promote effective listening skills such as probing for further information or that require training in the negotiation of meaning help develop adaptation as a skill. Competence is therefore partly defined in terms of the ability to transfer what is learnt in one context to other unpredictable (intercultural) contexts. Transferability is the aspect of international communicative competence that best distinguishes it from other aspects of communicative competence. It is also the aspect that has the most implications for teaching and training. Transferability is the ability to use, adjust or develop knowledge and skills learnt in one context in unknown and often unpredictable contexts. All communication can require us to deal with the unpredictable but Intercultural Communicators need to be even more prepared for the unexpected. They need to adjust by reflecting on how what they learnt, the way they dealt with a situation or the way they solved a problem in one situation may be adjusted and transferred to another. Communication in temporary community contexts always has something in common with communication in any other contexts, but certain aspects will be unpredictable and therefore not directly transferable.
- Compensation: knowledge and skills of any individual in such a broad area as EIL/intercultural competence can only be partial. This means that the ability to compensate is vital. It also follows that the ability to cooperate in multi-cultural teams is an important attribute as individuals cannot master all aspects that might be needed in a given situation.
- Intelligibility: No variety of English is automatically more understandable than another across contexts. All Englishes need to be *made intelligible* when engaging in international communication. Intelligibility depends on adapting to the audience. Learners need practice in making sure their meaning has been understood. This is not limited to pronunciation, but students may need practice in prominence and intonation and in awareness

of segmental differences across accents. The listener must also share responsibility for intelligibility.

4. Rethinking pragmatics

The study of pragmatics needs to be at least partially disassociated from specific target speech communities. Learning the way one community enacts particular functions such as compliments or apologies (see for example Lingley, 2006) is only a useful learning aim in so far as the principles and skills learnt for one context are transferable to other contexts. We may consider those students going to live, study, communicate in one target culture as an exception, but even in these cases, schools and universities teaching courses related to our EFL/EIL field will have multicultural student cohorts. Comparative studies need to be broad enough to allow awareness of potential rather than actual differences across communities. They need to be able to generalize about the nature of pragmatic misunderstanding and to raise awareness of the potential for pragmatic misunderstanding in intercultural communication and the need to negotiate interim pragmatic norms with interlocutors.

5. Teaching approaches

Teachers can share approaches across cultures but also need to be aware of the local community in relation to other cultures. Comparative descriptions of method-in-use can help transfer learning across cultures. Philosophies of learning need to be holistic to be able to make sense of cultural difference. Approaches such as constructivism (proposed in this volume by Sivasubramaniam) do not necessarily take precedence for all contexts but holistic approaches that are by definition open to alternative meanings might still be seen as best suited to EIL learning.

6. Linguistic competence

Linguistic competence in a locally appropriate variety of English needs to be developed in any local context. National origin is not a limitation on linguistic competence. There are no native speakers of *international* English. There are only highly competent speakers without regard to origin. The relationship between varieties of English is complex both linguistic and ideological. Issues such as ‘collocation’ for example need serious consideration in relation to varieties of English. There *are* native speakers of different varieties of English, all of which need to be adapted for international use. International intelligibility of all local models needs consideration. Reduced models of competence may be appropriate for BICS but not for CALP (Baker, 2000).

7. Equal dissemination of knowledge and publications across cultures

Journals need to attempt to provide an inclusive forum that is not biased towards particular cultures in order to obtain a reasonable international sample of viewpoints and accounts of activities. Journals such as AEJ and EIL attempt to provide an international forum with broad international participation, but do also have rigorous review systems which might in practice have in-built biases.

Intercultural competence

While intercultural communication is not always EIL communication, EIL communication is always intercultural communication. Valuable work on defining, teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence has been proposed in the work of Michael Byram. His paradigm is exploited and referred to frequently both internationally and in these pages. For example, Nault (2006, pp. 8-13) summarizes different dimensions of Byram's (1997) model of intercultural communicative competence and suggests they can be exploited as teaching objectives as follows:

1. *Attitudes.* Learners should be curious, open-minded and flexible, or ready "to suspend disbelief" about others' cultures;
2. *Knowledge*. Learners should understand "social groups and their products and practices" and "the general processes of societal and individual interaction" in their own and foreign countries;
3. *Skills of interpreting and relating*. Learners should be able "to interpret a document or event from another culture" in relation to their own cultural perspective;
4. *Skills of discovery and interaction*. Learners should be able "to acquire new knowledge of a culture and cultural practices" and "operate knowledge, attitudes and skills under the constraints of real-time communication and interaction"; and
5. *Critical cultural awareness*. Learners should be able "to evaluate critically and on the basis of explicit criteria perspectives, practices and products" in their own and others' cultures and countries.

Heuser (2007, p. 44) also adopts Byram's (1997) model of intercultural competence to help formulate learning objectives as follows:

1. develop intercultural attitudes that demonstrate a willingness to decenter or relativize one's own beliefs; and
2. increase knowledge of social processes and their resulting products, and refine skills of discovery and interaction leading to the ability to interpret and apply what has been learned.

DuPraw and Axner (1997) provide the following guidelines for successful collaboration which challenge us to challenge our own assumptions. "Don't assume" is in itself a useful starting point. DuPraw and Axner's guidelines for multicultural collaboration are as follows:

- Learn from generalizations about other cultures, but don't use those generalizations to stereotype, "write off", or oversimplify your ideas about another person. The best use of a generalization is to add it to your storehouse of knowledge so that you better understand and appreciate other interesting, multi-faceted human beings.
- Practice, practice, practice. That's the first rule, because it's in the doing that we actually get better at cross-cultural communication.
- Don't assume that there is one right way (yours!) to communicate. Keep questioning your assumptions about the "right way" to communicate. For example, think about your body language; postures that indicate receptivity in one culture might indicate aggressiveness in another.
- Don't assume that breakdowns in communication occur because other people are on the wrong track. Search for ways to make the communication work, rather than searching for who should receive the blame for the breakdown.
- Listen actively and empathetically. Try to put yourself in the other person's shoes. Especially when another person's perceptions or ideas are very different from your own, you might need to operate at the edge of your own comfort zone.
- Respect others' choices about whether to engage in communication with you. Honor their opinions about what is going on.
- Stop, suspend judgment, and try to look at the situation as an outsider.
- Be prepared for a discussion of the past. Use this as an opportunity to develop an understanding from "the other's" point of view, rather than getting defensive or impatient. Acknowledge historical events that have taken place. Be open to learning more about them. Honest acknowledgment of the mistreatment and oppression that have taken place on the basis of cultural difference is vital for effective communication.
- Awareness of current power imbalances – and an openness to hearing each other's perceptions of those imbalances – is also necessary for understanding each other and working together.
- Remember that cultural norms may not apply to the behavior of any particular individual. We are all shaped by many, many factors – our ethnic background, our family, our education, our personalities – and are

more complicated than any cultural norm could suggest. Check your interpretations if you are uncertain what is meant.

Examples of learning activities from recent AEJ publications

Nguyen (2007) provides the following list of learning activity types that can assist in developing the kind of intercultural competence outlined:

Lecture and readings (Develop understanding of the issues)	"Simply telling students about the things which may cause the greatest problems"
Cultural assimilators (Develop understanding of values and sensitivity)	"A brief description of critical incidents of cross-cultural behaviors that would probably be misunderstood by students. After the description of the incident, the students are presented with explanations from which they are asked to select the correct one (Seelye, 1984), followed by possible responses."
Cultural capsule	"Cultural capsules are brief presentations showing one or more essential difference between cultures, accompanied by visuals that illustrate these and a set of questions to stimulate class discussion. Cultural capsules can be recorded or written."
Self-confrontation "An emotional response which results in self-confrontation."	Mini-drama approach. "The mini-drama consists of from three to five brief episodes, each of which contains one or more examples of miscommunication. A discussion is led by the teacher after each episode."
Role play	"In role-play activities, students imagine themselves in an intercultural situation outside the classroom, and perform a role-play about a situation within one's own culture or another culture. Experiencing the situation from different perspectives can contribute to a "clearer perception, greater awareness" and "a better understanding of one's own culture and culture of other people" (Fennes & Hapgood, 1997, p. 109)."

Cultural simulation games	"Simulation developers state that the purpose of the games is to simulate culture shock. They maintain that experiencing cultural shock prior to field experience will cushion actual shock by increasing awareness of cross-cultural problems (Gudykunst, Guzley & Hammer, 1996; Krasnick, 1984;). Therefore, students can become sensitized to the helplessness of people from different cultural backgrounds when confronted with a totally new and foreign situation. The preparation for intercultural interaction provided by rehearsal and practicing in the games "can make a measurable difference in the stress inherent in these situations" (Fowler, 1986, p. 73)."
Discussion	"Discussion involves various topics about intercultural aspects, contributing greatly to learner's motivation and critical thinking (Gudykunst et al, 1996; Tomalin & Stempleski, 1993)."
Inviting Foreigners	"People from other cultures and people who are recently returned expatriates are invited into the class to talk about their culture or their experience. This activity is useful in helping students experience real life intercultural interactions (Argyle, 1982)."

Nguyen (2007) concludes that "each activity described has some merits, and it seems likely that a combination of activities would be the most effective" (p. 134). To this list we might add the use of literature, popular novels, films, newspapers, internet sites and documents and other media as rich sources of cultural material with which to design activities (Nault, 2006). From the skills perspective, there is no limit to the creation of activities which stimulate negotiation of different meanings and interpretations of information, events or documents. In the following pages, a limited number of activities published mainly in the Asian EFL Journals are outlined that match one or more of these categories and provide training in one or more of the aspects of competence outlined above. Those that are available online are summarized. Those not available online are described in more detail. We hope that these will add to readers' resources and will stimulate creation and adaptation to local contexts rather than imitation.

Crossing borders – "Inviting foreigners" and beyond

If we intend to view English as an international means of communication, it is necessary to provide experience of EIL communication with members of other cultures. This could be by meeting members of expatriate communities in one's own country. It could be through travelling and studying in other countries. However, students studying in their own countries are not all able to travel or meet foreigners on a regular basis. These students need not be deprived of communication opportunities beyond their own culture. Crossing virtual borders is one way to provide students studying in a mono-cultural environment with an experience of international communication. Al-Jarf's (2006) paper, *Cross-cultural Communication: Saudi, Ukrainian, and Russian Students Online*, describes an innovative cross-cultural writing project involving three EFL college instructors in Saudi Arabia, Ukraine and Russia and their undergraduate students who crossed borders in cyber space. Naturally, EIL journal authors and editors have become used to making friends and having meaningful professional relationships online, yet teachers who have themselves physically crossed cultures frequently may still wonder about Al-Jarf's claim that "second language (L2) students no longer need to leave their homes or travel to meet people from other countries and learn about their culture" (pp. 7-8). Al-Jarf's pioneering effort aims at more than just language improvement and, importantly, students felt they developed a global outlook in addition to language and communication skills.

The project had multiple aims that went beyond the aim of developing students' English writing skills. Parallel to the linguistic aims, Al-Jarf emphasizes the two global humanistic aims of developing awareness of local *and* global cultural issues and events, and developing the ability to communicate and interact with students from other cultures. On the practical side, meticulous preparation supported these aims. Sites that can be shared across borders are available at minimal or no cost. In this project, thirteen discussion threads, twenty external links, nine documents, three assignments, a photo gallery and Powerpoint presentations were posted on the course-site. In her paper, Al-Jarf reports the findings of quantitative and qualitative analyses of the students' messages and reactions.

Imagination is often needed to create intercultural opportunities for students within an institution. Heuser (2007) designed linked intercultural learning activities with colleagues in other courses within her own institution. A joint curriculum was created for Japanese students (enrolled in an American Society course) and American students (registered in a Modern Japanese Society and Culture course).

Students collaboratively engaged in a series of short-term linked tasks, conducted in English, related to the topics of dating, weddings, elementary education, and the sempai-kohai [senior- junior] relationship. Additionally, seven groups, with equal representation from Japanese students and American students, worked on a semester-long project in which they researched, scripted, and acted out a play about dating or weddings (Heuser, 2007, p. 39).

The aim of this approach was to develop intercultural competence using English as an international language. Specific aims to support this main aim were to develop awareness of the other groups cultural values, behavior and communication patterns. At the same time this encouraged the students to develop self-awareness of their own values, behavior and communication. Heuser also provides some interesting critical incidents of problems that arose during this in-depth intercultural learning process.

Culture and literature teaching

Another important issue is raised in relation to intercultural competence by Nault (2006) in *Using World Literatures to Promote Intercultural Competence in Asian EFL Learners*. While traditional university "language" majors tended to study little but literature, we are now experiencing a situation in many contexts in which literature is hardly taught at all. This seems difficult to justify when one aim of many language–based courses is the study and understanding of culture. Nault (2006, p. 147) considers counter-arguments:

> At a time when communicative skills are a major concern in EFL programs, literature may seem to be a frivolous addition to language classes. By putting texts at the center of lessons, the English instructor using literature might be accused of neglecting speaking, listening and practical reading skills.

He then outlines a convincing intercultural approach pointing out that this "can improve … general English reading and discussion skills as well as enhance … intercultural competence" (p. 147). Further advantages of using literary texts identified by Nault are both emotional and intellectual enrichment and establishing important humanistic educational goals.

Cultural assimilators - Studying critical intercultural incidents

The critical incident approach (Lingley, 2006) is proposed as a vehicle for providing learning opportunities that develop these abilities, attitudes and skills. Lingley describes in detail an example of a critical incident that illustrates a highly mediatised example of failed intercultural communication between Japan and America in 2001. A US submarine on a training maneuver near Hawaii surfaced and accidentally hit the *Ehime Maru*, a Japanese high school training ship. Nine crew members including several students were killed. What followed was a media dispute about appropriate forms of apology for such an incident. Lingley used authentic materials (media reports, opinion pieces and letters) as a starting point for analyzing culture's influence on communication problems. Lingley's approach acknowledges the influence of Bennett's (1998) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS).

Bennett's (1993) DMIS model of intercultural sensitivity is rooted in developmental psychology and views understanding of cultural difference in terms of personal growth spanning a continuum from Ethnocentric Stages (denial, defense, minimization) to Ethnorelative Stages (acceptance, adaptation and integration). The "acceptance" level has been described by Bennett (1998, p. 28) as follows:

> People at the acceptance stage enjoy recognizing and exploring cultural differences. They are aware that they themselves are cultural beings. They are fairly tolerant of ambiguity and are comfortable knowing there is no right answer (although there are better answers for particular contexts). 'Acceptance' does not mean that a person has to agree with or take on a cultural perspective other than his or her own. Rather people accept the *viability* of different cultural ways of thinking and behaving, even though they may not like them. (cited in Lingley, 2006)

Lingley illustrates with a specific and meaningful example in the context of his students how culture and language are interrelated. He shows how a two-culture misunderstanding might be used to challenge students to see the potential for even greater difficulties in situations in which multiple cultures are involved. Lingley outlines a pedagogical strategy in detail that has been put into practice successfully. This kind of attempt, if exploited from a broader perspective, creates understanding of the differing linguistic expectations that can occur across cultures in any context. Lingley refers to the need to create a better understanding of the *self* and the *other* that is resonated in much of the literature cited above.

Following Lingley's approach, we can suggest that Intercultural Communication provides a bridge between language and culture. Critical incidents "provide an opportunity to show how culture impacts on language and behaviour, and to show how to overcome, or preferably prevent, the cultural resentment that so naturally appears in failed intercultural communication." (Lingley, 2006, p. 98.)

Designing simple activities simulating intercultural negotiation

Negotiation in the context of intercultural communication can be defined as the "here-and-now" process that participants are engaged in as they continually adjust to the other participant's contributions. In structural terms, negotiation delays the closure of a unit of interaction and makes units of interaction (such as an exchange) more flexible and extendible. It may, for example, seek an expansion of a response, may encourage or even require a speaker to continue speaking or may simply be a request for clarification or repetition. Negotiation is potentially the most powerful element of intercultural communication, although it is optional in any spoken exchange and might be avoided. Where it does not take place, it is unlikely that real intercultural communication will take place. Where shared norms are not present, negotiation of interim norms is necessary to avoid communication breakdown. This dynamic process of negotiation can enable meaningful intercultural communication and intercultural education based on real experience. If it is successful, it will lead to the establishment of a compromise culture of the kind that reflects all instances of successful international communication.

It is through the medium of language that such a process takes place. The students are obliged to solve their communication problems by making use of whatever English they have acquired during their years of secondary education. If an intercultural process is unsuccessful, it will lead either to communication breakdown or to the subjugation of one set of norms by the other. In cases where it is unsuccessful, it is possible to view communication breakdown as the worst option as it is the most publicly disturbing. However, solutions will normally be found for communication breakdown, so, from an intercultural point of view, it is rather the failure to produce compromised norms that constitutes failed intercultural communication. The victory of one set of norms over another is at best a pyrrhic victory. Teaching guidelines and classroom teaching will therefore encourage the development of strategies for handling negotiation and avoiding breakdown.

The example activity below (previously published in Nunn, 2000) exploits a game situation in which student must negotiate the rules they are using with a partner who has learned different rules and norms. It is based on personal experience many years ago in France when playing drafts using rules learnt in the

UK with my French niece who was using to very different and more flexible rules she had learnt in France. Using the British rules made it impossible to win and the situation took me by surprise. My first reaction was to think that my opponent was cheating. Even when the new rules had been learnt, it was difficult for me to operate them, as I was so used to my own rules.

Whenever we use English as an international language we are engaging in intercultural communication, but much foreign language teaching takes place in mono-cultural classrooms. How can we provide the students with something which resembles true intercultural experience? In intercultural communication, participants bring with them their own particular socio-cultural assumptions about interaction, which they are unlikely to share with members of another culture. Schiffrin (1994, pp. 100-101) refers to the background knowledge of participants in monocultural interaction as "shared contextualization cues" (based on Gumperz 1982), also stating that "contextualization cues are learned through long periods of face to face contact". In intercultural interaction, we cannot assume that the same norms or rules have been learnt.

Wittgenstein's game analogy, summarized by Speake (1979) below, is useful to illustrate this point.

> To understand, and assess, any given use of language we have to know what game is being played, and what its rules and objectives are. A linguistic move, like a move on the sports field or at the card-table, is to be seen as a move *within* a particular game, and can only be judged permissible or impermissible, a success or a failure, accordingly. There are no all-embracing criteria of assessment to which we can appeal. (Speake 1979, p. 376)

One teaching focus of intercultural communication will always be on the skills of negotiating interim norms between participants playing to different rules. Many language students have not been abroad and have not experienced situations in which they have had difficulties because they were applying different rules of communication. The following simple classroom activity was designed to provide a memorable holistic experience using a non-linguistic situation accompanied by negotiation in English to bring the point home. It is presented here as an example of how to adjust games readily available in one culture to simulate intercultural experience. I asked a group of four students to meet one hour before class to learn the rules of draughts (checkers in the US). I taught them to play draughts using the following rules:

The Rules of Draughts (1): Moving and taking pieces

Your aim is to remove all your opponents' pieces from the board using the following rules:

1. Pieces must always move forwards and diagonally except in cases mentioned in rules 3 & 4.
2. When your piece is in front of an opposing piece and the space behind it is free, you must jump that piece. If you don't jump when it is possible to do so, your piece can be taken off the board by your opponent. It may be possible to jump more than one piece providing there is always a space free behind the piece that is jumped over. After jumping a piece, that piece is removed from the board.
3. Although you should always move forwards you may also move backwards to jump a second piece providing that there is a space behind that piece.
4. A piece that reaches the other side of the board is doubled becoming a queen. It may then move forwards or backwards.

After learning these rules, I left them to have a competition, asking them to come to the class after 45 minutes (of a 90-minute class). I taught the rest of the class to play draughts with the following rules and them I gave them practice in playing, selecting four of the best players for the second part of the activity.

The Rules of Draughts (2): Moving and taking pieces

Your aim is to remove all your opponents' pieces from the board using the following rules:

1. Pieces must always move forwards and diagonally, but see also rule 3.
2. When your piece is in front of an opposing piece and the space behind it is free, you may jump that piece, but you are not obliged to do so. After jumping a piece, that piece is removed from the board.
3. A piece that reaches the other side of the board is doubled becoming a "queen". It may then move forwards or backwards.

The students from the first group have learnt rules which make it far easier to win. They may take the piece of an opponent who fails to take an opportunity to jump, they may take more than one piece at a time in the same turn and they may also move backwards to jump a second piece. When these students arrive half way through the class, I set up four games between them and the four best players from the class session. At this stage it is important to remove the papers with the rules written down so that students cannot refer to them during the games. Players are told that they may speak to opponents if necessary, but only in English. I divide the remaining students into observers for each group with instructions to watch silently and to note down any incidents on a sheet of paper. They are asked not to assist any player or intervene in the games in any way.

Normally the games start off smoothly, but as the games progress the different rules gradually become apparent and players start to become uneasy. The way participants handle this situation is interesting. Some choose to ignore the problem. Some end up adopting the other player's rules without discussion, others get annoyed and the game cannot continue, others negotiate or discuss and discover the root of the problem and manage to play on successfully using compromised rules.

The activity finishes with a discussion in which observers report back to the class and players are then invited to give their reactions after seeing the rules their opponents were playing with. Only at the end do I make the analogy with intercultural communication and provide them with the quotation on Wittgenstein above. Games can then be replayed encouraging opponents to develop compromised rules.

International media activities

For advanced university students, international news can be exploited in developing a theoretical awareness of the apparent inevitability of cultural bias. In Nunn and Nunn (2006) we exploited a media error by the BBC in relation to the War in Afghanistan using a detailed analysis of the text as a way of stimulating projects by students using the international news media. The following extract identifies the idea of cultural neutrality as a central concept for intercultural analysis. Mey (1993, p. 293) points out that news writing can never achieve absolute "neutrality". A basic presupposition of neutrality is the existence of a non-ideological attitude or position, what Mey calls a "zero point". Setting the zero point can only be done if we know what the values are; however, those values are precisely what an analysis seeks to determine. This does not mean that we cannot distinguish between attempts to be fair or neutral and deliberately biased one-sided representation, but it does explain why the major challenge of international media analysis is identifying the way ideologies and values are embodied in language. Multiplying the perspectives will clearly be one important technique.

Accepting that there can be no neutral zero point is not an excuse for ethnocentrism. Students can now easily access reports on the same story from around the globe in search of different cultural values and beliefs. In this way they learn to consider multiple viewpoints and angles on the same stories and learn to consider the status of evidence *and* argumentation provided in support of different views.

Focusing on the "International Community" in the media

The information overload that inevitably results from searching the web on a very broad topic such as International Media Communication can be countered by starting with an extremely limited search focus. Similarly, micro-research does require a very precise and limited focus. Another media activity I have used is to observe the media for a week focusing on just two words "international community". From the examples that are found, students can then determine if it is used to include other cultures by the speaker or to exclude them. Promoting critical awareness of how English is used in the international media is one way to combine content-based teaching with a focus on authentic language use in context. English is increasingly viewed as a language for international communication, but advanced students who are learning to process language in context, and who increasingly use international news reports for this purpose, can also be challenged to develop critical thinking skills about how language is being broadcast across borders. Critical linguistics (Fowler, 1991) is a means of exposing hidden processes of text creation and hidden ideologies in news media "to display to consciousness the patterns of belief and value which are encoded in the language – and which are below the threshold of notice for anyone who accepts the discourse as 'natural'" (p. 67).

Furthermore, students who are learning English to advanced levels, increasingly envisage the possibility of study in an English-speaking context, where the approach to study may be more student-centred than home-based study. Searching the worldwide web for information can at first be a bewildering experience, such is the volume of information available.

The phrase "the International Community" is often heard in international news broadcasts. "International Community" is also a very useful phrase to stimulate critical thinking about the media process. Another equally useful phrase is "Global Village". Micro-research also needs to limit its theoretical scope. Here the focus will be provided by considering vocabulary in relation to just a few notions of critical linguistics that have been chosen for their relevance to this study.

Vocabulary, according to Fowler (1991, p. 82) "can be regarded … as a representation of a world *for* a culture; the world as perceived according to the ideological needs of a culture." As Bell (1991, p. 2) puts it, "News is determined by values, and the kind of language in which that news is told reflects and expresses those values." When phrases recur frequently, they may not be considered critically, just because they are so familiar that we have decided once and for all that we 'know' what they mean. However, vocabulary such as "international community" functions pragmatically in a context and is never neutral. Fairclough (1989, p. 127) refers to the inclusive and exclusive use of language. The pronoun "we" for example can express "an implicit authority claim", the implication being that the speaker has the authority to exclude or include others. Using language to exclude is an attempt at "gatekeeping" (Fairclough, p. 47), in the sense that the speaker is attempting to present himself as powerful insider with the authority to deny entry or membership to those presented as outsiders. These two notions of "inclusion/exclusion" and "gatekeeping" are appropriate for this research as "community" is a potentially inclusive or exclusive concept. "International", while not as broad as "global", in that it encompasses "two or more" countries, does not normally have "exclusion" as part of its conventional meaning, when defined outside its context of use, in dictionaries, for example. In combination, the words in themselves would therefore tend to make the default reading a broadly inclusive phrase. For Fairclough, we need to consider the "experiential value" of words (knowledge/beliefs), the "relational value" (social relations expressed by using the words) and "expressive value" (social identities revealed by the persuasive use of words) (p. 112).

Micro-research is no different from other research in that it is useful to list research questions, to formulate research hypotheses and to articulate research aims. The aim of this study is to develop critical thinking about media language by discovering how the global concept, "International Community", is actually used in context. Several research questions can help to realize this aim:

In the contexts in which "International Community" is used:

1. What are the most common topics of the texts in which it occurs? (War, politics, diplomacy, environment, natural disasters…)
2. Who uses it and about whom?
3. To what extent is "International Community" linked to the United Nations or International Law?
4. To what extent is it used to include or to exclude?
5. To what extent does it typically refer to a broad concept of a global community, or, conversely, to a limited, exclusive group?
6. To what extent is it used to empower or, conversely, to exert power over other nations?
7. To what extent is it used persuasively in the interests of the nation that the user comes from?

While it is theoretically wrong to prejudge the findings of any research, a hypothesis can be an effective way of being honest about our inevitable intercultural 'prejudices' before challenging students with real data. My own 'prejudices' are inevitably embodied in my questions, but are only based on limited anecdotal evidence.

In my view, International news is in itself a controversial topic about which it is healthy to be skeptical. My hypothesis is that "International Community" is not normally used in a global sense, but has become an example of convenient media speak to serve narrow partisan interests. On the other hand, I am not committed to imposing my prejudice on the data, because I would be delighted to be proved wrong.

The teaching approach stage by stage

Firstly, the topic is introduced with one or two examples in a mini-lecture. Each member of the group (here fourteen students) then find ten examples, each from a different media source. www.onlinenewspapers.com is a useful site for locating a wide variety of international media sources from around the globe. It is also possible to exploit non-English sources using other languages known to the students. However, in a class aimed at developing English skills, only English sources have been used. Students carefully record each reference, providing a hyperlink and copying and pasting the relevant paragraph into a word text. They also, wherever possible, make a print-out as some media sources do not keep archives. Once the data has been collected, it is collated and classified according to the research questions. Each student then makes an individual report discussing the finding and answering the research questions. The ten reports are then displayed in class. Students circulate and compare their conclusions, making critical peer comments and suggestions, before each student submits a final individual report on their research and on their research process.

Examples

> There is no such thing as the United Nations. There is only the international community, which can only be led by the only remaining superpower, which is the United States.
>
> http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,11069-1515816,00.html (John Bolton, cited in a Times Online article)

Students are first presented with examples and are asked to answer the research questions in relation to each example. The first example is presented as a reference point for students in that it is easily characterized as an uncontroversial, fully legitimate use of "International Community". Kofi Annan, in a televised 2005 New Year Message on behalf of the United Nations following the catastrophic Tsunami disaster in the Indian Ocean, stated: "It is now crucial that the whole International Community works together so that our common efforts bring the earliest possible relief." In this case the topic is international solidarity in the face of a natural disaster. It is used by the Secretary General of the UN in a very inclusive sense appealing to a very broad concept of global community. Unless we consider that emergency aid is used to exert power, there is no notion of power or any possible interpretation of self or national interest in the statement, although the Secretary General of the United Nations may be seen to be defending his organization's right to speak on behalf of the "International community". This example can be classified as a fully "legitimate" use of the term, if we assume the UN by definition has the role of representing a broad view of "International community", with the UN at its centre.

In contrast, the second example is presented as a more controversial ideological usage, which is open to a variety of interpretations. British Prime Minister, Tony Blair made the following statement during a short Middle East Tour, reported on the BBC 10 O' Clock News (December 22, 2004):

> There is absolutely no sympathy left in the International Community for people who are ambivalent about terrorism. On the other hand, there is complete sympathy for the desire of the Palestinians for their own state.

Answers to the seven research questions proposed above can be summarized as follows. The topic is a combination of war, politics and diplomacy. It is used by a British Prime Minister about the Palestinians and is in no way linked to the United Nations, although Britain is a permanent member of the Security Council. Any statement on the Palestinian situation by a British Prime Minister is highly charged, given the historical involvement of Britain in conflict. Although this may not be the speaker's intention, a strict linguistic reading reveals the implicit exclusion of the Palestinians and also implicitly appears to cast the speaker in the role of someone who can make decisions about membership, the prerogative of a limited but powerful group. It is not directly made in the interests of the speaker's own country, but it does show the Prime Minister of just one country speaking very confidently and categorically – "there is absolutely no sympathy left" – about what the whole community thinks or feels. It implies that violent action by the Palestinians even within the geographical limits of the disputed territories is to be defined as "terrorism". The validity of this definition is critical, because, if accepted, it automatically excludes the recipient from almost any definition of "International Community". Arguably, the view of the British Prime Minister is presented as the view of the whole "International Community". It is therefore, by comparison with Kofi Annan's usage, difficult to see this usage as "legitimate", although it is important to accept that it is open to a wide variety of ideological interpretations. Similarly, US President Obama (BBC News, November 11, 2009) in relation to the alleged nuclear ambitions of Iran for military use unambiguously uses the exclusive "we" when he states that "we would organize the international community". During a visit in South Korea Obama goes on to state "we have begun our discussion with our international partners ..." My conclusion is that "international community" is used as a non-inclusive synonym for international coalition partners of the speaker.

Other uses fall between the overtly inclusive and exclusive uses. On the BBC 10.O'Clock News of January 14, 2005, BBC Middle East Correspondent, Orla Guerin was reporting from Gaza after Israel cut off relations with the new Government of recently elected Palestinian President, Mahmoud Abbas, following a suicide attack in Israel: "Israel's boycott of Yasser Arafat lasted years, but Mahmoud Abbas is different. For now, he has a lot of good will in the International Community and tonight an American source telling us (sic) there will be quiet pressure from the White House for Israel to relent."

The topic is a very critical incident at an extremely critical moment in an ideologically charged conflict in which Britain has had a historically controversial role. The fact that the speaker, Orla Guerin, has access to both the Israeli Government and Palestinian activists (as in this report, where she speaks to armed and masked militant member of Hamas in Gaza), and frequently puts herself in personal physical danger, suggests that she has won the kind of reputation for even-handedness which is extremely difficult to earn in such a polarized conflict and which provides her with some authority with regular BBC listeners. This statement is made "live" from Gaza on the BBC News with no visible editing during the cited on camera statement itself. She does not link her statement to the UN. Indeed, it is linked in the same sentence, through simple grammatical coordination with an unnamed American government source, which linguistically directly links the Americans to the Internationally Community and could implicitly suggest they speak on its behalf. The Palestinians are not clearly excluded from the "International Community" and no intention to speak in the interests of the speaker's own country can be imputed. The statement is uncut and I interpret it as an example of spontaneous unguarded speech that shows how even an experienced professional international journalist with a reputation for neutrality implicitly claims privileged knowledge of who has the "good will" of an ill-defined "International Community". The lack of neutrality is embedded in the process. Mey's apparently theoretical view about the impossibility of neutrality is simply a reflection of practice.

Shared knowledge and intercultural negotiation

Sperber and Wilson (1995) have cast doubt on the ability of any two members of even permanent close-knit communities to truly possess common knowledge or to fully share assumptions. Even identical twins have different life histories. They suggest that a more realistic goal is to create a "mutual cognitive environment" within which we can then make our assumptions available to the other party or "mutually manifest" (Sperber & Wilson, 1995, p. 41). This does not mean that mutual knowledge or assumptions result or can result. The biggest knowledge problem relates to not knowing what we don't know, but what we might need to know. 'Known unknowns' (To cite former US Secretary of State Donald Rumsfeld, The Plain English Campaign Website, 2003; see Nunn, 2004) can be resolved by tolerance and negotiation. 'Unknown, unknowns' pass unnoticed by both parties and lurk below the surface as potential communication barriers. Intercultural communicators therefore need to be constantly on the look-out for hints about what the other person does not know she does not know but clearly would need to know. The main problem here is that each speaker might need to depend on the other speaker or even a third party to become aware of "unknown, unknowns".

A negotiation exercise

Nunn (2003, 2004) reports the following conversation extract between an American student and a Japanese student during an intercultural communication exercise in a Japanese university. The two students are taking part in a negotiation to determine the percentage of blame after a traffic accident.

Transcript Part 1

JP1: |Why | |Ah ...I think ..{.er ...Escort..}…{you… Escort
AM: Yes.}
JP1: ::Escort is forty to fifty|
AM: |Tell me why |
JP1: |Tell me why |
AM: |Tell me what laws I broke first |
JP1: |I don't know {I don't know that, I don't know} about er the situation in other country :: but er in Japan ::especially in Japan :: er ...er You were drunk, {drunk.}|What is drunk is ...er...driving
AM: Ah
JP1: ...is most severe situation|
AM: |Okay| Where does it say ::I was drunk then |It doesn't say {er my er client does not say} :: he was drunk|

JP1: |Ah...even a little bit {er couldn't er }you couldn't admit
That in Japanese law ::I think|

Transcript Part 2 *(6 minutes later in the same conversation)*

AM |You should be more cautious:: when you`re {when
you`re} coming into this lane :: because I'm driving ... |In
Japan these lines here ...:: well according to what {the
VW} the representative for the VW was ...|
JP1 (Interrupting) |::Even if you are driving
main road you are drunk…| you are drunk…| Okay | Er
{you have} you did have a drink :: even a little bit :: so I
think er your responsibility is er 40 to 50, {er 40 to 50 and
er}…|
Am |{How do you} how do you know :: I was drunk though ::
or my client was drunk | I mean :: how do you know |
JP1 |You said ...before|
AM |I didn't say :: he was drunk| I said :: he had a drink|
JP1 |In Japan a little bit drink means drunk:: |Okay| {… in
Japanese law}| (laughter from other JP students)

The Japanese student uses the word "drunk" to mean "had had a drink", something which is not just illegal, but considered a serious offence for a driver in Japan where there is zero tolerance of drinking and driving. There is clearly an issue of cultural knowledge that is not shared, an "unknown, unknown". Interestingly, JP1 identifies the knowledge problem early in the conversation. AM does not. This is clear from the way JP1 explains "drunk" contrastively.

JP1 |I don't know {I don't know that… I don't know}
about er the situation in other country :: but er {in
Japan} especially in Japan, er ...er You were drunk
{drunk} |What is drunk ...er...driving…
AM: Ah
JP1: ...is most severe situation|

The American student (I didn't say he was drunk, I said he had a drink) interprets this to mean that the Japanese student has misunderstood the different shades of meaning between "having a drink" and "drunk". However, whatever linguistic difficulty might be in evidence in this transcript, for the Japanese student, the conventional meaning is not detachable from the background assumption about drinking and driving in Japan. According to Sperber and Wilson (1995, p. 15) "a context is a psychological construct, a subset of the hearer's assumptions about the world". In the context of this driving incident in Japan, there is no significant distinction between "drunk" and "having a drink". ("In Japan a little bit drink means drunk OK … in Japanese Law".) For the American student, a "couple of drinks" do not represent the most critical factor in determining responsibility. As Sperber and Wilson (1995, p. 16) suggest "a mismatch between the context envisaged by the speaker and the one actually used by the hearer may result in a misunderstanding".

Practically speaking these problems are by definition very difficult to detect, they are potentially "unknown unknowns" unless one of those involve manage to detect the problem and supply the missing knowledge. This implies that personal qualities such as good humour, tolerance and patience might be more important than the trained skills of communicative intelligence.

Conclusion

In this brief overview, some of the implications of the internationalization of English for teaching and learning have been outlined and illustrated with an emphasis on the importance of intercultural communication knowledge and skills which in combination constitute intercultural competence. The last extract illustrates that native language competence does not necessarily represent an advantage in intercultural understanding.

In this paper, I have attempted to outline a rationale for considering the implications of current characterizations of EIL/intercultural competence. (The subject is perhaps too broad to call these definitions.) The purpose of the forthcoming book proposed by Nunn and Sivasubramaniam (2011), is to assemble in one volume, for ease of reference, many of the papers briefly addressed above either in the form they were originally published or in updated form.

References

Acar, A. (2007). Standards and competence in English as an international language pedagogy. *The Journal of English as an International Language 2*, 65-81.

Al-Jarf, R. (2006). Cross-cultural communication: Saudi, Ukranian and Russian students online. *Asian EFL Journal, 8*(2), 7-32.

Argyle, M. (1982). Inter-cultural communication. In S. Bocner, (Ed.), *Cultures in contact* (pp. 61-79). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Baker, C. (2000). *The care and education of young bilinguals.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bell, A. (1991). *The language of news media.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Bennett, M. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 21-71). Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

Bennett, M. J. (1998). Intercultural communication: A current perspective. In M. J. Bennett (Ed.), *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp. 1-34). Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

InBochner, S. (1986). Coping with unfamiliar cultures: Adjustment or culture learning? *Australian Journal of Psychology, 38*(3), 347-358.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

DuPraw, M., & Axner, M. (1997). Working on common cross-cultural communication challenges. *AMPU (A More Perfect Union)*. Retrieved January 28, 2011, from http://www.pbs.org/ampu/crosscult.html

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Harlow: Longman.

Fennes, H., & Hapgood, K. (1997). *Intercultural learning in the classroom*. London and Washington: Cassell.

Fowler, M. S. (1986). Intercultural simulation games: Removing cultural blinders In L. H. Lewis (Ed.), *Experiential and simulation techniques for teaching adults* (pp. 71-81). London: Jossey-Bass.

Fowler, R. (1991) *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. London: Routledge.

Gudykunst, W. B., Guzley, R. M., & Hammer, M. R. (1996). Designing intercultural training. In D. Landis, & S. R. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training*. California: Sage Publications.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heuser, L. (2007). Collaborating together: Linked intercultural learning activities for undergraduate Japanese and American students. *Asian EFL Journal, 9*(1), 39-64.

Knowles, E. (Ed.). (1991). *Oxford dictionary of quotations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krasnick, H. (1984). From communicative competence to cultural competence. In J. Handscombe, R. A. Orem, & B. P. Taylor (Eds.), *On-Tesol 83: the question of control: selected papers from the Seventeenth Annual Convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of other Languages, Toronto, Canada, March 15-20, 1983* (pp. 209-221). Washington, D.C: TESOL.

Lingley, D. (2006). Apologies across cultures: An analysis of intercultural communication problems raised in the *Ehime Maru* incident. *Asian EFL Journal, 8*(1), 97-122.

Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics. An introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nault, D. (2006). Using world literatures to promote intercultural competence in Asian EFL learners. *Asian EFL Journal, 8*(2), 132-150.

Nguyen, T. M. H. (2007). Developing EFL learners' intercultural communicative competence: A gap to be filled? *Asian EFL Journal Professional Teaching Articles*, *21,* article 1.

Nunn, R. (2000). The game analogy in intercultural communication." *TESOL Matters 10* (3), 20.

Nunn, R. (2003). Intercultural communication and Grice's Principle. *Asian EFL Journal, 5*(1), Retrieved March 23, 2011, from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/march03.sub3.php

Nunn, R. (2004). The "Unknown unknowns of plain English. *Asian EFL Journal, 6*(10). Retrieved March 23, 2011, from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/december_04_RN.php.

Nunn, F., & Nunn, R. (2006). Teaching language and research skills through an International Media Project. *Asian ESP Journal 2*(2), 27-53.

Nunn, R., & Sivasubramaniam, S. (2011). *From defining EIL competence to designing EIL learning.* Pusan: Asian EFL Journal Press.

Nunn, R. (2007a). Competence and teaching English as an international language. *The Journal of English as an International Language*, *1*, 11-24.

Nunn, R. (2007b). Re-defining communicative competence for international and local communities. *The Journal of English as an International Language*, *2*, 7-49.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Seelye, H. N. (1984). *Teaching culture: strategies for intercultural communication*. Illinois: National Textbook Company.

Speake, J. (Ed.) (1979). *A dictionary of philosophy.* London: Pan Reference.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

The Plain English Campaign Website (accessed on 02.12.2003). Formerly available at: http://www.plainenglish.co.uk/footinmouth.html. Retrieved March 23, 2011, from http://www.plainenglish.co.uk/awards/foot-in-mouth-award/foot-in-mouth-winners.html

Tomalin. B., & Stempleski, S. (1993). *Cultural awareness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Note on Contributor

Roger Nunn is Professor of Communication and currently rotating Head of the Communication Department at the Petroleum Institute in Abu Dhabi (a specialized university for engineering students.) He has a doctorate and an MA in TEFL from the renowned Centre for Applied Language Studies at the University of Reading (UK). He combines his practical teaching background with research into a wide range of language related issues. He currently specializes in holistic EAP and ESP research. He has been a teacher for 35 years in seven different countries (including the last 28 in Asia) and a researcher for the last 24 of these. Roger is a strong believer in holism and lifelong education and has so far avoided burn-out by developing a very broad range of related interests. He has extensive experience in conducting, teaching, supervising, editing, reviewing and publishing research into a broad range of subjects, from EAP/ESP studies, developing EIL/intercultural competence, intercultural communication, classroom method and discourse, assessment, curriculum and materials design to post-colonial analysis of English literature and communication in the novels of Jane Austen. Email contact: rogercnunn@yahoo.co.uk.

Hidden Agenda in TESOL Methods

Sardar M Anwaruddin

North South University, Bangladesh

One of the characteristic features of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) curriculum is its focus on language teaching methodologies which prescribe learning techniques, classroom activities, and behaviors of both teachers and students. Methods are no doubt an important element of any language teaching curriculum. However, I argue in this paper that TESOL methods excessively empower native-speaker teachers of English, teacher-trainers, and publishing companies in the UK and the USA to monopolize the global TESOL industry. The methods also marginalize the non-native-speaker teachers of English around the world. Thus, the legacy of TESOL methods has become a part of the USA-led neo-colonial enterprise. The article concludes with a plea that a more locally-situated approach to TESOL pedagogy needs to be adopted for a diversity we need in global TESOL education in the 21st century.

Keywords: TESOL, curriculum, methods, pedagogy, neocolonial, core, periphery

Introduction

In *(re)locating TESOL in An Age of Empire*, Julian Edge problematizes the question of whether or not it is possible to see the teaching of English to speakers of other languages "as one strand of the USA-led globalization process that adds up to a new age of empire, with English as the imperial language and teachers of English as imperial auxiliaries" (p. xiii). Given the constantly expanding TESOL industry and its global activities, such a claim deserves careful attention. In 1962, William R. Parker wrote, "In terms of the number of pupils and teachers, of timetable hours and geographic extent, the teaching of English as a second language is the biggest educational undertaking in the world today" (cited in Darian, 1972, p. 149). At present, the scope and impact of TESOL is even greater than that of Parker's time. To address all aspects of TESOL in order to trace their contribution to an overarching neo-colonizing enterprise is clearly beyond the scope of this paper because neocolonialism is a very complex phenomenon. It encompasses any policies and initiatives by which a country maintains its dominance and control over other countries or territories. Although economic and cultural domination is often associated with the notion of neo-colonialism, other elements such as knowledge, education, technology, race, and religion are also vital in the processes of neo-colonialism. In the new world order, the neocolonialist powers maintain their control in ways different from the former colonialist nations. The colonialists extended their power by physically conquering other territories, but the neocolonialists adopt policies which help them dominate less powerful countries in many subtle ways. As the primary mode of communication, the English language plays important roles in the inter-connected processes of neocolonialism. The linguistic imperialism of English has already been discussed by some scholars (e.g., Phillipson, 2008).

In this paper, I argue that TESOL methods excessively empower native-speaker teachers of English, teacher-trainers, and publishing companies in the UK and the USA so that they can monopolize the global TESOL industry. The methods also marginalize non-native-speaker teachers of English around the world. However, for the kind of diversity and pedagogical effectiveness we need in global TESOL education, a locally-situated approach to pedagogy needs to be adopted. Incidentally, a method is an overall plan for a systematic organization and presentation of a language in order to facilitate effective teaching and learning. Examples of TESOL method include, but not limited to, Grammar Translation Method, Direct Method, Audiolingual Method, Total Physical Response and so on.

A brief history of the methods

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, language teaching practitioners in the USA faced much confusion and bewilderment because of an apparent conflict between the new and old ideas of language teaching. In the beginning of twentieth century, the Report of the Committee of Twelve (1900) revealed a fairly detailed situation of language teaching at American schools. The National Educational Association requested the formation of the committee, chaired by Prof. Calvin Thomas, president of the Modern Language Association of America. The committee investigated "the position of the modern languages in secondary education…to make recommendations for methods of instruction, training of teachers, and other questions connected with the teaching of the modern languages in the secondary schools and colleges" (Titone, 1968, p. 75). The committee found the conditions "somewhat chaotic and bewildering" and made "a critical review of the contemporary methods and some pertinent recommendations and proposals" (p. 75). The Report of the Committee of Twelve thoroughly examined contemporary teaching trends and placed considerable amount of emphasis on the methods of language teaching. Since then, method has become a buzzword in the American TESOL industry.

The post World War II era witnessed an increasing need of teaching English as a second or foreign language. Social mobility increased more than ever before. Refugees, immigrants, and workers started to move from country to country. A huge number of foreign students were coming to the UK and the USA for higher education. This trend created a growing demand in English language teaching both in English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries. Some people came to the USA or the UK without required proficiency and some, on the other hand, wanted to learn English before entering their target countries. Even though many colonies started to gain independence in this period, the English language continued to enjoy its prestige as the language of the British Empire. Many people regarded English as a gateway to success. In order to meet this growing demand, language teaching practitioners started to think about the best method which could ensure effective language learning. Not only English teachers but various organizations such as the Council of Europe came forward to take part in language teaching research. The primary goal of their research was to create an up-to-date method supported with the theories of teaching and learning of a language.

An analysis of TESOL methods

It is important to note the patterns of the methods, their emergence and decline, and how each one of them caused the creation of a new method. There is a cyclical pattern in the changing and shifting of TESOL methods. For example, after the decline of the Direct Method, many people seemed to lean toward the principles of Grammar Translation Method. The Coleman Report in 1929 convinced foreign language teachers to adopt a reading-based approach. When World War II broke out, the United States, especially the US military, realized the importance of oral proficiency in foreign languages of both allies and enemies. Therefore, the government asked universities to devise special language programs for military personnel. Thus, the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) was established in 1942 with a focus on aural/oral skills. This ASTP was later presented as Audiolingual Method in the 1950s. In fact, each method borrowed techniques, which were thought to be learning-and-teaching-friendly, from other methods. Moreover, these cyclical patterns are present not only in the emergence of methods but also in teaching techniques and debates about the nature of language learning. Many argue that the shifts and trends in language teaching reflect social, cultural, political, and economic factors of a particular time-frame, but not necessarily add conceptually sound insights to teaching practices. Among others, Stern (1983) believes that the whole method concept is somewhat unproductive and misleading. Many elements in a new method are not as new as claimed. For example, emphasis was placed on inductive teaching of grammar by St. Augustine in the 4th century, by Francis Bacon in the 17th century, and by Henry Sweet in the 19th century (Pennycook, 1989). Nevertheless, the concept of method — be it a recycling, addition, or renewal — has dominated the TESOL curriculum more than anything else. Richards (2001) claims that "[i]f we look back at the history of language teaching throughout the twentieth century, much of the impetus for changes in approaches to language teaching came about from changes in teaching methods" (p. 2).

Many TESOL practitioners often overlook or fail to understand the deeper, sometimes concealed, implications of the methods. A number of questions need to be raised. Who are the manufacturers of these methods? Who are the consumers? Do the methods work equally for everybody as it is claimed? Most of the methods originated in Europe and North America, whereas the majority of learners of English as a foreign language live in Asia, Africa, and South America. In other words, the manufacturers of the methods are the industrialized and developed west and the consumers are the developing or the underdeveloped. The exporters of the methods are the former colonizers and today's neo-colonizers, and the importers are the colonized. In this process, there is a fallacy that everything imported from the developed countries is of superior quality.

A four-dimensional approach to the agenda of methods

Kumaravadivelu (2003) proposes a four-dimensional approach to analyzing the liaison between globalization, empire, and TESOL (pp. 541-543). The dimensions are scholastic, linguistic, cultural, and economic. This four dimensional approach can be used to analyze how TESOL methods serve as a neocolonial tool. The scholastic dimension implies the ways in which western scholars disseminate their knowledge and marginalize local knowledge in order to maximize their interests. The linguistic dimension refers to the processes in which the knowledge and use of local language(s) are made irrelevant, unimportant, and subordinate to the learning and use of English. The cultural dimension investigates how western culture has been, and is being, exported with the English language to different parts of the world. This also helps create an empathy and appreciation of the culture of native English speakers among the learners of English as a second language/foreign language. Another important trend of TESOL which can be added to the cultural dimension is the spread of Christianity with the English language. The fourth one is the economic dimension which relates to economic opportunities such as creating jobs and selling teaching materials in a worldwide TESOL market. In the following sections of this paper, I use Kumaravadivelu's four-dimensional model to point out how the neocoloniality aspect predominates our TESOL methods.

When western English language teachers go to the non-western parts of the world to teach English, their knowledge of TESOL methods gives them an edge over the non-native teachers. To establish the validity and acceptance of their methods, they often tend to end up devaluing the local knowledge. An English native speaker enjoys certain privileges because s/he uses a language which the non-native learners of English try so hard to learn. This ability to speak fluent English offers a scholastic authority to the native-speaker teachers and teacher-trainers. The scholastic superiority empowers them to serve the interests of the core. (By "core," I mean the USA and the UK, and "periphery" is any other country where English is learned as a second/foreign language.) To illustrate the idea, the Office of English Language Programs of the U.S. Department of State, a leading government-funded organization designed to implement English language programs throughout the world, can be taken as an example. Among a number of programs the Office implements are English Language Fellow Program, E-Teacher Scholarship Program, English Access Microscholarship Program, and English Language Specialist Program. These programs promote not only the English language but also American interests and values abroad. The vision of American government is reflected in the following quote:

> By assisting teacher training programs overseas, the US Government can help foster an English competent world in which U.S. universities, businesses and other organizations can flourish and advance *American interests*. The Office of English Language Programs provides professional teacher training programs worldwide to promote understanding of *American language, society, culture, values and policies*. [emphasis added] (Office of English Language Programs [OELP], 2009)

The U.S. government envisions a world where everybody needs to learn English. This not only creates jobs for native-speaker teachers but also gives them a scholastic privilege. They can teach their language and knowledge to others, and thus maintain their so-called scholastic dominance. When we talk about global education and try to educate students into citizenship within pluralistic societies and states, the American approach found in the abovementioned quote seems to be contradictory and deceitful. The American policies play, in McIntosh's words, "the role[s] of the independent, dominant, unapproachable, individualistic, lone power whose self-interest is seen as the ethos that should prevail throughout the world" (2009, p. 389).

In addition to self-interest, the American policies reflect a self-claimed scholastic supremacy and ability to use the best teaching methods. One of many examples is the E-Teacher Scholarship Program. The program objective reads:

> The courses introduce the *most recent* English language teaching *methods* and techniques, offer the opportunity to engage in an innovative distance-learning program that employs the latest in modern technology, and provide direct *access to U.S. experts* with whom participants might not normally have the opportunity to interact. The E-Teacher Scholarship Program is open to candidates worldwide. [emphasis added] (OELP, 2009)

It is imperative to note how the notion of methods is used in this course objective. The courses use *most recent* methods and provide an *opportunity* to interact with the *U.S. experts*. The objective assumes a scholastic authority of the U.S. experts and their indisputable ability to use the "appropriate" methods. Thus the TESOL methods help the western TESOL professionals maintain a scholastic superiority.

The scholastic dimension is closely related to linguistic dimension which shows how the local languages have been and are being made irrelevant and subordinate. Although research shows that a judicious use of students' first language (L1) can be facilitating, there are instances that many English language schools around the world prohibit the use of students' L1. Proponents of English-only classrooms justify their practices by claiming "that use of the L1 will impede progress in the acquisition of English" (Auerbach, 1993, p. 10). (Readers may recall the principles of the Direct Method in which the use of learners' L1 is prohibited.) Kumaravadivelu (2003) believes that "once local knowledge was marginalized and made irrelevant for colonial scholastic pursuits, the next logical step was to make the knowledge and the use of local language(s) irrelevant for learning and teaching English as an additional language" (p. 542). We can also notice a dual approach in teaching foreign languages in England and teaching English in other countries. As Howatt (2004) points out, Britain taught foreign languages to its citizens in a bilingual manner following Grammar-Translation Method, and taught English to colonized people in a monolingual method. Today, the western English language teachers put a special emphasis on a monolingual approach to teaching English because most of them do not speak the first language of their students. Accepting a bilingual approach will result in losing their linguistic monopoly in the TESOL industry.

The third dimension is concerned with culture. A cultural hegemonic attitude was common in various policies of the British colonial enterprise. One such example was Sir Richard Wellesley, a Governor-General of the East India

Company in India, whose "long-term plans were based on a total disengagement from Indian culture and the way of life which was held to be decadent, over-fond of luxury and, above all, pagan" (Howatt, 2004, p. 144). This attitude is not absent in today's TESOL practices. It has been noticed that second language (L2) learners generally develop an empathy and fondness for the culture of the people who speak their target language. In the context of TESOL, the teaching methods encourage learners to think like native speakers. It is often said that L2 learners need to develop an awareness of and sensitivity to the culture of the native speakers. Through various strategies, English teachers create a mental framework among the students which help them think like English native-speakers. The cultural associations needed for this framework relate mainly to American and British cultures. Although it is often claimed that English has become an international language, "it remains the case that US (and British) culture is still widely seen as representing important elements of the target culture that the English language now expresses" and that the "US and British contexts and characters provide a great deal of the cultural background to a wide variety of ELT learning materials" (Sellami, 2006, p. 172). As a result, it is possible for students to interpret a lack of local cultural elements in their textbooks as a threat to the native culture.

Another aspect of TESOL that can be discussed under the cultural dimension is the spread of Christianity along with the English language. Historically, English language teaching has long been associated with Christianity, particularly since the start of missionary work. European colonialism is an explicit example of this link between language and religion. One of many instances is the language policy in British India. In 1835, Thomas Babington Macaulay, Chairman of Committee of Public Instruction, recommended that the medium of higher education in British India be English. Although many people praised Macaulay's utilitarian views and massive language policy changes throughout the British Empire, "there was a thinly disguised religious subtext. The ultimate aim of many 'anglicists', particularly those like Macaulay of an evangelical turn of mind, was not enlightenment…but conversion, and a knowledge of English was an essential pre-requisite for Christianization" (Howatt, 2004, p. 146). Even though not all evangelical language teachers bring Christianity into classrooms in order to convert pupils to their faith, research by Crooks (2003), Snow (2001), and Pennycook and Coutand-Marin (2003) shows that TESOL is one of the most a convenient and popular platforms for missionary work. Today, the growth of US power and the spread of Christianity are moving forward hand in hand. Varghese and Johnston (2007) report that "the number of Christians in the world has grown from 1.2 billion in 1970 to 2 billion in 2000" and that "the number of Christians living in the developing world has increased from 15% in 1900 to 60% in the late 20^{th} century" (p. 10). Although this increase is not solely a product of the TESOL industry, a link between missionary work such as translation of the Bible, teaching of English, and spread of Christianity is clearly visible. Drawing examples from the lives and works of practicing English language teachers, Johnston and Varghese (2006) show that there is a link between TESOL and evangelical Christianity. Thus, TESOL creates opportunities for the native-speaker teachers of English to travel around the world and spread their culture and religion along with the language.

Scholastic, linguistic, and cultural dimensions lead to a fourth one called economic dimension. Among others, Graddol (2000) believes that the English language has secured its position mainly because of Britain's colonial expansion and recent political and economic dominance of the USA. In post World War II era, a number of key financial institutions were established with much American involvement, power, and domination. The language of such institutions as International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank (WB) was English. The United States controlled and monopolized the global market because the American economic policies were aligned with those of IMF and WB. With this monopoly of economy, the spread of English has also increased. As Graddol (2000) points out, "[a]s more countries have been rendered 'open' to global flows of finance, goods, knowledge and culture, so the influence of English has spread" (p. 9). To participate in this global flow of finance, people around the world are forced to learn English.

To meet the global demands, publishing companies are selling TESOL materials such as books and DVDs to different parts of the world and, at the same time, making millions of dollars. In China alone, ESL has become a more than 10-billion Yuan business, and it has 25% of market share of the 37 billion Yuan annual book sales (Qiang & Wolff, 2007). Since the new materials contain recent methods, experts are needed to implement them. The native-speaker teachers and teacher-trainers, with their scholastic superiority, naturally attract the world's attention. The requirements described in recruitment advertisements for TESOL positions around the world are surprising. In many cases, the first qualification of a candidate is being a native speaker of English. For example, "China annually recruits some 100,000 'Foreign Experts' to teach English as a Foreign or Second Language" (Qiang & Wolff, 2007, p. 62). Here the underlying assumption of the recruiters may be that the native speaker teacher is better able to implement the best method to effectively teach English, and employing mainly native speakers reinforces this assumption. Kumaravadivelu (2003) argues that "what continues to fuel the TESOL economic engine is method as a construct of marginality with its monolingual tenet and native speaker tenet. These tenets make sure that the fountainhead of global employment opportunities for native speakers of English does not dry up any time soon" (p. 543).

The kind of knowledge produced by the methods has a major economic effect, which is a huge business profit for the publishing companies. As Richards (1984, p. 14) states

> The term *notional-functional* and *communicative* sell well. Many an underpaid academic has consequently succumbed to attractive offers to lightly work over an audiolingual or structural course so that it can be published in a new edition bearing a notional-functional or communicative label. (cited in Pennycook, 1989, p. 609).

Marketing of a new method also popularizes the name of organizations, e.g., University of Michigan for Audiolingualism and more recently the British Council for Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Moreover, a method, being highly prescriptive rather than descriptive, requires expert professionals, and the native speaker teachers and teacher-trainers are the obvious preference for this expertise. These native speaker "experts" not only secure highly-paid jobs abroad but also help the publishing companies sell their textbooks and other teaching materials.

What needs to be done?

The four-dimensional analysis presented above shows that the TESOL methods help marginalize non-native speaker teachers of English and devalue local language, culture, and economy. As a matter of fact, there has been a growing dissatisfaction in the methods in both the core and periphery countries because the prescriptions of the methods are often far from the classroom realities. Among others, Clarke (1983) thinks that there is reasonable doubt about the coherence between the claims made by a certain method and what actually happens in classrooms. Many teachers around the world find it difficult to contextualize a particular method due to the uniqueness of their settings. In fact, there are instances that learners have refused to learn English in an American or British way. In Sri Lanka, a group of Tamil students of English offered resistance to the western representation of language and culture. In Pakistan and Palestine, some teachers failed to implement the CLT approach. They encountered resistance from their students while introducing CLT as a teaching methodology (Kumaravadivelu, 2001). It is possible that the students' previous learning experiences were not supportive of the new method and an insistence by the teachers was creating psychological barriers for them. As TESOL practitioners, we need to keep in mind that education is fundamentally a socially and culturally embedded process; therefore, adaptation of methods and contextual adjustments are very necessary for effective learning. This adaptation, however, is often difficult because there is a widespread fallacy that everything imported from the developed to the developing is superior. Many teachers find it recommended, or even obligatory, to implement the methods exactly the way they are prescribed in the textbooks. In actuality, a prescriptive one-for-all teaching method cannot achieve the desired results. Regrettably, as Pennycook (1989) states, "Western teachers and teacher trainers frequently promote whatever techniques they happen to prefer, while supporting their views by recourse to the Method concept and its supposedly scientific and advanced backing" (p. 611). By doing so, they help maintain a neocolonial relationship between the core and the periphery. We, therefore, need to reexamine the legacy of methods in TESOL curriculum.

Instead of promoting the existing TESOL methods as one-and-only mantra of language teaching, we should pay attention to social, cultural, political, and economic factors of language teaching and the context in which it takes place. A locally-situated approach to pedagogy will help the TESOL practitioners and material developers devise a curriculum which can fulfill the needs of a particular group of students and empower non-native speaker teachers of English. This locally-situated pedagogy should encompass any strategies, procedures, and techniques to facilitate students' learning of English in a specific social context. In order to make this pedagogy context-specific, we need to analyze five elements. They are educational goals, subject matter, society, student, and teacher. First, educational goals are the most important determinant of any curricular decision. Second, selection of teaching and learning strategies depends on the subject matter. Unfortunately, many teachers end up teaching about a subject rather than teaching a subject. Third, society is another important source of pedagogical decision making. We need to analyze a society's views on learning and teaching. For instance, discovery learning, which is highly regarded in most western societies, may not be applicable in a society which looks at learning as a process of acquiring knowledge from a teacher. Therefore, society's views and ideologies need to be reflected in the curriculum. Fourth, any pedagogical practice has to be appropriate for the target students. It should neither underestimate nor overestimate students' aptitude and ability. Last but not least, a teacher's ability to successfully implement a curriculum is also very vital in a locally-situated pedagogy. Her/His teaching style and level of comfort must align with a curriculum s/he chooses. It is certain that students will not benefit from a curriculum if it is not properly implemented by the teacher. Thus, we can take a locally-situated approach to TESOL pedagogy by carefully analyzing the five elements discussed above.

As every group of students is unique depending on their socio-cultural background, they will benefit from the locally-situated pedagogy which is based on their learning needs, preferences, and socio-cultural background. This locally-situated TESOL pedagogy not only helps students effectively learn the target language but also empowers local teachers of English. Because non-native speaker teachers of English (NNSTE) play major roles in considering five elements in the curriculum making process, their voices will be clearly heard in the curricula. Moreover, the local NNSTEs know students' first language, culture, and socio-economic background; therefore, they are better able to make a curriculum aligned with the students' needs and abilities. This empowerment of the NNSTEs will counterbalance the four dimensions of marginality in global TESOL industry – scholastic, linguistic, cultural, and economic – created by the western TESOL methods.

References

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 9-32.

Clarke, M. A. (1983). The scope of approach, the importance of method, and the nature of techniques. In J. E. Alatis, H. H. Stem, & P. Strevens (Eds.), *Georgetown University roundtable on language and linguistics* (pp. 106-115).Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Crooks, A. (2003). Ministering through English: Spreading the faith with EFL. *Miyagi University of Education Foreign Languages Studies Essay Collection*, 3, 31-44.

Darian, S. G. (1972). *English as a foreign language: History, development, and methods of teaching*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Graddol, D. (2000). *The future of English*? London: The British Council.

Howatt, A. P. R. (2004). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johnston, B., & Varghese, M. M. (2006). Neo-imperialism, evangelism, and ELT: Modernist mission and a postmodern profession. In J. Edge (Ed.), *(Re)locating TESOL in an age of empire* (pp. 195-207). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(4), 537-560.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). A postmethod perspective on English language teaching. *World Englishes, 22*(4), 539-550.

McIntosh, P. (2009). Gender perspectives on educating for global citizenship. In D. J. Flinders, & S. J. Thornton (Eds.), *The curriculum studies reader* (pp. 385-398). New York: Routledge.

Office of English Language Programs. (2009). *U.S. Department of State*. Retrieved November 29, 2009, from http://exchanges.state.gov/englishteaching/index.html

Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(4), 589-618.

Pennycook, A., & Coutand-Marin, S. (2003). Teaching English as a missionary language (TEML). Discourse. *Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 24*, 338-353.

Phillipson, R. (2008). The linguistic imperialism of neoliberal empire. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 5*(1), 1-43.

Qiang, N. & Wolff, M. (2007). Linguistic failures. *English Today, 23*(1), 61-64.

Richards, J. C. (1984). The secret life of methods. *TESOL Quarterly, 18(1)*, 7-24.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sellami, A. (2006). Slaves of sex, money and alcohol: (Re-)locating the target culture of TESOL. In J. Edge (Ed.), *(Re)locating TESOL in an age of empire* (pp. 171-194). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Snow, D. B. (2001). *English teaching as Christian mission: An applied theology*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.

Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Titone, R. (1968). *Teaching foreign languages: An historical sketch*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University press.

Varghese, M. M., & Johnston, B. (2007). Evangelical Christians and English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 41(1)*, 5-31.

Note on Contributor

Sardar Mohi Anwaruddin teaches English at North South University in Dhaka, Bangladesh. He received BA *summa cum laude* in English from Beloit College, Wisconsin, and M.Ed. *summa cum laude* in Curriculum & Instruction from Loyola University Chicago, USA. He has presented research papers at a number of conferences, including the *8th International Language & Development Conference*, Dhaka, Bangladesh. He writes op-ed articles addressing educational issues in the *Daily Star*, a leading English newspaper in Bangladesh. His research interests include democratic curriculum, teaching language through literature, gender issues in pedagogy, sociology of education, and coloniality of the English language. Email contact: sanwaruddin@luc.edu

Thai Journalists' Views on the Notion of World Englishes

Adcharawan Buripakdi

Walailak University, Thailand

This paper investigates the status of a World Englishes concept in Thailand through the lenses of Thai journalists. The aims of the paper are: 1) to examine how the Thai journalists conceptualize a variety of English; and 2) to address current theoretical issues pertaining to the World Englishes notion in the Thai sociopolitical context. Data were collected from in-depth interviews of 10 Thai journalists from two English newspapers in Thailand—*The Bangkok Post* and *The Nation*. Data analysis was based upon a grounded theory and a rhetorical move analysis. The findings reveal that the journalists had complex views of English. Most of them recognized localized varieties of English and gave importance to keeping *Thainess* in their work. However, they conformed to Standard English or King's English when they were involved with professional writing and global language usage. The key arguments for maintaining King's English in newspaper writing were audiences, genre conventions and institutional policies. This paper not only demonstrates the ideological and political position of Standard English in the Thai media contexts but also addresses macro aspects of English usage related to political and ideological issues. The participants' rhetoric on the prestige position of Standard English showed English use in Thailand was situated in a hierarchy of language and was deeply embedded in a colonial construct within the political hegemony of Western powers. The research findings call for a reconsideration of teaching practices in countries where English is not the native language.

Keywords: World Englishes, Thainess, Global English, Standard English

Introduction

In recent decades, English has been used by people at all levels of Thai society to fulfill their different objectives (Masavisut, Sukwiwat, & Wongmontha, 1986). Used as a foreign language, English has become increasingly crucial both in local and global contexts. Although the use of English in Thailand is restricted as Standard Thai dominates the domestic scene (Rappa & Wee, 2006), among 11 optional foreign languages, English is regarded as the most significant one in

Thailand (Wongsothorn, 2000). Besides being the language of Thailand abroad (Smalley, 1994), English has become a symbol of modernity (Huebner, 2006). In effect, the deep penetration of English in Thai society is reflected through its political agenda, which Thai people seem unaware of or which they take for granted. Watkhaolarm (2005) provided a contemporary picture of English used in Thai contexts through two Thai bilingual writers. In this article she raised a crucial issue about a study of a localized variety of World Englishes similar to the one this paper attempts to accomplish. Watkhaolarm suggested, "[a]s more and more people use English in everyday communication in their professional lives, the Thai English variety has potential to develop. Future research could focus on the Thais' use of English in the professional domain" (p. 156).

This study is an endeavor to investigate how Thai journalists conceptualize their English in relation to the concept of World Englishes — a variety of English. It is also an attempt to uncover how these writers theorize and practice such concepts in their work places. In short, it is a first step in establishing a conceptual investigation about the international usage of English in a media context — an English newspaper in Thailand in particular. The underlying agenda behind this investigation is to address current theoretical issues related to the notion of World Englishes.

The literature review of this paper has been presented in three sections, namely, *The Terms of Reference*, *Global English Positions*, and *World Englishes in Thailand*.

The terms of reference

The theoretical framework behind this study lies in the work of the scholars in World Englishes studies (B. B. Kachru, 1987), critical applied linguistics (Pennycook, 2001), cultural studies (Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1992) and postcolonial studies (Said, 1994). The emergence of the theoretical concept of World Englishes and its application had not gained currency in sociolinguistics and applied linguistics until the mid 1980s (Bolton, 2006). B. B. Kachru and Smith (1985) define the meaning of the term "Englishes" as symbolizing the "functional and formal variation in the language, and its international acculturation … The language now belongs to those who use it … whether in its standard form or in its localized forms" (p. 210). To put it into perspective, English is one medium but constitutes multifaceted cultures, reflects manifold voices, and represents a multiplicity of cannons (B. B. Kachru, 1996; Pakir, 1999, 2001). The term World Englishes originated in the two conferences on English as a world language that took place in 1978 at the East-West Center in Hawaii and at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Prior to the use of the term, the earlier conceptualization of World Englishes refers to the recognition of a unique linguistic phenomenon and particularly to the changing landscape of the post 1940s (B. B. Kachru, 1997). However, in its more contemporary situation, "a pluralist vision of Englishes" (Pennycook, 2007, p. 18) carries a postmodern discourse of localization, contextualization, and democratization of language use. The "-es", according to Canagarajah, 2002), allows voices of English communities in periphery to be heard.

B. B. Kachru (1988) defined the characteristics of the World Englishes paradigm into three key elements. First, the English language belongs to whoever uses it. Second, the localized innovations (in English) have pragmatic-based ownership. Third, there is a repertoire of models for English. In this sense, the Englishes, as Y. Kachru (2001) emphasizes, has carried repertoires of sociocultural identities. According to B. B. Kachru (2006), these multicultural identities involve linguistic interactions of three types of participants: native speakers and native speakers; native speakers and nonnative speakers; and, nonnative speakers and nonnative speakers. Presently, there are several labels used interchangeably with the term World Englishes. These include global English (es), international English (es), new English (es), varieties of English, English as an international language, English as a global language, and so on. These terms have been used almost interchangeably, with minimal varying connotations (Bolton, 2004, 2005; Schneider, 2003). In this paper, the term is associated with the Kachruvian studies (Bhatt, 2001a; Bolton, 2005) which have been characterized by the importance of inclusivity and pluricentricity in approaches to language use worldwide. Within the context of World Englishes, local English is gradually established and is appropriately used by the particular local communities.

In essence, world Englishes philosophy ideally seeks to "decolonize and democratize applied linguistics" (Bhatt, 2001a, p. 544) particularly in the area of SLA studies. Essentially, it informs us of the new mindset that English should be treated, not as a language controlled by the others, but as an additional means of communication. On this pragmatic platform, the greatest challenge for TESOL and applied linguistic professionals is; therefore, how to stay away from a uniform mode of seeing and thinking, teaching and learning. Rather, and most crucially perhaps, the field needs to push forward alternative avenues toward the underlying ideologies of inclusion, the divergence of visions, the discourse of hybridity, and the inclusivity of teaching approach to ensure linguistic health to students. Essentially, English classrooms need to foster a generation of tolerant citizens. The concerned enterprises need to raise awareness of the issues of plurality of knowledge, languages, and cultures along with a pluralism of Englishes. To paraphrase Canagarajah's (2006a, 2006b) notion, teachers need to teach English in a manner that includes rather than excludes learners, complements rather than competes with local languages and local interests. The growth of English, in other words, should not be a trade-off for the expense of local languages.

Global English positions

Pennycook (2001) established four English models to understand the role and phenomenon of global English. This framework describes the global position of English. It allows us to look closely at an interpretation of the phenomenon of identity positioning through the discourse of English. These global English models include colonial celebratory position, laissez-faire position, linguistic hybridity position and postcolonial performativity position.

Colonial celebratory position

This colonial celebratory or colonial language position serves to trumpet the benefit of English (Pennycook, 1999). The model is grounded in the premise that English is intrinsically and extrinsically a superior language and that Standard English, in particular, is a sacred language (Bhatt, 2002). This colonial celebratory view is primarily documented at length (e.g., Bailey, 1991; Pennycook, 1994, 1998; Phillipson, 1992). Specifically, the publication of Phillipson's *Linguistic Imperialism* (1992) is a historic milestone that has had a major impact in steering subsequent debate on the politics of English.

In this view, English is linked with the elite class and the glorious English culture, literature and civilization. Further, a crucial premise of this framework is that English is an inherently useful language. Hence, in this sense, teaching English is "a mission of salvation" or "a mission to the world" (Pennycook, 2001, p. 59) to spread "light" and to "civilize" the savage population of Asia and Africa (Y. Kachru & Nelson, 2006). Besides, Pennycook (2001) claimed that when English was tied to Christianity, it came to represent the superior Western civilization. In effect, this colonial celebratory position linguistically and culturally consecrates Standard English privilege (Sridhar, 1994). With respect to this English glorification construct, this framework raises debate as English is not free of political values but is used as an apparatus of domination.

Laissez-faire position

The laissez-faire or the modernist position on the global role of English is underpinned by the ideology that English is a neutral and functional tool for pragmatic purposes. This apolitical approach to language is the most common line of English within the field of English language teaching and applied linguistics (Pennycook, 2001). The debate about this claim is on the rise worldwide (e.g., Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992; Tollefson, 2000). Central to this laissez-faire framework is the assumption that English is an instrumental device — an aid to help language users develop themselves and to have an economic advantage.

The modern thinking that English is merely an instrument is widespread. Within this construct, English with the universalism profile has been softly marketed as the prestigious brand of the language through ELT worldwide. The pivotal belief of this economic progression argument is that learning English equates with an economic growth. Based on the argument of economic progression, Pennycook (1994) claimed that the underlying goal of the promotion of global English was to "protect and promote capitalist interests" (p. 22). Indeed, in this neutral message, this selling point of English appears to serve economic and political purposes only. One acute problem of this instrumental English domination is the production of an English language industry around the world (McArthur, 2001).

The problem with this position, however, is that it is mistaken and unhealthy. The view that English just happens to be in the right place at the right time (Crystal, 1997) turns out to be especially problematic when "the seductiveness of this English position makes its social and political naively dangerous" (Pennycook, 2000, p. 109). Such a view of English as lingua franca terminally consigns English to "the level of a technical language stripped of expressive and aesthetic characteristics and denuded of any critical or self-conscious dimension" (Said, 1994, p. 369). Simply put, this position dodges "all the crucial concerns around the global use of English, and buys into the apoliticism of applied linguistics and TESOL" (Pennycook, 2002, p. 38). It fails to account for the power of English or to analyze the global politics of English. As Tollefson (1991) put this position into a wider context:

> Language educational professionals must reject the notion that learning a language is an ideologically neutral act intended simply to develop an employment skill. That some people must learn English to get a job is a result of unequal relationships of power — not a solution to them. (p. 210)

Linguistic hybridity position

This third framing of English is synonymous with postmodern orientation. In contrast with the colonial celebratory position, this linguistic hybridity position centers on the ideology that languages and cultures evolve and adapt. The multiplicity of Englishes represents diverse linguistic, cultural, and ideological voices or identities or multicanon (Bhatt, 2001a, 2001b). In a multilinguistic ecology, this position claims that all discourse is equal and thus deserves to be promoted. Heading toward the multilingualism direction, Phillipson (1993) argued that all languages have rights and individuals and groups should respect the rights of speakers of other languages. Bhatt (2001b), grounding his argument on the pioneering studies in the field, concluded:

> This conceptual-theoretical shift has extended the empirical domain of the study of English. English is regarded less as a European language and an exclusive exponent of Judeo-Christian tradition and more as a pluricentric language representing diverse sociolinguistic histories, multicultural identities, multiple norms of use and acquisition, and distinct contexts of function. (p. 528)

Although this shifting direction allows the particularized Englishes to emerge, it is obvious that this model raises some concerns. One of the noteworthy aspects of this position relates to linguistic human rights, arguing that English might pose a particular harm to minority discourses.

Postcolonial performativity position

Arguing against an apolitical understanding of English, this postcolonial performativity or the poststructuralist position regards English as part of postcolonial politics. Foucault (1980) argued that English was never neutral and value-free since it concealed subjective power. Along the same line, Ngugi (1981) asserted that English may be the most racist of all human languages. In the field of World Englishes studies, B. B. Kachru (1986) is the first to apply Foucault's work on power and knowledge directly to the study of global dissemination of English. In principle, this position moves toward the ground that English is political. In Pennycook's (2000) contention, English hegemony and the cultural politics of resistance and appropriation are the most salient components of this position. Also, Pennycook (2001) stresses that contextualized language acts should be taken into account.

World Englishes in Thailand

In Thailand, there are two major empirical studies regarding a variety of World Englishes. First, Chutisilp (1984) was a pioneer scholar in bringing the concept of Thai English into light. Her study rested on linguistic analysis with data drawn from novels, short stories, newspapers, and magazines. Some of the texts employed for data analysis were original; others were translated from Thai to

English. This linguistic-based study concluded that Thai English was another developing variety of World Englishes. The researcher contended that *Thainess* in English resulted from the contextualization process. Second, grounded in B. B. Kachru's (1987) framework in analyzing texts, Watkhaolarm (2005) investigated writing strategies of two Thai bilingual writers. Her study discovered that the Thai English literary texts illustrated uniqueness and creativity. Its conclusion was that the authors' writing style may be termed as a Thai English variety. Watkhaolarm further predicted that English would be increasingly nativized in the near future when judged by the increasing role of English in Thai people's professional lives. Both pioneering studies have paved the way for future research of the Thai English concept.

Research design

The study was grounded in a qualitative research inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The data was mainly drawn from face-to-face interviews. The focal informants included 10 Thai journalists from *The Bangkok Post* and *The Nation*, two major English newspapers in Thailand. To begin with, the researcher sent an invitation letter via email and/or snail mail to 20 Thai journalists. Eventually, 10 of them voluntarily participated in the project. The interviews were carried out in both Thai and English based upon the participants' preference. The interview questions were conceptually designed to allow the participants to reflect their understandings, beliefs, and insights into the theory and practice regarding their English and the World English varieties. The interviews lasted about 60-90 minutes.

To yield descriptive information about this notion, this study employed a principled and systematic approach to the analysis of the interview transcripts (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) and the rhetorical move analysis (Selzer, 2004). The focus of analysis was an examination of the participants' understanding of World Englishes. A categorization system was a significant discourse-analytic tool for text analysis. Emphasis in conceptualization of the coding process was placed on research device building, re-conceptualization, interrogation, and analysis of raw interview data under investigation (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996).

Results

The rhetorical move analysis illustrates how each participant incorporated different rhetorical strategies to conceptualize their English, and to take a position towards the concept of particularized Englishes. In other words, it shows how the participants formed, imagined, and reinforced their relationships with Standard

English and other English varieties used around the globe. Based on the analysis of the rhetorical moves, it is significant to note that all of the participants prioritized what their workplaces required them to do rather than paying attention to a type of English. In all, the analysis revealed that the participants developed repertoires of multiple rhetorical moves to take up their stances toward their English. There are seven major themes of the move emerging from the analysis.

Move 1: Ideological discourse

The rhetorical move, ideological discourse, is a language usage orientation toward Standard English ideology. Although most of the participants unconsciously inserted *Thainess* in the form of Standard English in their work, this line of argument explicitly showed that they conformed to dominant English discourse. In other words, regardless of their realization of their Thai identity, the participants maintained Standard English in their writing.

For example, Pim, a young journalist of *The Nation* called her English *Thaiglish* and described that it had a Thai smell. Her aim as a writer was to dispose of *Thaiglish* and even *Thainess* in her English. She longed for the day when her English could reach the bar of American English, which in her mind signified "international", "professional", and "high ranking" images. With such identification, Pim revealed, "I hope my *Thaiglish* will be gone soon. I will make it American English". Asked why she wanted to do away with *Thaiglish*, Pim smiled, then reasoned, "If you make it look Thai style then it will be like you're in an elementary level; you are not in a university level; you are not in bachelor degree yet." In her view, the Thai English variety, if it existed, was ranked at a lower position when compared with Standard English. Pim further explained why she disassociated herself from Thai English:

> Because I'm writing for professionals, for executives, for businessmen in high ranking, people in high level. Then I also write mainly for international people to read. That's why you know they don't want to read something that they don't understand although they very appreciate on Thai. But when you write in English, you have to make it English. Don't make it look Thai.

Further, some informants assumed that mastering the English language required an immersion in English speaking cultures. In light of this, Saman, a Bangkok Post columnist, stated, "My English isn't perfect, perhaps because I didn't study in a foreign country".

Move 2: Genre convention

The next move emerging from the analysis is called the genre convention move. The central argument for this move was that the nature of the media and target audiences determined the way writers presented stories. The function of the move, genre convention, was to focus on communication rather than linguistic forms. With respect to this argument, the participants chose to write in a form of Standard varieties of English namely American English or British English. Wichai, for instance, argued:

> We are writing for English audiences who read English newspapers. We have different types of readers from all walks of life, Americans, Japanese. So, we try to make writing neutral as much as we can so that our readers can understand our message. We try to keep writing simple, not to pepper colors in writing. (Translated from Thai)

As this passage shows, the ramifications of mainstream media discourse had an impact on the participants' perceptions of non-standard English varieties.

Move 3: Professional concerns

The rhetorical move, professional concerns, referred to composition orientations that abided by a workplace's norms and policies. Based on this move, the highest concern for the journalists was to professionally meet their institutional requirements. In doing so, they sought to serve the workplace's policy rather than to promote a variety of English. For example, Saman explained, "We use British English here — Z instead of S, double R, for example". Rnan echoed Saman's opinion: "Here, we use the same writing format — British writing style. As for newspaper writing, you really have to be strict with Standard English usage. Perhaps that's why I'm not concerned with this Thai English thing". Similarly, Tnan stated his English standpoint by describing the nature of his job:

> Here it is not literature work. It's something universal. What I've been doing is the same thing as what other people, English newspaper people, are doing. One formula, one soup, one universal. English newspaper. One universal pattern to look at.

As such, aware of the nature of the medium and its discipline, Tnan regarded English as an apparatus at work. Central concern for him was writing to serve *The Nation*'s target audiences. When asked about a variety of English such as Thai English, he simply responded, "It doesn't come to my head." Then, he added:

> When I write, there're two main concerns; when I write opinion, I just want to convey my thinking, my thoughts, the issues, that's it. When I write new

> story, I want to convey the notion, that's it. How about the Thai thing? It doesn't come to my head.

Wichai, likewise, took the same line of argument on the conceptualization of local World Englishes varieties. Spending his first and current job for almost two decades at *The Bangkok Post*, he admitted that his English language was "still a language of others" and English writing "is never easy". By and large, his writing approach was framed by the following thoughts:

> English is just a tool. That's it. … The most important thing in writing is that no matter what tool you use, either Thai or English, whatever you write, whoever you are, for instance a novelist or a columnist, you have to communicate your thoughts to readers. That is, get your message across effectively. (Translated from Thai)

In response to the notion of English varieties, Wichai took his position toward the Thai English variety. He asserted, "In a case of newspaper writing, there's no need to make writing Thai English". In his opinion, the underlying goal of newspapers was to convey messages as quickly and as possible to grasp readers' attention. Hence, he said he avoided illustrating his articles with phrases in Thai English unless "it was necessary". Keeping writing succinct and engaging, he highlighted, was his principle to enhance the newspaper's competitiveness. Whenever an opportunity permitted, he said that he identified himself as Thai and showed Thai perspective.

By the same token, Saman, whose perspective on English was in line with Standard English, perceived that English was a means not an end in media communication. Deciding not to pursue an engineering career, he has made journalism his life and has adopted mainstream English, British English variety, in his writing. His stance on the World Englishes concept was, "If you want to write in any language, you have to stick to what, the way that people in those countries use it. Not to make it, you know, 'this is Thai English'". Significantly, when asked further how concerned he was about the idea of construction of Thai English at *The Bangkok Post*, Saman responded the same way as Wichai did: "On a regular basis, we try not to". In similar fashion, Rnan and Pairat conceptualized their English and echoed their perspectives in line with the instrumental English — the idea that English is regarded as a tool. In brief, there were consensus viewpoints among these supporters that English should be used as a medium to convey their convictions as Thais but not to turn their writing into a particular type of English — Thai English. Saksit's self-identification with English was mixed and conflicted. Implicitly, he also conceptualized English phenomenon through the lens of World Englishes. As he argued, "You're a part of a much wider community of people who share common, yet not identical. We all know we have different versions, forms of English, dictionary of English languages".

Like Saksit, Pairat structurally identified himself with mainstream English. In doing so, he read *Financial Times*, *Financial Daily*, and other UK publications in order to "get expressions and the tempos". Conceptually, Pairat, however, also valued his Thai identity more than anything else. Thus far, he has placed emphasis on promoting the soul of Thais. His self-observation on the notion of *Thainess* was too remarkable to fail to overlook here. He offered a constructive aspect in looking at his English, "I'm not a native born English speaker. I think I can express myself ninety to ninety five percent when I write in English. That's a charm of it. If I can express one hundred percent of it, there would be no *Thainess*". A *Bangkok Post* journalist, Malai articulated her thoughts with strong pride in Thai culture and, in particular, her English. Claiming herself to be a hard-headed journalist, she contended, "English writing is not only about writing but also presenting who you are. This is crucial". Thus, even though her area of writing was international news, she has been trying not to sit silently but to stand up to voice her mind as a marginalized writer in the office. Malai used the Thai typical dish — *Namprik-Prathu* — as a symbol to illustrate how Thainess or Thai identity would be somehow shown in English writing. In other words, a smell of this Thai dish was compared with a Thai learner speaking English with an accent.

Move 4: Authority claim

The rhetorical move, authority claim, referred to an influence of Western ideology on the way the participants conceptualized English. The intention in this move was to specify sources of authority. Simply put, the move illustrated the influence role of imported publications, especially literature and theories from the West, on the Thai authors' ways of thinking. The Western representatives, including global media, were indicators of the inseparable relationship between the Thai writers' writing and the Western canon's philosophy. Because of the great impact of the West as a role model, this move, authority claim, implied that it was virtually impossible for Thai English to develop. As Pairat put it, "I read *Financial Times*, *Financial Daily*, and other UK publications in order to get expressions and the tempos".

Move 5: Stereotype

The rhetorical move, stereotype, centered on language myths and linguistic bias. In this move, the participants made generalizations and/or stereotypical statements pertaining to language ideology and language use. In the course of the interviews, there were many times when the participants mystified language usage. Basically, the point they made was loaded with linguistic prejudice about privileging Standard English over Thai English. As Pim put it, "I don't think Thai English works for international world. And English is universal language. So English is the language that is understood by people from every country".

Move 6: Stigmatized English varieties

The rhetorical move, stigmatized English varieties, signified negative attitudes toward non-Standard English variety constructs. In this move, non-Standard English varieties were trivialized. As Pim put it:

> I'm writing for professional, for executives, for business in high ranking, people in high level. Then I also write mainly for international people to read. That's why you know they don't want to read something that they don't understand although they very appreciate on Thai. But when you write in English, you have to make it English. Don't make it look Thai.

In somewhat the same vain, Saksit, who spent high school years in the Philippines, expressed his view toward localized English varieties:

> I don't think I have carried the Philippine's accent or some of the usage I think because there's distinct consciousness in me to keep it, cling close to either the American or English tradition, somewhere between British or that of American English. … I am very conscious of trying not to speak like the Filipinos. … It must have been my father who got education in France. He had negative impression of Filipino English. It's very sad!

Move 7: Editing

The function of the editing move was an attempt to question the imposing influence of editors on language usage. The central argument of this move was to address a vital impact of an editing process on writers' voices. In this line of argument, the participants, from both *The Bangkok Post* and *The Nation,* pointed out how editors influenced their work. Simply put, these participants said although they did not pay attention to the notion of Thai English, they could not deny that examples of the essence of Thainess, such as Buddhist perspectives, somehow were reflected in writing. Even so, their editors would turn Thai English or Thainess, if it existed, into mainstream English or mainstream thinking. As a result, a Thai English structure could not be maintained. In this regard, Nithi explained:

> If our English has a Thai smell, it will be cleaned up to fit into Standard English mode. For example, in Thai we usually say, '*I think you can't do it.* It will be corrected to '*I don't think you can do it'*. (Translated from Thai)

In sum, it is important to note that most of the journalists were aware of World Englishes varieties, namely, Singapore English, Indian English, and Filipino English. They however gave the most importance to the use of a Standard form of English. As a result, they chose to write in a form of Standard English or King's English. These journalists argued that their writing language was controlled by their editors, the target audiences, the nature of media and the organization policies. Although the majority of the participants' responses fell into the Standard English category, three journalists from *The Bangkok Post*, were aware of the existence of the multiplicity of World Englishes. There was keen awareness of English varieties such as American English, Singapore English, and Indian English. Even though these writers were not in favor of the form of the Thai English variety, they made their efforts to voice their *Thainess* or Thai identity. Whenever opportunity permitted, these writers unconsciously and consciously conveyed Thai messages through stories, socio-cultural elements, and Thai perspectives.

Discussion

The central objective of this study is an investigation of the Thai journalists' understanding of their English and their position towards the notion of World Englishes. The rhetorical moves that the journalists employed illustrated how the participants established their different stances toward English in relation to the World Englishes concept. In order to better understand the way the participants' self-positioned themselves in a particular way, Pennycook's (2001) framework of global English is used to explain two English models the journalists employed to conceptualize their English and to understand the global role of English. Regarding this global English position, two significant points can be drawn from the study result.

First, the research finding clearly demonstrates that the majority of the participants manifested a strong affiliation to the colonial celebratory position of Standard English. Their rhetoric of promoting Standard English as well as the rhetoric of marginalizing Thai English can be interpreted that these journalists held strongly to a prescriptive ideology of language use. The rhetorical move analysis reveals that Standard English ideology functioned deeply and firmly in the participants' mind. The discourse of English glorification was clearly constructed. As their rhetoric showed, the notion was portrayed toward the positive lexicalizations and expressions. For example, mainstream English varieties such as American English or British English were described as "beautiful," "expressive," "international," "appropriate," "subtle," and "professional." Besides, the use of labels symbolized the power of English. For instance, "Oxford English," "King's English," "perfect English," "universal," "high ranking," and "original English." In this regard, it can be interpreted from the participants' views toward Standard English that there is clearly an association between English and the elite class, the glorious English culture and civilization. Besides, these descriptive statements of Standard English to some degree implied how localized English varieties were marginalized or devalued.

Interestingly enough, although the advocates of this position shared similar views toward the above positive expressions of English, they differed from one another when it came to providing rationales for their English positions. Pim, for example, strongly desired to distance herself from what she called "Thaiglish". Instead, she said that she would want to feel emotionally connected with American English. Her take on this colonial celebratory position resonated in her argument: "If you make it look Thai style then it will be like you're in elementary level; you are not in a university level; you are not in bachelor degree yet". Unknowingly naïve to the imperial concept of English, her rhetoric leads to an interpretation that Pim marginalized herself, devaluing her own English to the point that she wanted to eradicate it.

Likewise, it can be interpreted from Saksit's response that he also subscribed to the Queen's English community of practice. His narrative echoed the superior position of this colonial celebratory position. As he put it:

> Sadly I must have been brainwashed by Middle England which is Oxford. I think it is beautiful. On top of being snobbish, but snobbery aside and pretension aside, I see this as the beauty of the so-called Queen's English or Oxford English. Although my exposure to that was very limited when I was in the Philippines, I learn to see some beauty of American English, but not Texan accent.

As exemplified, these journalists seemed to render privilege and superiority not only to Standard English discourse but also to Western ideology. Interestingly, it is worthy of note that these advocates of the Oxford English, Standard English or Queen's English positions were very much influenced by their schools, workplaces, and media houses. They did not contest or question but were highly proud when they were able to comply with conventional norms of language use.

In effect, this celebratory position is problematic. As stated earlier, most of the participants embraced the Anglocentric ideological tenets. The pitfall of this Anglocentric argument is prejudice of the Standard English variety over other discourses. This static view of the language does not seem to provide a place for a sense of diversity. It can be interpreted from the research that using English, in fact, does not just mean using a foreign language but "unconscious implantation of the Anglocentric attitudes or the perspective of the dominant race in the native's mind" (Tripasai, 2004, p. 11). The journalists whose responses fell into this position viewed the world from the perspective of colonial subjects. These writers placed themselves marginally in the discourse hierarchy in relation to the dominant discourse and Western ideology. Moreover, the rhetoric demonstrated the creation of a colonized image of non-Western writers, Thai writers or Thai English as inferior Self and the construction of the Standard English, Western media such as *Wall Street Journal*, *Times*, and *Newsweek* as the superior Other.

The premise that the West or the Western ideology was more advanced and sophisticated was deeply situated in the participants' minds. The hierarchical assumptions of discourse reconfirmed that the writers devalued their English, had low self-esteem, and even put down their own discourse. For example, Rnan, Pim and Kampol, perceiving English as the language of others, regarded themselves as vulnerable and not privileged. Pim, in particular, strove for the day when her "Thaiglish" would fade. Also, Ladda hoped that one day her opinion pieces could be published in the way she wanted to without sacrificing her voices to her editors. Kampol, who evaluated his English as "low class, too simple, not that sophisticated, and uneducated," made these remarks about the root of the marginalizing social relationships in Thailand:

> I think after all it's about perception. This is how most Thai people conceive of English. And I don't think it's a good idea to have this kind of attitude, let's say, about this face issue. We shouldn't measure others on outside appearance. For example, we have a perception that if one's written language is beautiful; we tend to assume that one is smart. (Translated from Thai)

Formation of this colonial celebratory position occurred through several rhetorical moves: the authority claim move, the stereotype move, and the stigmatized English varieties move.

In particular, the manifestation played out around the stereotype move and the stigmatized English varieties move implied that the participants deemphasized English varieties such as Philippines English, whereas they legitimized the higher status English varieties such as American English or British English. This discriminatory discursive process indicates that English seems to prevail everywhere yet it seems not equal to everyone (Holborow, 1999). For example, Ladda, along with Pim and Saman, did not regard Thai English as a stabilized form. Their argument was that Thai English was not "the kind of English that people around the world would understand". Saksit, too, disclosed his bias toward

Oxford English. As previously described, his expression captured the paradox of his discriminatory attitude toward non-standard English varieties as well as his awareness about the root of the unfortunate phenomenon.

Interestingly, some of the participants even recognized that there was prejudice toward non-Standard English varieties. Ladda and Kampol, for instance, made similar remarks about the status of Thai English. As Ladda put it, “Here, when we come across a beautifully written essay, we tend to assume that a writer must have grown up or be educated abroad. At the same time, when we come upon weak or strange writing, we tend to think that it was written by Thais”. Her observation indicated that this discriminatory discourse dies hard. Eventually, it seems that such a discourse might keep buoying up the hegemonic position of English in Thailand. Needless to say, the colonial celebratory position strongly held by the participants to some degree can explain hegemonic forces of Western discourse, the politics, the inequalities, and the cultural effect of English, and the hegemonic relationship of English.

Secondly, the way the journalists conceptualized their English and positioned themselves towards the laissez-faire or the modernist position on the global role of English is clearly evident. As previously presented, these journalists employed the thematic moves of genre convention and professional concerns as the major arguments to take on this instrumental English position that regards English as a neutral and functional tool for pragmatic purposes. As Tnan, for instance, argued, “Here is not literature work. It’s something universal. English newspapers are doing one formula, one soup, one universal”. Echoing Tnan’s stance, Saman expressed a macro-assumption of English as a world language. He claimed, “You use English as a medium to convey Thainess, not turn English into Thai English. … I try to avoid adding a Thai word in my story. People read our newspaper everywhere around the world now”. Grounded in the editing move, the participants’ argument also reflected the impact of the editing process on their writing convention.

The laissez-faire position reaffirmed that English, in this respect, is a lingua franca or the language of globalization *par excellence* (Bamgbose, 2003; Crystal, 1997). The journalists’ rhetoric clearly reflected the underlying premise of this pragmatic framework. That is, English is constructed, reconstructed and internalized as apolitical (Crystal, 1997), or as Pennycook (1994) put it, as “natural, neutral and beneficial” (p. 7). The authors such as Tnan, Rnan and Saman who considered English as the natural choice for progress (Crystal, 1997) and held universal and stereotypical views toward discourse seemed not concerned with other aspects of language use, namely identities, cultures, or emotional components. These participants whose responses were in line with this position seemed unaware of the political agenda accompanying the English language. It can be interpreted that the justification of English as a global media device perhaps influenced these journalists to overlook the political and ideological aspects of English.

In addition to expressing positive attitude toward Standard English, the practice of these journalists was obviously echoed in May's (2005) argument. That is, their choice of English stemmed from the perception that Standard English was "inevitable, unproblematic and, crucially, uncontested" (p. 324) for their work. Hence, within this instrumental frame of thinking, the chance for particularized English varieties to be established and acknowledged among these participants was virtually impossible as a currency of localized Englishes varieties, compared with that of Standard English, was too low to be marketed in the world language market.

Conclusion

Pennycook's (2001) analytical framework eventually permitted us to better understand about the participants' conceptualization of English, their blended identity positions, and colonial marginalization. The findings showed that even though the majority of the participants were aware of the English varieties used around the globe, all of them tended to conform to Standard English or King's English variety. The key arguments for these journalists to write in the Standard English form were the factors of the target audiences, genre conventions and the institutional policies of their newspapers. Besides, the analysis found that most of these journalists revealed a marginalized view toward their English. Their attitudes were greatly influenced by the hegemonic power of Standard English. Therefore, it can be concluded that their perceptions of the English language conformed to a colonial, hierarchical standpoint which privileged the types of English spoken and written within the U.S. and Great Britain.

Importantly, the analysis of the participants' English positioning drawn from the use of a variety of rhetorical statements finally allows us to conclude that English use in Thailand was deeply embedded in a colonial construct within the political and economic hegemony of Western Anglophone powers. This most salient research result appears to confirm the notion that English language usage is never apolitical and is always involved in global inequality and imposition of ways of thinking (Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992). The colonial celebratory position, in particular, explained hegemonic forces of Western discourse, the politics, the inequalities, the cultural effect of English, and the hegemonic relationship of English.

Interestingly, although Thailand has never been physically ruled by European imperialists, the study results ferreted out a close connection between English and colonialism. Regardless of their awareness of a variety of English, the way the writers conceived of Standard English in relation to localized English varieties and the notion of Thai English variety unveiled the powerful construct of English discourse hidden in language use. The research findings showed a rich example of how the hegemonic position of English was unconsciously and consciously constructed and enacted by the participants. It can be interpreted from the analysis that this colonial construction of the mind and colonial view of the world illustrate the unfortunate consequence of the cultural politics of promotion of English (Canagarajah, 1999; Pennycook, 1994, 1998).

The issues of implications

Even though the focus of this empirical research was not about English learning and teaching and the study was conducted out of a school context, the implication of the study results to English language learning and teaching (ELT) in Thailand and other related settings seems undeniable. After all, the hegemonic position of Standard English and the self-marginalized position of the participants toward Standard English raise two key concerns. On a conceptual level, policy makers, educators and teachers should undertake the deconstruction of apolitical views of English. In order to push for a change in the course of colonial discourse and mindset, this project has prompted ELT educators in Thailand to take language policy seriously and take status planning into account (Bamgbose, 2003). In this respect, they should involve local knowledge and culture into English curricula.

On a pedagogical level, the repercussions of Eurocentric ideology accompanying English usage, as discovered in this study, seem subtle yet have an extremely mental effect. This Eurocentric belief has worked gradually to discriminate Thai cultural contexts from the dominant Western culture. In order to deconstruct colonial English in classrooms, a good place to start to deal with the self-marginalization issue in English educational contexts is teachers. By providing a place of agency in English classrooms, teachers might find themselves to be in a good position to help capitalize on students' identities, their learning background and local contexts.

References

Bailey, R. (1991). *Images of English: A cultural history of the language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Bamgbose, A. (2003). English in language policy and planning. *World Englishes, 22*(4), 419-431.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York: Routledge.

Bhatt, R. M. (2001a). World Englishes. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 30*, 527-550.

Bhatt, R. M. (2001b). Language economy, standardization, and World Englishes. In E. Thumboo (Ed.), *The three circles of English: Language specialists talk about the English language* (pp. 401-422). Singapore: Unipress.

Bhatt, R. M. (2002). Experts, dialects, and discourse. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 12*(1), 74-109.

Bolton, K. (2004). World Englishes. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 367-396). Sidney: Blackwell.

Bolton, K. (2005). Symposium on World Englishes today (Part II): Where we stand: Approaches, issues, and debate in World Englishes. *World Englishes, 24*(1), 69-83.

Bolton, K. (2006). Where we stand: Approach, issues and debate in World Englishes. In K. Bolton & B. B. Kachru (Eds.), *World Englishes: Critical concepts in linguistics* (pp. 279-297). London: Routledge.

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

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). Reconstructing local knowledge. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 1*(4), 243-259.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006a). The place of World Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication, 57*(4), 586-619.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006b). The politics and pedagogy of appropriating discourse. In K. Bolton & B. B. Kachru (Eds.), *World Englishes: Critical concepts in linguistics* (pp. 212-238). London: Routledge.

Chutisilp, P. (1984). *A sociolinguistic study of an additional language: English in Thailand.* Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign.

Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.

Hall, S. (1992). The questions of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held & T. McGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and its futures* (pp. 274-325). Cambridge: Polity.

Holborow, M. (1999). *The politics of English: A marxist view of language*. London: Sage.

Huebner, T. (2006). Bangkok's Linguistic Landscapes: Environmental Print, codemixing and language change. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 3*(1), 31-51.

Kachru, B. B. (1986a). The power and politics of English. *World Englishes, 5*(2-3), 121-140.

Kachru, B. B. (1987). The bilingual's creativity and contact literatures. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), *Discourse across culture: Strategies in World Englishes* (pp. 125-140). New York: Prentice-Hall.

Kachru, B. B. (1988). *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin, 12*(1), 1,3,4,8.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The Other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1996). The paradigm of marginality. *World Englishes, 15*(3), 241-255.

Kachru, B. B. (1997). World English 2000: Resources for research and teaching. In L. E. Smith & M. L. Forman (Eds.), *World Englishes 2000* (pp. 209-251). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Kachru, B. B. (2006). The spread of Englisn and sacred linguistic cows. In K. Bolton & B. B. Kachru (Eds.), *World Englishes: Critical concepts in linguistics* (pp. 483-500). London: Routledge.

Kachru, B. B., & Smith, L. E. (1985). Editorial. *World Englishes, 4*(2), 209-211.

Kachru, Y. (2001). Discourse competence in World Englishes. In E. Thumboo (Ed.), *The three circles of English: Language specialists talk about the English language* (pp. 341-355). Singapore: National University of Singapore.

Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian context*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Masavisut, N., Sukwiwat, M., & Wongmontha, S. (1986). The power of the English language in Thai media. *World Englishes, 5*(2-3), 197-207.

May, S. (2005). Language rights: Moving the debate forward. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 9*(3), 319-347.

McArthur, T. (2001). World English and World Englishes: Trends, tensions, varieties, and standards. *Language Teaching, 34*, 1-20.

Ngugi, W. T. (1981). *Writers in politics*. London: Heineman.

Pakir, A. (1999). Standards? Dictionaries and their development in second language learning contexts. *World Englishes, 18*(2), 199-214.

Pakir, A. (2001). English as lingua franca: Multiforms, multimedia, multi-disciplines. In E. Thumboo (Ed.), *The three circles of English: Language specialists talk about the English language* (pp. 77-90). Singapore: National University of Singapore.

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

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

Pennycook, A. (1999). *Development, culture and language: Ethical concerns in a postcolonial world.* Retrieved August 8, 2008, from http://www.languages.ait.ac.th/hanoi_proceedings/pennycook.htm.

Pennycook, A. (2000). English, politics, ideology from colonial celebration to postcolonial performativity. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics, and language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 107-119). Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.

Pennycook, A. (2002). Turning English inside out. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 28*(2), 25-43.

Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. London: Routledge.

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

Phillipson, R. (1993). Symposium on linguistic imperialism. *World Englishes, 12*(3), 335-373.

Rappa, A. L., & Wee, L. (2006). *Language policy and modernity in Southeast Asia : Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand*. New York: Springer.

Said, E. W. (1994). *Culture and imperialism*. London: Vintage.

Schneider, E. W. (2003). The dynamics of new Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language, 79*(2), 233-281.

Selzer, J. (2004). Rhetorical analysis: Understanding how text persuade readers. In C. Bazerman & P. Prior (Eds.), *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices* (pp. 279-308). Mahwah, NJ: Ealbaum.

Smalley, W. A. (1994). *Linguistic diversity and national unity: Language ecology in Thailand*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sridhar, S. N. (1994). A reality check for SLA theories. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*, 800-805.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality*. London: Longman.

Tollefson, J. W. (2000). Policy and ideology in the spread of English. In J. K. Hall & W. Eggington (Eds.), *The sociopolitics of English language teaching* (pp. 7-21). Clevedon,UK: Multilingual Matters.

Tripasai, P. (2004). *Debating Anna: The textual politics of English literature teaching in Thailand.* Retrieved August 2, 2008, from http://www.aare.edu.au/04pap/tri04046.pdf

Watkhaolarm, P. (2005). Think in Thai, write in English: *Thainess* in Thai literature. *World Englishes, 24*(2), 145-158.

Wongsothorn, A. (2000). Thailand. In H. W. Kam & R. Y. L. Wong (Eds.), *Language policies and language education* (pp. 307-320). Singapore: Time Academic Press.

Note on Contributor

Adcharawan Buripakdi earned a PhD degree from Composition and TESOL program in Indiana University of Pennsylvania in 2008. She currently teaches at English Program, School of Liberal Arts, Walailak University, Thailand. Her areas of interests include World Englishes, Postcolonial Discourse, L2 Writing and Identity, Minority and Language Rights. Email contact: ajarngob@gmail.com or badchara@wu.ac.th

Japanese English Pronunciation – Issues of Intelligibility, Achievability and Perception in the Context of World Englishes

Eoin Jordan

Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, China

This paper addresses the problematic issue of teaching English pronunciation to Japanese learners, advocating a shift away from the native speaker as a model. An argument is presented for the development and recognition of a distinct Japanese English pronunciation standard that can be used as a guideline to inform oral English teaching practices in the Japanese school system. Suggestions are made at the end of the paper for future research to contribute towards the development of such guidelines.

Keywords: Pronunciation, phonology, intelligibility, achievability, guidelines, Japan.

Introduction

This paper addresses the problematic issue of pronunciation guidelines for Japanese learners of English. In the context of growing acceptance of World Englishes, each with differing pronunciation systems, an argument is made here for the development and recognition of a distinct Japanese English pronunciation standard for use in the Japanese school system. An overview of pronunciation-related issues relevant to English learners in Japan is presented first, followed by a brief discussion of the status of Japanese English with relation to World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca. Consideration is then given to how new pronunciation guidelines might be decided on and the possible benefits that a Japanese English pronunciation standard could bring to English language education in Japan. Producing a finalized set of pronunciation guidelines is beyond the scope of this paper. However, in the final sections suggestions for future research to this end are put forward, and the existence of a potentially influential role model for Japanese English pronunciation is highlighted.

Pronunciation and English teaching in Japan

Despite its obvious critical importance to spoken communication, several writers have commented that the area of pronunciation in English language teaching has not been given the focus that it deserves within the field of Applied Linguistics (Derwing & Munro, 2005; Jenkins, 2002). Derwing and Munro note that in comparison to work done on areas such as grammar and vocabulary there has been very little published research on the teaching of pronunciation, and that classroom practice and materials relating to pronunciation are often based on intuition rather than empirical evidence. A survey of language teachers in Canada conducted by Breitkreutz, Derwing, and Rossiter (2002) highlighted the fact that many instructors receive little or no training in this area, a situation that is likely to be the case in Japan too, especially given that many language schools do not require prospective teachers to have any specific English teaching qualifications. Jenkins (2002) also points out that the intuitions that are taken into account are generally those of native English speakers, with little consideration given to intelligibility for non-native speakers, in spite of a growing consensus that the latter group outnumber the former by a significant margin (Crystal, 2008; Graddol, 2000).

One complicating factor when considering the teaching of pronunciation is that there are currently a wide variety of different English pronunciation norms in existence that do not conform to the traditionally proposed textbook standards of General American (GA) and Received Pronunciation (RP) (both in the "inner circle" nations, as denoted by Kachru (1992b, p. 356), and other countries). Teachers and learners alike are thus faced with a choice as to which pronunciation model to set as a target. GA and RP models are estimated to be spoken by only a minority of the US and UK populations respectively (Jenkins, 2002; Kachru, 1992a) and, from the perspective of learners in Japan, feature a large number of sounds that do not exist in the phonology of the Japanese language. Furthermore, it is reasonable to argue that for geographical reasons many Japanese students of English are more likely to have interactions with Koreans, Chinese, or Taiwanese than with English speakers from America or the UK. If it is assumed that English will be used for international communication within Northeast Asia (an issue that will be discussed later on in this article), then in this context achieving a pronunciation that is highly intelligible to Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Taiwanese listeners may be a more important consideration than intelligibility to speakers from the US or UK. Tanaka and Fukuda (2007) in their needs analysis for non-governmental organization (NGO) staff also note that there is not a general expectation for "native" English in the NGO work environment, suggesting another reason why, in this field of employment at least, it is not necessary to aim for RP, GA or any other inner circle norm when it comes to pronunciation.

Before proceeding further it should be noted that the very concept of an English native speaker is a highly controversial one (Rampton, 1990). Although the common perception of an English native speaker in Japan is likely to be of a white Caucasian from one of the inner circle countries (Seargeant 2005), in the context of World Englishes it is perfectly valid to argue that speakers from non-inner circle countries are native speakers of their own variety of World English. Given the different perceptions that exist, and the confusion that they may cause, the term will be avoided to the greatest extent possible here, with the widely accepted framework outlined by Kachru (1992b) of "inner circle", "outer circle" and "expanding outer circle" countries used to describe speakers' affiliations instead (p. 356).

It is also necessary to clarify what is meant by intelligibility in this context. Smith (1992) views it as the lowest of three markers of understanding (intelligibility, comprehensibility and interpretability) and the results of his research suggest that intelligibility does not necessarily entail comprehensibility and interpretability. Derwing and Munro (1997) and Munro and Derwing (1995) also measure intelligibility in a similar manner to Smith (through transcription tasks). Smith's framework rightfully acknowledges that there is more to understanding than simple identification of the words that are spoken, however when considering pronunciation as an isolated aspect of language, such recognition would appear to be a vital building block for further understanding. For any given speaker, if all other variables are kept constant, an improvement in intelligibility is likely to result in increased comprehensibility and interpretability, and should never lead to a decrease in overall understanding. With this in mind intelligibility will generally be used here in line with Smith's definition as the extent to which the words that a speaker intends to say are recognized by a listener (without concern for pragmatic understanding), but with the expectation that an increase in intelligibility will often entail an increase in overall understanding.

The studies carried out by Derwing and Munro (1997) and Munro and Derwing (1995) found that intelligibility did not correlate closely with what they denote as "accentedness" (as measured by inner circle speakers), suggesting that learners of English from Japan or elsewhere do not need to mimic inner circle pronunciation in order to be understood by speakers from countries such as America or the UK. Smith (1992) also notes that the speech of some inner circle speakers may actually be less intelligible to a range of different listeners (from the inner, outer and expanding outer circles) than some non-inner circle varieties, though it should be pointed out that the pronunciation of the inner circle speech that was used in his experiments may not have corresponded closely to the textbook models of GA or RP. It has additionally been suggested by several researchers that the goal of acquiring inner circle native-sounding pronunciation is rather unrealistic for most young adult learners of English, even if they are living in an environment where this pronunciation is the norm (Flege, Yeni-Komshian & Liu, 1999; Morley, 1991; Oyama, 1976; Piske, MacKay & Flege, 2001). Dörnyei (2008) suggests that setting unrealistic language targets such as this may have a strong demotivational effect on learners.

On top of the difficulty that Japanese learners of English may experience in trying to master pronunciation of unfamiliar sounds in GA or RP, it can also be argued that this may not be an appropriate goal for other reasons. A strong focus on interaction with inner circle speakers may be inappropriate if the primary usage of English for many students will be what is commonly referred to as English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), defined by Seidlhofer (2005) as a situation when English is used as a medium of communication for people from different first language and cultural groups. As was mentioned above, this type of usage seems likely, especially given the statistics of international tourism to and from Japan (Japan Tourism Marketing Co., 2009), trade statistics (Japan External Trade Organization, 2009) and Japan's geographical location. This evidence suggests that Japan has, and is likely to increasingly have, a great deal of economic interaction with China, Korea, and Taiwan. If English is to be the medium of communication in many of these interactions then a focus on ensuring intelligibility with English speakers from these countries, as opposed to inner circle countries, should be a priority of English education in Japan.

It needs to be pointed out here that using a language other than English may provide the most efficient way of meeting communication needs in some cases, and that further research into how ELF co-exists with other languages in Northeast Asia is needed. From an educational perspective, however, the study of English provides the potential for more widespread communication than the study of Chinese, Japanese, or Korean as a foreign language in any of the countries mentioned. There is also already a strong infrastructure in place for English education in China, Japan, Korea and Taiwan, thus making it arguably the most accessible language for young people to learn. The use of English may on many occasions is a politically neutral choice too in an area with a troubled history of international relations, possibly providing a fairer and more even basis for communication than adopting the mother tongue of one of the countries in the region. Its usage may also avoid the difficulties that foreign speakers of languages such as Japanese experience with appropriate employment of polite language (Siegal 1996), the misuse of which may cause offence in certain situations.

Despite the disadvantages outlined above of using an inner circle model for pronunciation in Japan, the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) appear to still strongly promote the utilization of inner circle speakers in school language classrooms. Although MEXT documents allude to international communication being a target of English language education, many of the measures put forward involve the introduction of native speakers, as opposed to highly proficient non-inner circle speakers, to lessons, suggesting that the primary goal is communication with members of inner circle nations, or at the very least that an inner circle overseer needs to be present in the classroom in order for communication in English to take place (MEXT, 2002; MEXT, 2003).

Japanese English? English as a Lingua Franca?

In the current climate of increased acceptance of variety, some writers have suggested that forms of English such as "China English" should be developed as alternative standards to UK or US English (Hu, 2004). In a similar vein to propositions such as this, an argument for developing a specialized Japanese English pronunciation system to be taught in Japanese schools is put forward here. The main reason for this motion is broadly that an insistence on inner circle norms within the Japanese education system is proving highly detrimental both to the teaching of spoken English in Japan, and to the perception of English as a language of international communication by those studying it. Within the limited scope of this paper it is not possible to investigate what the precise details of the proposed standard should be, but rather to outline why such a standard is necessary and suggest directions for future research that move towards establishing appropriate pronunciation guidelines.

It is important at this juncture to clarify the relationship between ELF and Japanese English as a variety of World English in the form that it is proposed here. ELF, by its very nature, varies depending on who the interlocutors are, thus in essence it describes a wide range of usage rather than one specific type of English. Jenkins (2002) argues for the existence of a core of pronunciation features that are essential for communication in an ELF context; however this again does not imply a single variety. The goal behind the development of a Japanese English pronunciation model is to create a standard that is unique to Japan, but which is also highly intelligible in ELF contexts, in particular those that involve communication with people from Northeast Asian countries. As usage between Japanese interlocutors is likely to be fairly limited then intelligibility considerations with other countries take on more significance than perhaps they would do in nations such as Singapore or India, where there is more extensive internal use of the language. Thus Japanese English can best be conceptualized as a World English variety that is primarily used in ELF contexts (as opposed to defining English in Japan as one or the other of these). Interestingly, the concept of a Japanese form of English is not just a recent idea; as long ago as the 1970s proposals were made for the introduction of a form termed "Englic" in Japan as an alternative to UK and US varieties (Suzuki & Takao, 1975 as cited in Goto-Butler & Iino, 2005).

Whether Japanese English, as it currently exists, should really be considered a variety of World English has been questioned by writers such as Seaton (2001), who cites factors such as a current lack of consistent internal grammatical and spelling rules as arguments against such a perception. Seaton points out that much of the 'Engrish' that can be seen adorning billboards and T-shirts in Japan appears to be primarily for design purposes, a view that is also endorsed by Doughill (2008). However he overlooks the fact that both written and spoken English with a high level of grammatical consistency is needed, and routinely used, in many international workplaces within Japan. For example, at universities, such as the author's current place of employment, there are numerous meetings with only one or two non-Japanese participants that are regularly held in English.

Regarding the nativization of English in Japan, the perceived lack of which is a key component of Seaton's (2001) argument against the recognition of Japanese English, both Daulton (2008) and Stanlaw (1992) highlight the fact that modern Japanese features a very large number of loanwords from English that have been phonologically altered to fit in with the Japanese syllabary. These words generally have consistent pronunciation and written forms within the Japanese language, and Stanlaw considers this to be a type of English nativization. Accordingly it is the author's opinion that the case for recognizing a Japanese variety of English is a strong one.

Given that English is used on a regular basis in many Japanese workplaces, there is certainly a need for further development of proficiency in a consistent spoken form of English to communicate for international trade, tourism, and other areas of exchange. In 2003 MEXT specifically highlighted this issue by mentioning that, owing to a lack of English ability, "many Japanese are restricted in their exchanges with foreigners and their ideas or opinions are not evaluated appropriately" (MEXT, 2003). Regardless of the actual phonology selected as a standard, greater consistency in pronunciation is likely to have a positive effect in the long-term on the intelligibility of English spoken by Japanese.

The MEXT action plan also notes that English language skills are not the only problem that the education system needs to address (MEXT, 2003). A lack of ability when using the Japanese language is also a concern, suggesting that there may be an underlying problem with the general communicative ability of many students. If this is to be believed then the introduction of Japanese English pronunciation guidelines is not likely to be effective in improving overall communicative competence in English unless it is supplemented by other measures to focus on students' general communication skills.

New guidelines

In order to firmly establish the proposed Japanese English phonology, clear pronunciation guidelines need to be developed and introduced for classroom use. Deciding on these guidelines is likely to be problematic and there are a variety of factors that must be taken into account. Observation of the actual pronunciations that Japanese speakers of English currently produce is an important point of reference, though the intelligibility of these pronunciations to Chinese, Japanese, Korean and other speakers of English should be given central consideration as well. Of course years of UK and US centered English education are likely to have had a strong influence on what is intelligible; however it is reasonable to expect that mother tongue phonologies will have some effect here too. The guidelines for teaching pronunciation of English as an International Language that Jenkins (2002) puts forward also constitute an important reference point when making decisions in this area.

Perhaps the most important requirement of the pronunciation guidelines for Japanese English is that they should be easily achievable for Japanese learners of English. One way to ensure this is to base the guidelines on the phonology of the Japanese language to the greatest extent possible. The proposed benefits of this go beyond just ease of acquisition for students; giving a more achievable English phonology an official status may inspire confidence in many Japanese teachers of English to become useful pronunciation role models for their students, as opposed to avoiding speaking activities in the classroom on account of self-perceived poor pronunciation (the author's experience of teaching at elementary, junior high and senior high schools in Japan suggests that there are many Japanese teachers of English who regard their English pronunciation as being incorrect). Despite the reforms outlined in the MEXT paper (MEXT, 2003) the majority of English lessons at the lower levels of education will, given the limited number of imported inner circle speakers, probably still be taught by Japanese teachers, and with this in mind it is important that these teachers are able to act as valid pronunciation role models for their students. If the goal is set as inner circle pronunciation, perhaps in the form of RP or GA, then a large number of teachers may not be able to do this successfully. If, on the other hand, a system of pronunciation that most teachers are able to produce accurately is introduced as a target then this may have the positive effect of encouraging teachers to include more oral communication elements in their classes.

Future research

It is important to note that, despite the wider acceptance implied by the whole concept of World Englishes and ELF, development of the pronunciation model proposed here will ultimately necessitate evolution, rather than revolution, away from existing standards such as GA and RP. Accordingly a starting point in determining the guidelines will be identifying GA or RP sounds that are problematic for Japanese learners and then carrying out empirical research to see which possible substitutions for these sounds, taken from the phonology of the Japanese language, are most intelligible to a variety of listeners (with a particular emphasis on intelligibility to English speakers from Northeast Asian countries). The "th" sounds in GA and RP would be one such example, with /s/, /z/, /t/, and /d/ as possible substitutions that could be made. Of course features such as intonation and word stress also need to be treated in a similar fashion. In its initial stages this is similar in nature to the idea put forward by Dalton and Seidlhofer (1994 as cited in Jenkins, 1998) of treating GA and RP as models that can be approximated to as opposed to norms that do not allow for deviation, although it is taken a step further here in that the ultimate aim is to develop an entirely new model.

A Hollywood role model?

One can hear an example of what a form of English with substitutions such as those outlined above might sound like by listening to the speech of Japanese actor Ken Watanabe in recent Hollywood films such as Batman Begins (2005), Letters from Iwo Jima (2006), Memoirs of a Geisha (2005) and The Last Samurai (2003). Watanabe makes quite clear substitutions for numerous GA and RP sounds, including the "th" pronunciations mentioned above, yet his speech has obviously been deemed intelligible enough to be broadcast to a worldwide English speaking audience without the aid of subtitles. Although the finalized guidelines proposed above may not correspond exactly to the actor's speech, and the visual aspect of the films may also contribute to the intelligibility of the actor's utterances, the exposure to a form of Japanese English that these films give English speakers around the world can certainly be seen as beneficial in terms of improving the international intelligibility of Japanese English pronunciation. The use of the films in English classrooms in Japan may also instill confidence in students that this type of pronunciation is perfectly acceptable as an alternative to inner circle norms. It is important to note, however, that Japanese English should not be the only type of English that students in Japan are exposed to. On the contrary, from a listening perspective it is of the utmost importance that students gain as much exposure as possible to other varieties of English in the classroom too, in particular to speakers from China, Korea and Taiwan.

References

Batman Begins (2005). Directed by Chistopher Nolan. Warner Bros.

Breitkreutz, J., Derwing, T. M., & Rossiter, M. J. (2002). Pronunciation teaching practices in Canada. *TESL Canada Journal*, *19*, 51-61.

Crystal, D. (2008). Two thousand million? *English Today*, *24*(1), 3-6.

Daulton, F.E. (2008*). Japan's built-in lexicon of English-based loanwords.* Clevendon: Multilingual Matters.

Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (1997). Accent, intelligibility, and comprehensibility: Evidence from four L1s. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*, 1-16.

Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2005). Second language accent and pronunciation teaching: A research-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, *39*(3), 379-397.

Dörnyei, Z. (2008). New ways of motivating foreign language learners: Generating vision. *Links*, *38*, 3-4.

Doughill, J. (2008). Japan and English as an alien language. *English Today*, *24*(1), 18-22.

Flege, J. E., Yeni-Komshian, G. H., & Liu, S. (1999). Age constraints on second language acquisition. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *41*, 78-104.

Goto-Butler, Y., & Iino, M. (2005). Current Japanese reforms in English education: The 2003 'Action Plan.' *Language Policy*, *4*, 25-45.

Graddol, D. (2000). *The future of English?* London: British Council.

Hu, X. G. (2004). Why China English should stand alongside British, American and other 'World Englishes.' *English Today* 20(2), 26-33.

Japan External Trade Organization (2009). *Japanese trade and investment statistics*. Retrieved February 25, 2009, from http://www.jetro.go.jp/en/reports/statistics/

Japan Tourism Marketing Co. (2009). *Tourism statistics*. Retrieved February 25, 2009, from http://www.tourism.jp/english/statistics/index.php

Jenkins, J. (1998). Which pronunciation norms and models for English as an International Language? *ELT Journal*, *52*(2), 119-126.

Jenkins, J. (2002). A sociolinguistically based, empirically researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an international language. *Applied Linguistics*, *23*(1), 83-103.

Kachru, B. B. (1992b). Teaching World Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 355-365). Chicago: Illinois University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1992a). Models for non-native Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 48-74). Chicago: Illinois University Press.

Letters from Iwo Jima (2006). Directed by Clint Eastwood. Warner Bros.

Memoirs of a Geisha (2005). Directed by Rob Marshall. Columbia Pictures.

MEXT (2002). *Developing a strategic plan to cultivate "Japanese with English Abilities".* Retrieved February 25, 2009, from http://www.mext.go.jp/english/news/2002/07/020901.htm .

MEXT (2003). *Action plan to cultivate "Japanese with English abilities".* Retrieved February 25, 2009 from http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/03072801.htm .

Morley, J. (1991). The pronunciation component of teaching English to speakers of other languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, *25*, 481-520.

Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1995). Processing time, accent, and comprehensibility in the perception of native and foreign-accented speech. *Language and Speech*, *38*, 289-306.

Oyama, S. (1976). A sensitive period for the acquisition of a nonnative phonological system. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *5*(3), 261-283.

Piske, T., MacKay, I.R.A. & Flege, J.E. (2001). Factors affecting degree of foreign accent in L2: A review. *Journal of Phonetics*, *29*, 191-215.

Rampton, M. B. H. (1990). Displacing the 'native speaker': expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, *44*, 97-101.

Seargeant, P. (2005). "More English than England itself": The simulation of authenticity in foreign language practice in Japan. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *15*(3), 326-345.

Seaton, P. (2001). "Shampoo for extra damage": Making sense of Japanized English. *Japan Forum*, *31*(2), 233-247.

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, *59*(4), 339-341.

Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, *17*(3), 356-382.

Smith, L.E. (1992). Spread of English and issues of intelligibility. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 75-90). Chicago: Illinois University Press.

Stanlaw, J. (1992). English in Japanese communicative strategies. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 178-208). Chicago: Illinois University Press.

Tanaka, H., & Fukada, Y. (2007). Comprehensive needs analysis for NGO staff. In K. Bradford-Watts (Ed.), *JALT2006 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 396-406). Tokyo: JALT.

The Last Samurai (2003). Directed by Edward Zwick. Warner Bros.

Note on Contributor

Eoin Jordan currently works in China as a tutor at Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University English language Centre. His research interests include English pronunciation, L1 transfer in language learning, and vocabulary acquisition and assessment. Email contact: eoinpatrickjordan@gmail.com

BOOK REVIEW

Shalini Advani, *Schooling the national administration: Education, English and the Indian Modern*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, 205 pp. UK£13.99.
Reviewed by Philippa Mungra

This slim volume deals with how the educational system and in particular, English language teaching has affected the construction of nationalism, self-identity and modernity in independent India. The authors examines the entire construct of educational policy , contradictions, ideology and textbooks as well as syllabus and testing process of high-school certification in different parts of the this vast sub-continent.

The role of the global spread of English in post-colonial times is the subject of much debate and the opinions of Pennycook (1994), Krachu (1986), Phillipson (1992); Viswanathan (1994) and Canagarajah (2005) are still highly debated The author enters this debate by considering three broad themes, outlined in the three sections of the book.

The first section deals with the policy landscape - four chapters describing the fostering of a national identity through schooling. By contrasting two English-medium schools – one a private unaided school outside of Delhi and the other a public school in the majority Hindi-speaking urban sprawl within Delhi itself. The author delineates a setting that drives education – that education is the ladder to social mobility and that English is an essential component to entering the modern. The author describes Indian-ness and the predicament of post-colonial heritage. Although English was originally associated with elitism, this has largely disappeared, thanks largely to the creation of a three-language curriculum for the national syllabus by the National Council for Education Research and Training called the NCERT. In the development of the curriculum, the author describes the political currents and hegemonic battles driving curricular choices both at the national as well as at the state level.

The second thread deals with the generating of textbooks for language teaching. This section is a logical follow-up since it describes how nationalism and the language policies of the first section have been realised in textbooks and how these textbooks present the ideology of citizenship. Specifically, the author examines how the themes of nationhood, citizenry and modernity are presented in three sets of text-books in a diachronic analysis. These language text-books were written by the NCERT in three periods - the 1960-70s and later updated in the 1980-90s and the current 2000s. Nationalistic themes are contrasted with corresponding textbooks used in two regions - of Uttar Pradesh and Kerala. These two states were chosen because the former has had an uneasy relationship with the dominant English post-colonial legacy while the latter appears to embrace English early in its history.

Spread over 3 chapters, the book examines how issues are presented and how they foster national identity. These issues are presented in scenarios of language use and deal with local diversity in sweets, mealtimes, foods, the undercurrents of modernity in a meeting of young modern Indians with foreigners, the rural life as opposed to an urban setting and the ever-present issue of caste. A whole chapter is devoted to the female vs. male condition and how it is represented in lessons in these textbooks. Interestingly, the author appears to criticise current textbooks claiming that "far from introducing a feminist or liberal discourse on the role of women, the education system is locked into a masculinist national rhetoric, which makes women a pure and uncritical signifier of Indian nationhood and Nationalist tradition" (p. 145). While these are undoubtedly important issues, it is not clear if the author is referring to lessons within a foreign-language classroom, as she set out to discuss or in general language-literature-culture classroom.

In the third section of this book, the author examines the real world of the English classroom in schools in the Hindi-speaking urban belt of Northern India-Haryana, Uttar Pradesh and Delhi and looks at how teachers use these texts and how lessons are structured around them. All schools are non-elite institutions. Two are Hindi-medium schools - a government-run boy's school in Lucknow, and a private school for girls and the findings are compared with an English-medium school frequented by children coming from families with an economic profile similar to the other two schools.

In this ethnographic study of the two types of schools, the author uses an idiographic approach, that is, non-participant observation notes during the lesson followed by non-structured interviews of teachers as well as groups of students exploring values, beliefs, behavior, disciplinary measures likes and hopes as well as predictions about exam outcomes. This classroom information is supplemented by a brief digression on classroom overcrowding and pedagogical culture in the Indian School System with the author condemning poor training and the predominant "tabula rasa" approach, in which the pupils are considered empty heads waiting to be filled up with the knowledge of the teacher. The author concludes that neither current teaching practice nor the syllabus as it is applied, conspire to help students gain lifelong learning skills associated with upward social and professional mobility.

The final chapter begins with an excursus on the need for India to recognize a transnational concept in the articulation of education policy and that such approach would not destroy but would rather enhance and address the imperatives of a transnational world. Accordingly, the author gives credit to the National Curriculum Framework provided by the NCERT and specifically the three-language policy but she attacks the norms used since she labels them as addressing an urban elite rather than the multiple realities that exist in India. She also holds that the content of many of the language textbooks is not only unrealistic but also not rich enough nor varied enough to induce communicative competence for lifelong learning. She calls for more analysis to pinpoint pedagogic needs and wider application of foreign-language communicative pedagogy by specialist teachers.

The author of this book comes from a unique perspective in that her experience as a classroom teacher but she adopts a bottom-up approach from classroom activities through materials development to language policy. The book is well-documented and well-researched and the ethnographic approach is down-to-earth and realistic. At times though the author appears to confuse foreign-language teaching with teaching of literature. For example, on page 173, she asks "to what extent was the curriculum framework successful in implementing its inclusive vision into pedagogic practice?" and then answers her own question by suggesting that this has been only "a partial success" as seen from "social science curriculum, most noticeably in the subject areas of Political Science and History" but she does not mention evaluation of English Language teaching.

This is a serious error, because it draws conclusions over wide swathes of the curriculum and raises doubt in the reader's mind about the author's motivation and stance. Overall, however, this book provides the reader with a well-documented exposé of the pedagogical issues facing English-language teaching in India and furnished an insightful and critical overview of the area. It is definitely a pleasure to read and is an engaging read for those interested in sociolinguistics, or those fascinated with language policy.

Note on Contributor

Philippa Mungra is a trained biologist and is now retired from 1st. Medical School of the University of Rome "La Sapienza" in Italy. Her research priorities revolve around the structure and evolution of specialist medico-scientific publications from a communicative and textual point of view. She is the author of a textbook for reading and writing skills within the new 5-year syllabus for Italian Medical Schools. She serves the EILJ Editorial Board as Reviews Editor. Email contact: philippa.mungra@gmail.com