Localizing Global English

English is the most widely taught and learned language in the world and is used for communication among speakers from different language backgrounds. How it can be effectively taught and learned, what English means to, and how it can be "owned" by, non-native speakers of English in Asia and elsewhere, are all issues that warrant contemplation. This edited collection addresses these issues and more by looking at a wide range of topics that are relevant and timely in contexts where English is taught as a foreign language. The authors offer novel perspectives gleaned from theory and actual practice that can inform English language teaching in Asia and beyond. This book will be of interest to researchers, policymakers, curriculum developers, and practitioners in the field of English teaching and learning.

Hikyoung Lee is a Professor of TESOL and applied linguistics in the Department of English Language & Literature at Korea University, Korea. She has held administrative positions such as the Director of Teaching and Learning and Director of the Institute of Foreign Language Studies at Korea University and has served as vice-president of several academic associations in Korea. Her recent publications are on English in higher education, language policy, materials writing, and English as a lingua franca.

Bernard Spolsky has taught at schools and universities in New Zealand, Australia, Israel, Canada, and the United States. He retired as Professor Emeritus from Bar-Ilan University in 2000. He has published a number of books, including *Conditions for Second Language Learning, Measured Words, The Languages of Jerusalem,* the *Handbook of Educational Linguistics, Language Policy, Language Management, The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy* and *The Languages of the Jews.* He was a foundation editor of the journals *Applied Linguistics,* and *Language Policy.* He has been President of International TESOL: He served as Publications Director of Asia TEFL, editor-in-chief of its journal, and has co-edited ten of its books. He has held Guggenheim and Mellon fellowships, and is a Fellow of the Linguistic Societies of America and India.

Routledge Critical Studies in Asian Education

Series Editors: S. Gopinathan, Wing On Lee and Jason Eng Thye Tan

Teacher Education for English as a Lingua Franca
Perspectives from Indonesia
Edited by Subhan Zein

The Governance and Management of Universities in Asia
Global Influences and Local Responses
Chang Da Wan, Molly N.N. Lee, and Hoe Yeong Loke

Building Teacher Capacity in Vietnamese English Language Teaching
Research, Policy and Practice
Edited by Van Canh Le, Hoa Thi Mai Nguyen, Thi Thuy Minh Nguyen, Roger Barnard

Is it Time to Let Meritocracy Go?
Examining the Case of Singapore
Nadira Talib

Localizing Global English
Asian Perspectives and Practices
Edited by Hikyoung Lee and Bernard Spolsky

Internationalization of Teacher Education and the Nation State
Rethinking Nationalization in Singapore and Beyond
Rita Z. Nazeer-Ikeda

Education and Social Justice in Japan
Kaori H. Okano

For more information about this series, please visit: https://www.routledge.com/Routledge-Critical-Studies-in-Asian-Education/book-series/RCSAE

Localizing Global English

Asian Perspectives and Practices

Edited by
Hikyoung Lee and Bernard Spolsky

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2021
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record has been requested for this book

ISBN: 978-0-367-53639-8 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-08270-5 (ebk)

Typeset in Galliard
by Taylor & Francis Books

Contents

List of Tables

Tables

Contributors

Alejandro S. Bernardo is Associate Professor at the Department of English of the University of Santo Tomas, the oldest university in the Philippines and in Asia. He is the current president of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines (LSP) and sits as a member of the *Asian Journal of English Language Studies (AJELS)* Editorial Board.

Bernard Spolsky has taught at schools and universities in New Zealand, Australia, Israel, Canada, and the United States. He retired as Professor Emeritus from Bar-Ilan University in 2000. He has published a number of books, including *Conditions for Second Language Learning, Measured Words, The Languages of Jerusalem,* the *Handbook of Educational Linguistics, Language Policy, Language Management*, *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy*, and *The Languages of the Jews.* He was a foundation editor of the journals *Applied Linguistics* and *Language Policy*. He has been President of International TESOL: He served as Publications Director of Asia TEFL, editor-in-chief of its journal, and has co-edited ten of its books. He has held Guggenheim and Mellon fellowships, and is a Fellow of the Linguistic Societies of America and India.

Christy Chan is Senior Tutor and Manager of English Language Support Services at the English Language Centre of City University of Hong Kong. She is a co-investigator of two UGC Teaching and Learning Grants on developing a capstone project app and setting up a professional development hub for university English teachers in Hong Kong. She is the principal investigator of three internal grants on OBTL learning and entrepreneurship education. Christy is a reviewer of two regional journals and an appointed English subject specialist for HKCAAVQ.

Hikyoung Lee is a Professor of TESOL and applied linguistics in the Department of English Language & Literature at Korea University, Korea. She has held administrative positions such as the Director of Teaching and Learning and Director of the Institute of Foreign Language Studies at Korea University and has served as vice-president of several academic associations in Korea. Her recent publications are on English in higher education, language policy, materials writing, and English as a lingua franca.

Julia Chen, PhD, is Director of the Educational Development Centre at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University. She is a two-time recipient of her university's President Award for Excellent Performance, first in teaching and then in service. She was also shortlisted by the Hong Kong University Grants Committee for the UGC Teaching Award and by QS Quacquarelli Symonds for the Reimagine Education Learning Assessment Award. She is the Principal Investigator of several large-scale government-funded inter-university projects on developing English Across the Curriculum, learning analytics, and using technology to develop students' academic English skills.

Le Pham Hoai Huong is an Associate Professor in the English faculty, Hue University of Foreign Languages, Hue University, Vietnam. She achieved a BA in English from Hue University, Vietnam, an MS in TESOL from California State University, Fullerton, USA, and a PhD in education from Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. Her research interests include sociocultural theory, classroom interaction, teacher training, and teaching and learning vocabulary. This paper was her featured presentation at the 17th Asia TEFL international conference in Bangkok, Thailand in June, 2019.

Oryang Kwon received his PhD from the University of Texas at Austin, USA. His career had been devoted to ELT and research before he retired from the Department of English Language Education, Seoul National University, where he is currently a Professor Emeritus. He served as the President of Korea TESOL, Korea Association of Teachers of English (KATE), and Korea English Language Testing Association (KELTA). He also served as an editorial board member of *Language Testing*, the journal of the International Language Testing Association, and of *Asian Englishes*. He has written numerous secondary school English textbooks, co-authored *A History of English Language Education in Korea*, and edited a book titled, *New Horizons in English Education Research* (2014). He is currently translating books in education.

Paul McBride is an Associate Professor of English as a lingua franca (ELF) and Acting Director at the Center for English as a Lingua Franca at Tamagawa University in Tokyo. He is interested in pedagogical implications of ELF, including issues of language, literacy, meaning, and knowledge as they are interrelated in the generation, validation, and maintenance of structural power within academic institutions. He is a member of the Asia TEFL Lingua Franca Research Network.

Angela Ng served as Senior Lecturer and Head of English Section of the Language Centre, Hong Kong Baptist University. She oversaw the offering of all credit-bearing courses and the English across the curriculum collaboration within the University. She serves as External Examiner and Consultant for English and Foreign Language Programs in several tertiary institutions in Hong Kong. She moved to Vancouver in January 2019 and is now completing her EdD at Northeastern University.

Malinee Prapinwong was an Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Education, Kasetsart University. She earned a PhD in Language Education from Indiana University, Bloomington. Her research interests include intercultural communicative competence, critical literacy, and technology integration in the language classroom. Her recent work is on the blended learning model to enhance pre-service teachers' language proficiency and intercultural competence.

Raja Nor Safinas Raja Harun (PhD) is an Associate Professor at the English Language and Literature Department, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris. Her research interests and publications are mainly on TESL/TEFL teacher education, TESL methodology, innovative pedagogy, and classroom discourse. She was the recipient of the Malaysian prestigious National Academic Award under the category of Teaching and Learning in 2015. She is active in conducting research and has secured several research grants at the national level.

Willy A Renandya is a language teacher educator with extensive teaching experience in Asia. He currently teaches applied linguistics courses at the National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. He has given numerous plenary presentations at regional and international conferences, and published extensively in the area of second language education. His latest publications include, *Simple, Powerful Strategies for Student Centered Learning* with George Jacobs and Michael Power *(*2016), and *Cooperative Learning in Language Education* (2019) with George Jacobs.

Pragasit Sitthitikul, is an Associate Professor at the Language Institute, Thammasat University in Bangkok, Thailand. He earned a doctorate in Language and Literacy Studies, with a concentration in second language reading processes, at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA. His areas of interest include Second Language Literacy, Cognitive and Sociocultural Factors in Second Language Learning, and Intercultural Issues in Second Language Learning.

Ruanni Tupas lectures in Sociolinguistics in Education at the Centre for Applied Linguistics, Institute of Education, University College London. He has taught in the University of the Philippines, Virginia Polytechnic University and State University, National University of Singapore, and the National Institute of Education, Singapore. He is an Associate Editor of the International Journal of the Sociology of Language and is on the editorial boards of several journals such *Language Teaching, The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, and *TEFLIN Journal*. He is sole editor of *Unequal Englishes: The Politics of Englishes Today* (2015), and co-editor of *Why English?: Confronting the Hydra* (with Bunce, Phillipson, and Rapatahana, 2016) and *Language, Education and Nation-Building: Assimilation and Shift in Southeast Asia* (with Sercombe, 2014).

Yanty Wirza is an Assistant Professor at the English Education Study Program, Universitas Pendidikan, Indonesia. She received her PhD from Ohio State University in 2017. Her research interests include L2 Identity, Literacy

Education, TESOL, Teacher Education and Professional Development, and Qualitative Research. She is currently involved in several research projects on English teaching and English teacher education and professional development. She has published her work on L2 identity and has been invited to give talks at several conferences. She has won academic scholarships and awards for her community service.

Preface

Bernard Spolsky

In the summer of 2002, Dr. Hyo Woong Lee, immediate past-president of the Korea Association of Teachers of English (KATE), founded The Asian Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (AsiaTEFL) as a way of realizing a 30-year career goal he had held as an English language teaching (ELT) practitioner and researcher. AsiaTEFL started its activities with a series of conferences and a journal. Since 2007, it has annually published collections of major invited papers written by leading scholars nominated by the national member organizations. For the first few years, these were published by the Association; since 2012, except in 2014 when a volume was published by Cambridge Scholars Publishing, they have been published in the Routledge Critical Studies in Asian Education. This volume continues this association.

As I write this Preface in the middle of February 2020, this productive tradition is under threat. The 18th Annual AsiaTEFL Conference is scheduled for June in South Korea, but we cannot predict whether it will take place: COVID-19 has closed schools, universities, and factories in China and other East Asian countries, and international airlines, including American, Delta, United, Lufthansa, and British Airways, have canceled flights to China; Cathay Pacific has cancelled half its flights. The epidemic is spreading, with European countries and the USA also reporting cases and deaths. No one is predicting how long it will last, and international conferences planned for June are being postponed.

But fortunately, preparation of this volume does not require travel. The papers have already been presented, and the editing process has been through email. The chapters in the book present current perspectives and research by a select group of featured speakers from the 17th AsiaTEFL International Conference held in June, 2019 in Bangkok, Thailand. They were tasked with discussing the conference theme "ELT for Glocal Synergies across Disciplines and Multilingual Ambiences". To avoid the perhaps puzzling coinage, the title of the book is *Localizing Global English: Asian Perspectives and Practices*. It thus recognizes the growing concern over the potential conflict between global and local processes, something that applies not just to language education, but to climate change and major pandemics like COVID-19, the name that the World Health Organization has started to use for the disease.

This of course leads us to think about the effects on local policies (by which we mean regional, national, or even smaller communities) of the growing importance

of world languages and in particular of English. The spread and growing significance of English language teaching was noticeable in the period after the Second World War, with the formation of US-sponsored International Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) in 1966 and, a year later, of the British-sponsored International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (IATEFL), two international organizations for teachers of English. This happened at much the same time as an ethnic movement which called for recognition of the significance of heritage and minority languages, setting up a conflict between economic and identity values for language. The tension continues; even in the People's Republic of China where the main direction of language policy is the diffusion of Mandarin as Putonghua, the common language, there is some support for topolects like Cantonese and Shanghainese and for selected minority varieties. AsiaTEFL, as the E signals, is concerned with increasing the proficiency of Asians in the world language, but as the theme of the 17th annual conference proclaimed, it also recognizes the need for continued loyalty to national and local concerns. The aim is not a shift to English, but an expansion of individual and community repertoires to add English.

It claims a role for English not just as a foreign language for communication with those for whom it is the mother tongue, but also as a way of communicating with others for whom it is an additional language. It follows the recognition of World Englishes, based on the three circle model proposed by the Asian scholar, Braj Kachru. The term "glocal English" was used by another Asian scholar, Anne Pakir, at a conference in honor of the late Professor Kachru, and defined there as "global yet rooted in the local contexts of its users". Pakir posited that "English will acquire a new status as a global language supporting local users of English in the Outer and Expanding Circles and their specific uses for the language". Pakir raises a question that this book helps answer: "What will be the impact of English-knowing bilingualism on the ELT profession?" (Pakir, 1997).

The contributors to this volume continue to represent the best scholarship in the field. They include past presidents of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines, of the Korean Association of Teachers of English, and of Korea TESOL, and they have published extensively in the field of English language teaching, edited and contributed to many books and collections, and have written up to 30 papers each in the field. Their papers in this book consider issues raised by the contrasting pressures of global and local needs. It is noteworthy that many of the papers are written by two or three scholars, a sign showing the collaboration needed in scholarship.

Paul McBride asks how local curricula should change in response to the growing recognition of English as a lingua franca. Ruanni Tupas and Alejandro S. Bernardo note the development of World Englishes, and are interested in how this should be applied to individual users of the language. Oryang Kwon criticizes current Asian approaches to teaching English such the Grammar-Translation Method, and the approach to language as a subject rather than as a means of communication. Ruanni Tupas and Willy A Renandya tackle the problem of diversity of learners, and argue that multilingualism suggests we should be

teaching Unequal rather than Standard English. Malinee Prapinwong and Pragasit Sitthitkul call for the import of Intercultural Communicative Competence into English language teaching in Thailand. Julia Chen, Christy Chan, and Angela Ng report on three universities that have initiated English across the Curriculum programs that build on cooperation between teachers of English and other subjects. Raja Nor Safinas Raja Harun describes a five year experimental English teacher education program in Malaysia and suggests how it can be improved. Yanty Wirza describes and recommends literacy sponsorship practices in Indonesia. Le Pham Hoai Huong argues for the application of Vygotskyan mediation practices to English language teaching.

What this shows is a healthy concern about current practices, and suggests improvements in English language teaching on the basis of the recognition of the role of English in countries where it is not the first language. English in Asia (as in much of the world) is no longer a foreign language but part of the expanding linguistic repertoires of individuals and communities.

Reference

Pakir, A. (1997). *English: Multiforms, multimedia, multidisciplines.* Paper presented at the Three circles of English: A conference in honor of Professor Braj Kachru, National University of Singapore.

Introduction

Hikyoung Lee

The ever-increasing status and role of English in Asia underscores the notion of English as a lingua franca (ELF) and makes clear that English is used not only for non-native speakers to communicate with native speakers but also for interaction among non-native speakers (Kirkpatrick 2009; Jenkins, 2006; Seidlhofer, 2005). It also draws attention to the heightening of perceptions that English can be "owned" by non-native speakers (Higgins, 2003; Norton, 2012) and used in particular regions, such as Asia, to foster communication, enhance similarities, and respect differences. Under these circumstances, newly emerging issues as well as traditional topics in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) need to be (re-)examined, especially in terms of how synergy can be achieved across similar yet different contexts and what ambiences these multilingual contexts entail.

This book follows in the tradition of publishing timely and noteworthy research on English Language Teaching (ELT) and learning issues in Asia by The Asian Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (AsiaTEFL). At its annual international conferences, renowned scholars from a diverse array of Asian countries are nominated to give a featured talk on a topic of high interest. These scholars have authored chapters that have led to the publication of nine books dealing with ELT practices across the spectrum. The chapters in this book present current perspectives and research by a sampling of the featured speakers from the 17th AsiaTEFL International Conference held in June, 2019 in Bangkok, Thailand. The book is, thus, aligned with the conference theme, "ELT for Glocal Synergies across Disciplines and Multilingual Ambiences".

The key aim of this book is to showcase the synergies and ambiences in TESOL through diverse perspectives and practices that are not readily found in journals or other similar books. As the title, *Localizing Global English: Asian Perspectives and Practices*, suggests, local and global processes can and do co-exist and complement each other. The title also underscores that Asia is the undisputed epicenter of local global English in today's world (Bolton, 2008; Kirkpatrick, 2012; Nunan, 2003). All of the chapters are original works by authors who are authoritative researchers and practitioners. Additionally, the present book has a clear focus on the teaching and learning of English across Asia, where recent research in TESOL is burgeoning. The book is also at once timely and timeless in terms of the range of topics it

addresses and their implications for the future. The present book starts with critical perspectives on English language and teaching in Asia and then moves on to actual practice, so readers can follow a trajectory that leads to pedagogical implications.

The present book is comprised of nine chapters. These chapters are divided into two parts, perspectives and practices, that together holistically present a current snapshot of English language learning and teaching in Asia. The first part presents critical perspectives on ELF. In Chapter One, Paul McBride looks closely at English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and its pedagogical and ideological implications and the need to break free from "Western TESOL" practices which are not compatible with EFL contexts. His critical lens is directed toward EFL needs in the Asian curriculum by examining latent essentialism, reductionism, and exclusion. He challenges the status quo and calls for gradual change by outlining specific measures that EFL teachers can take to customize English learning for their students. Chapter Two by Ruanni Tupas and Alejandro S. Bernardo offers a view of knowledge construction in World Englishes (WE) that has not been previously considered. It sets out to document research threads and how they developed in the field of WE. While recognizing the importance of past research, they claim that now is the time to look at the individual and their lived experiences as legitimate users of English in daily life. This chapter provides insight into the future of the field through recommendations for expanding the methodological reach of current WE research. In Chapter Three, Oryang Kwon expands the field of TESOL by coining the term "Tesology" as a cover term to encompass all the different disciplines related to TESOL, including learning, testing, materials and so forth. This novel approach notes with regret that English teaching in Asia is still enamored of the Grammar-Translation Method and proposes that English learning should no longer be considered subject matter but rather full-fledged language learning. Chapter Four starts with the contemporary implications of globalization on the use of English. Ruanni Tupas and Willy A. Renandya rightfully claim that English teaching must be reconceptualized and that a multilingual English should be taught in classrooms. They call for attitudinal change, recognizing the significance of identity to facilitate English learning. Their cogent argument attempts to rectify the inequality, or rather in their terms, the unequal Englishes, that still pervades English teaching and learning in localized contexts today.

Part Two of the book deals with practice and how the teaching of English is actually played out in Asian contexts. In Chapter Five, Malinee Prapinwong and Pragasit Sitthitkul discuss the role of Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) in English teaching in Thailand. They first start off with a review of ICC and Byram (2012)'s ICC model and how they have been implemented in Thai education. This look into Thai contexts offers a critical review of policy, research, and classroom practices. The authors also provide practical guidelines for ICC implementation in wider EFL contexts. Chapter Six by Julia Chen, Christy Chan, and Angela Ng document a Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) collaborative program among Hong Kong Polytechnic University, City University of Hong Kong, and Hong Kong Baptist University. This detailed chapter on practice

illustrates not only the individual efforts of each university but also the synergy that the three universities achieved through the use of a mobile app among other endeavors. In Chapter Seven, Raja Nor Safinas Raja Harun describes a teacher preparation program in Malaysia and the role of the 3Es (engages, empower, and emancipates) curriculum framework for teachers. The results described in this chapter come from an extensive, government-funded, five-year research project on developing a teacher education model for the Malaysian EFL context. The student teachers' learning experience provide robust support for the use of a transformative pedagogy. Next, Yanty Wirza in Chapter Eight presents the results of an in-depth study of graduate students and their narratives about learning and using English in the local Indonesian context. As graduate students are a relatively less-studied population, this chapter provides valuable insight into how multifaceted literacy sponsorship and ideologies can affect Indonesian EFL leaners' identity formation. Their voices ring loud in this chapter. Lastly, in Chapter Nine, Le Pham Hoai Huong revisits a previous study of EFL university students in Vietnam and reviews other studies to shed new light on how verbal interaction used as mediation facilitates English learning. The chapter goes on to re-examine the mediational role of teachers, peers, and artifacts and how Vygotsky (1978)'s "Zone of Proximal Development" can be harnessed in EFL classrooms.

All in all, this book contributes diverse perspectives and conveys the unified desire of scholars and practitioners in Asia to further advance English language teaching and learning, a discipline which has the potential to grow more in Asia, considering the sheer number of non-native speakers of English and continued interest in English in this region. This book serves as not only a current slice of time but also a tome which looks into the future of Asia and TESOL. As most of the chapters are written by non-native speakers of English, the English varieties used are diverse, which in turn reflects the reality of English used and owned in today's world.

References

Bolton, K. (2008). English in Asia, Asian Englishes, and the issue of proficiency. *English Today*, 24(2), 3–12.

Byram, M. (2012). Conceptualizing intercultural (communicative) competence and intercultural citizenship. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 85–97). New York: Routledge.

Higgins, C. (2003). Ownership of English in the outer circle: An alternative to the NS-NNS dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 615–644.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 157–181.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2009). *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kirkpatrick A. (2012) English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education. In A. Kirkpatrick, & R. Sussex (Eds.), *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education* (Multilingual Education, Vol. 1) (pp. 29–44). Dordrecht: Springer.

Norton, B. (2012). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 409–429.

Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 589–613.

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

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.), *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (pp. 19–120). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Part 1

Perspectives

1 Considering English teaching in the context of ELF

Paul McBride

The pervasive use of English as a lingua franca is not widely reflected in classroom practice (Widdowson, 2016), not least because, as Jenkins (2014) explains, there is an "uncritical tendency … to persist in traditional ways of thinking about English that do not take account of the major structural changes in the use and users of English around the globe" (p. 18). Correctness and appropriateness of English language teaching, testing, and materials tend to be driven largely by the standards of native speaking communities (Jenkins, 2012), despite the restricted relevance of such standards to vast numbers of people (Seidlhofer, 2011). Curricular choices tend to be made on the basis of norms of English as it is used in communities of English native speakers with little regard for the present or future communication context students may experience (Jenkins, 2012, p. 487).

Presented in this chapter are aspects of ELF and language teaching which may be useful as teachers and administrators consider implications of ELF in their contexts. The first is understanding ELF and reflecting on pedagogical implications. It is not uncommon in my experience to spend considerable time locating and reading through resources which present the various aspects of ELF which require synthesizing. One excellent resource is Chapter 8 of *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca* (Seidlhofer, 2011), and another is an article "What is ELF? Introductory Questions and Answers for ELT Professionals" by Ishikawa and Jenkins (2019). In the following section I present aspects of English as lingua franca which I have found helpful for teachers to be aware of.

The second aspect I believe teachers need to consider is ideology in curriculum. Embedded within English-speaking Western Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) (Holliday, 2005), hereafter referred to as "Western TESOL", are practices which are incompatible with ELF contexts (Seidlhofer, 2011; Jenkins, 2014; Toh, 2016b). Essentialism, reductionism, and exclusion (Oda & Toh, 2018), present and yet tending to be hidden in everyday teaching situations, may obstruct transition to ELF-aware teaching practices. Resistance to change among English language teachers is heightened by factors enumerated by Toh (2016b): Western TESOL's naturalized essentialisms, evidenced by deficit notions of pedagogy; adherence to exportable curricula; inattentiveness to local sociocultural aspects of education; reductionism associated with discrete and bounded views of language and culture, manifested in prolific drills and routines;

and exclusion, exemplified by assumptions about the superiority of native versions of English. Writing in academia is examined in section two, where the taken-for-granted rhetorical norms of language in higher education are scrutinized in accordance with Turner's approach, as "part of wider cultural practices and the effects of social and political power, rather than (an) independent codification of rules which must be adhered to" (2011, p. 2).

The final aspect of ELF and language teaching to be considered is how teachers might change classroom practices in response to ELF, a recently developing area of ELF research. According to Seidlhofer (2011):

> What really matters is that the language should engage the learners' reality and activate the learning process. Any kind of language that is taught in order to achieve this effect is appropriate, and this will always be a matter of local decision.
>
> (p. 198)

Strikingly, Seidlhofer (2004) characterizes "typical 'errors' that most English teachers would consider in urgent need of correction and remediation", as "generally unproblematic and no obstacle to communicative success" even though they are allocated considerable time and effort in English lessons (p. 220).

Understanding EFL and considering pedagogical implications

Presented in this section are aspects of ELF which I have found useful for teachers and learners to understand as they make decisions about how they might respond to its widespread use. It can be helpful to introduce the concept of ELF by telling the story of how Jennifer Jenkins first became aware of ELF in London during the 1980s, teaching students from a range of backgrounds according to the conventions of native English. She noticed that "although they generally 'learnt' the rules they were taught, these students tended not to use them in natural(istic) conversation" (Jenkins, 2012, p. 487) and that "in most cases, their use of these alternative forms did not impede their mutual understanding" (p. 488).

Seidlhofer (2011) points out that regardless of the prestigious status of native versions of English, "it needs to be recognized that they are indeed only versions, historically shaped to suit the social and communicative requirements of certain communities and so necessarily of restricted relevance to other users of the language with very different needs and purposes" (p. 148).

Another useful aid to understanding ELF is an analogy offered by Sampson (2007):

> The grammatical possibilities of a language are like a network of paths in open grassland. There are a number of heavily used, wide and well-beaten tracks. Other, less popular routes are narrower, …but there are no fences anywhere preventing any particular route being used.
>
> (pp. 10–11)

Discussing Sampson's analogy and differences of opinion between educated native speakers about acceptable grammar variation within Standard English, Widdowson (2012), remarks that determining which sequences are grammatical and which are not is, "to say the least … a difficult thing to do" (p. 10) and that "a moment's reflection makes it obvious that the concept of the educated native speaker is simply an idealized construct, a convenient abstraction" (p. 13). Descriptions of standard language in grammar books and dictionaries, he continues, rather than being "empirically substantiated accounts of the actual language", essentially represent "versions of conventionalized constructs that are sanctioned by linguistic tradition" (p. 13).

In lingua franca communication, language appropriate for specific contexts is important. On the topic of adaptation (Widdowson, 2015) notes:

> So when, as with ELF use, the language is required to relate to social and personal needs other than those served by NS [native speaker] English, it will naturally get adapted in various ways that are functionally appropriate to different contexts and purposes.
>
> (p. 368)

The subject of language variability is also of interest in comprehending another important distinction which arises in understanding ELF. Widdowson (2015) comments on the distinction between ELF and World Englishes (WE), writing in the *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* that as ELF is studied, variability is considered "not in terms of variety at all but as the variable use of English as intercommunity communication, as communication across communities" (p. 362). After commenting that World Englishes scholars and sociolinguists tend to deny the validity of ELF research, he explains that WE adheres to sociolinguistic tradition by emphasizing the description of language varieties, being concerned mainly with associations between language and community, whereas ELF research is primarily concerned with associations between language and communication, being an inquiry into the variable use of language to accomplish intelligible communication (p. 363). Seidlhofer (2017) reiterates the distinction, observing that ELF is said not to be a variety of English because it is used fluidly and irregularly, and cannot be characterized as a particular system, adding that ELF may therefore not be taken seriously as an object of socio-linguistic inquiry (p. 10).

Significantly, non-native ELF users experience English not by "primary socialization whereby language, culture, and social identity are naturally and inseparably interconnected" as native speakers do, but rather "as an extension of a language resource they already have, acquired through secondary socialization and separated from these primary and inherent connections with culture and identity" (Widdowson, 2012, pp. 18–19).

A summary of conceptual differences between English as a foreign language (EFL) and ELF (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 18), although idealized and simplified according to the author, indicates that lingua cultural norms associated with lingua franca communication are ad hoc and negotiated, in contrast with foreign language lingua cultural norms which are preexisting and reaffirmed. Lingua franca

objectives, according to the summary, include intelligibility and communication in non-native speaker interactions or in mixed interactions between non-native speakers and native speakers, in contrast with foreign language objectives which are said to be integration and membership of a native speaking community. Further, lingua franca processes involve accommodation and adaptation, whereas foreign language objectives involve imitation and adoption.

Fundamental in understanding ELF is the notion that "forms and grammars that deviate from the 'system' as defined by linguists or native speakers are still communicative" (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 80). A related concept is that, "it is … lingua franca English rather than native academic English that characterizes the mainstream of academic English use" (Jenkins, Cogo, & Dewey, 2011, p. 300). The English as a Lingua Franca in the Academia (ELFA) corpus (WrEFLA, 2015) allows insights into English use "in academic lingua franca settings, in its own right rather than against some 'standard' academic English predicated on the way native English academics, a tiny minority of global academia, choose to speak (and write)" (Jenkins et al., 2011, p. 300).

Seidlhofer (2011) holds the view that, "what is learnt of English does not, and cannot, correspond with the language that is currently taught and … the specification of NS competence as the primary objective has to be abandoned", proposing instead that the purpose of teaching should become "the development of a capability for effective use which involves the process of exploiting whatever linguistic resources are available, no matter how formally 'defective'" (p.197). Insistence that learners conform exclusively to native speaker constructs, she says, "can only inhibit the development of this capability" (p. 189). This is not to suggest that native speaker models are without pedagogical worth. They are valuable, according to (Björkman, 2013, p. 196) especially if learners are likely to communicate with native speakers. Nevertheless, Walker (2010) states that, "using ELF-informed approaches in pronunciation is not the same as lowering standards, but implies a change to "different, more achievable standards" (p. 51), and Cogo and Dewey (2012) comment that "deciding what constitutes an error is not only a complex issue, it is possibly not an ELF-compatible way of thinking about language" (p. 78).

Having considered concepts helpful in understanding ELF: That successful communication for the needs of the majority of users of English is not confined to the parameters of native English use, that ELF involves a focus on language use in diverse and variable contexts rather than a focus on language form according to historically sanctioned constructs of native speakers, and that consequently teachers might consider corresponding shifts in emphasis, it is relevant to investigate some sources of inertia in curricula change.

Scrutinizing ideology in curriculum

Culturally embedded values inhibit curricular change in response to ELF whether ELF-aware change is being sought or not. The purpose in examining some of the ideological influences on English Language Teaching (ELT) curricula in this section is to focus on issues which may enable a more critical orientation and a basis

from which to make informed decisions about curricular change in response to ELF use and research.

Toh (2016b) remarks that, "maintaining fidelity to ELF thinking can prove difficult given the ideologies that time and again try to undermine its transformative and humanizing values" (p. 356). It is useful, for example, for teachers to examine the social and cultural power of scientific rationality which, according to Turner (2011), shaped modern academic writing. Turner's account probes rhetorical norms of language in higher education as "part of wider cultural practices and the effects of social and political power, rather than as an independent codification of rules which must be adhered to" (2011, p. 2). The reality is that English is a "heterogeneous language with a plural grammatical system and norms" (Canagarajah, 2006, p. 211).

The values associated with power and knowledge are maintained and perpetuated at the points of their dissemination (Foucault, 1980, p. 98). In their classrooms, teachers may be implicated as points of dissemination, or agents, often in ways not immediately visible, in maintaining and perpetuating normalizing world views and practices. Despite reluctance among English language teachers to reflect the diverse and variable nature of ELF interaction in classroom contexts (Jenkins, 2014; Seidlhofer, 2011) a deliberate rethinking (Dewey 2012, p. 163) and a transformation of deeply held convictions (Sifakis, 2014) are advocated. Turner (2011) invites teachers, as reflexive practitioners, to "recognize their position as 'subjects' of culturally constructed value systems, in their turn positioning their students within the same value system or possibly choosing not to" (pp. 24–25).

Social theory of literacy

When literacy is treated as social practice the interconnected nature of language, literacy and power relations becomes more visible than when literacy is conceived of as having merely technical dimensions (Barton, 2007; Lillis, 2013; Toh, 2016a). Barton's (2007) social theory approach to literacy as contextualized social practice complements ELF-aware orientations, and contrasts with a view of literacy as discrete technical skills. In pointing out the need to position writing in its cultural, social, and historical contexts, inseparable from considerations of diversity and the practices of institutions, Toh (2016b) cautions against conceptual reductionism resulting from behaviorist epistemologies (p. 361). Rather, he argues, "as a paradigm with a critical orientation, ELF needs to be identified with approaches that interrogate dominant hegemonies, while enabling teachers to disencumber their practice from the trappings and circumscription of Western TESOL" (p. 362). Yamada (2014) concludes that a lack of understanding of the diversity of English "possibly reinforces prejudice and discrimination about English speakers and hinders teachers and students from considering issues of social justice" (p. 123).

Historical influences on Western TESOL

The practices cautioned against in the previous section, being shaped by Western TESOL, tend to be regarded as normal and ideologically neutral (Toh, 2016a,

p. 356). The historical perspective presented in this section is intended to manifest some ideological processes which ELF-aware pedagogy might mitigate against.

In referring to the influence of scientific rationality on modern academic writing in her examination of the rhetorical norms of language in higher education, Turner (2011) comments:

> The social and cultural power accruing to scientific rationality in the wake of its success in the European political, cultural and economic ethos of the 17th and early 18th centuries meant that its scientists' preferred ways of using language, in effect the inscription of the values of their scientific culture, became rhetorical values. Those values are now the taken for granted rhetorical norms deemed appropriate for academic writing.
>
> (p. 6)

Investigating knowledge production practices in the 17th century, she notes that scientists of the time produced knowledge by observation and that seeing clearly became epistemologically important to verify that scientific claims were true and therefore constituted new knowledge. The powerful Royal Society of London was the body responsible to make judgments about whether scientific claims were true, and Turner (2011) presents arguments to demonstrate that Sir Isaac Newton altered the way he wrote about his experimental results, making them appear as facts rather than the result of speculation and the manipulation of scientific variables, and mapping out his arguments so they were authoritative. Newton, wanting to portray his experiments as valid, and to convince readers of the reliability of the reasoning process he used, invoked deductive logic and incontrovertible geometric proofs to give greater authority to his argument (Turner, 2011, p. 62). Turner (2011) is particularly interested in the way the values of scientific rationality were "rhetorically inscribed" (p. 69), a phenomenon which she sees as an effect of the process of power/knowledge, described by Foucault (1980) as a way of governing or regulating under which the origin of the power and knowledge are not visible, but their values are maintained at the points of their dissemination, a process constituting a "discourse of truth" (Foucault, 1980, p. 93) operating effectively by technologies which regulate or discipline.

Foucault (1977) had previously used a type of prison building as a metaphor in his work on the social history of punishment and prison. From the structure, Jeremy Bentham's *panopticon*, prisoners may be watched at any time. Turner (2011) explains that the panopticon metaphor exemplifies the process of power/knowledge. Since prisoners, or anyone subject to any other type of control, know that at any time they are "subjected to a field of visibility" they assume "responsibility for the constraints of power", beginning to police themselves and changing their behavior to be compatible with expectations (Foucault, 1977, p. 11). The effect of the panopticon was:

> To induce in the inmate a state of consciousness and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power. So to arrange things that the

> surveillance is permanent in its effects even if it is discontinuous in its action; that the perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary; that this architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it; in short, that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they themselves are the bearers.
>
> (Foucault, 1977, p. 10)

Inferring similarities between the rhetorical practice of academic writing and the techniques of surveillance discussed by Foucault, Tuner (2011) characterizes academic writing as being "policed by a visibilizing economy of rationality, language and knowledge" (p. 7). In claiming that academic language has been disciplined by the demands of rationality and knowledge since the period of the European Enlightenment, she compares it with the human body which, in the case of prisoners is disciplined by surveillance:

> The "body" of written language is disciplined by culturally embedded rhetorical values, including the rigors of an explicit step-by-step deductive logic, conceptual precision, and clear and concise representation, in other words, a visibilizing rhetorical technology of clarity, concision and brevity.
>
> (p. 71)

The conduit metaphor

The importance of discovering new knowledge during the 17th and 18th centuries coincided with a concern that language might interfere in the process of communicating knowledge accurately (Turner, 2011, pp. 54–55), and so "scientific rationality, in privileging knowledge, conceptualized the communication of knowledge as a conduit" (p. 56). In 1689, the philosopher Locke explicitly referred to language as the "great Conduit" (Locke, 1689, Book III. Chapter II Section 5).

As Turner points out, although the conduit model remains entrenched in English, as evidenced by expressions such as "put things into words", "get ideas across", and "transmit messages" (p. 57), linguists such as Holliday oppose the conceptualization of language as a conduit, preferring instead the social semiotic model which shows how language both reflects and shapes society.

The directness, security, and freedom from error in the transmission of ideas associated with the conduit model (Turner, 2011, p. 57) reflect an assumption that the language being "transmitted" accords with the customs and conventions of powerful groups in society, whether they be scientists of centuries past or contemporary native English speakers. In a later account Turner (2018) points out that the Lockean perspective, although no longer applicable in linguistic epistemology (p. 15) is institutionalized in higher education, clashing with the functionalist view that meaning is created in the process of language use. She observes that the tendency is for the clash to be ignored rather than opened to debate, resulting in the conduit model continuing to constitute and construct institutional

discourse (Turner, 2018, pp. 5–6). Rather than regarding the successful communication of knowledge as the mechanistically unidirectional expression of clearly defined ideas as the conduit model would construct it, she notes that the process of attempting to express ideas in writing may actually clarify the ideas in the mind of the writer (Turner, 2018 p. 23).

Turner's (2011) account of the embeddedness of ways of thinking and doing things as "an effect of power working overtime, and no longer visible as such" (p. 110) and her insight into remedial discourses associated with language in academic settings as regulatory sustainers of a "rhetorical power/knowledge" (p. 88) are complemented by Holliday's description (2005, p. 51) of a subtle form of control in Western TESOL resembling the corrective training studied by Foucault, maintained in part by teacher control and hidden beneath an apparent democracy. Holliday (2005, pp. 53–54) comments on the ritualistic nature of educational routines (beyond the element of ritual in all classrooms which is valuable for cohesion and identity) as being influential to the extent that even if a student teacher is experiencing difficulty with a lesson, the students, knowing the expectations, will tend to compensate.

The role of educational institutions

Schools not only control people but play a role in controlling meaning by preserving and distributing knowledge of a kind regarded as legitimate: The knowledge which everyone should have (Apple, 2004). For the purposes of this discussion, legitimate knowledge is represented by varieties of English used by communities of native speakers.

Although curriculum design is intrinsically moral and political, the commonsense view in education seems rather to be that curricular decisions are perceived as technical problems requiring instrumental approaches informed by technical experts (Apple, 2004, p. 104). Such perceptions are attributed by Giroux (2014, p. 198) to neoliberal capitalism's "ever-expanding support for (a culture in which) market-driven values and relations (act) as the template for judging all aspects of social life". There is a tendency for English language teachers to comply uncritically with market-driven practices in their use of commercially produced textbooks and tests, believing their actions to be ideologically neutral (Toh, 2016a).

English only *discourse*

Educational institutions may therefore uncritically promote *English only* discourse. Toh (2016b), drawing on Holliday's characterization of Western TESOL characterizes *English only* discourse as promoting the monolingual learning of English, as disapproving of first language use in ELT, and as constituting a hegemonic regime stemming from "colonial and imperialistic discourses" (p. 358), exemplified by a historical insistence that immigrants to America be patriotically loyal to

English. Adherence to *English only* may involve a similar kind of protectionism and insularity, incompatible with ELF communication (Toh, 2016a).

Critical thinking and critical literacy

Teachers can be explicit about the ideological function of language so that learners become consciously aware of it (Fairclough, 1989). Critical literacy, according to Luke (2013), is one of the few educational innovations not sourced from the ubiquitous Eurocentric educational traditions of the English-speaking West, having its origin in revolutionary movements in countries like Brazil and Argentina, and the work of people like Paulo Freire, which has a strong emphasis on critiquing dominant ideologies. Luke (2013) notes that critical literacy and critical thinking, although having different lineages and emphases, meet practically in classrooms.

Critical literacy may involve learners engaging with texts, discourses, and modes of information, attending to the ways texts function ideologically and hegemonically, and analyzing not only how texts work, but also how texts "might be manipulated otherwise by authors and readers" (Luke & Dooley, 2011 p. 8). Some attempts to have students attend to ideological messages contained in television advertisements are outlined in the following section.

Taking a critical approach to language learning involves situating languages, discourses, texts, authors, and readers culturally and historically, bringing attention to their "natural" unquestioned status, and understanding how it is possible to construct, deconstruct, and reconstruct texts and discourses in order to "represent, contest and, indeed, transform material, social and semiotic relations" (Luke & Dooley, 2011, p. 1).

Native English speaker custodianship of English

Two notions associated with Western TESOL are called into question by ELF research: That native speakers of English have ownership of English and that they have custodianship over the way it is used. Widdowson (1994) asserts that because English is an international language it cannot be subject to the custody of any nation, and that to take custody of the language would be to restrict its development, subverting its international status (p. 385). He argues "as soon as you accept that English serves the communicative and communal needs of different communities, it follows logically that it must be diverse" (1994, p. 385). Undermining standard English, a symbol expressive of the values of native speaking communities, is perceived as undermining the security of the community and its institutions to the extent that a decaying of standards in grammar is associated with an undermining of what it stands for: The security of the community and its institutions (p. 381).

Some members of the international scientific community, concerned about excluding the ideas of scientists whose writing is not expressed according to conventions of native English speakers, argue that scientists whose first language is not English can write effective manuscripts, and that during editorial processes their

science should be evaluated rather than their degree of conformity to native norms (Drubin & Kellogg, 2012).

Just as scientists might be expected to be concerned primarily with scientific knowledge, so teachers might be expected to be concerned primarily with learning. Nevertheless, teachers tend to test what is taught rather than what is learned, assuming learning to be reactive rather than proactive (Widdowson, 2019, p. 4). When learners continually do not meet the expectation to conform to the native English taught, Widdowson asserts, teachers penalize the learners, attributing the "failure" to them, whereas it would be more reasonable to attribute it to teachers who, by specifying unrealistic objectives, have failed to have their learners obtain the objective (p. 4).

Teachers could therefore consider Widdowson's position (2019), that the E in TESOL should be "based on how English is actually used by speakers of other languages" and the T in TESOL should be "process oriented whereby teachers give reactive support to what learners actually do rather than focus on what they **ought** to be doing (p. 5) (emphasis original).

Perspectives on essentialism, reductionism, and exclusion delineated in this section lend support to Wang's conclusion that teachers, rather than working towards satisfying the endeavors of learners to conform with native norms, should give critical thought to such aspirations (2013, p. 278).

Conceptualizing and enacting curricular

The main purpose of the previous section was to examine ideology which may undermine liberating change in classroom practices. Outlined in this section are some measures for teachers to consider, and some of my attempts to integrate ELF-aware writing and speaking tasks by employing videos of ELF-related communication in the context of the complementary relationship between critical awareness and ELF-awareness.

Measures for teachers to consider

Assumptions held in the past by English language teachers have been challenged, and so need to be reconsidered in a critical way (Widdowson, 2019, p. 5). Teachers might consider approaching English as a subject to be taught by emphasizing diversity and variability, accommodation and adaptation, and by focusing on intelligible language which is effective for its purpose, and communication strategies to support mutual understanding. ELF-aware curricular change may imply "a respect for locality, heterogeneity and the potential for fresh meaning making" and a harnessing of student "histories, interests and motivations" to create meaning in new ways (Toh, 2016b, pp. 363–364).

Change can be liberating without being sudden and conspicuous. "Be wary of radical change" warned Professor Widdowson (2017), speaking about pedagogical implications of ELF at a Japan Association of College English Teachers seminar. His point was that he was not advocating a revolution, but rather speaking about

doing what good teachers have always done, for example, extending and developing textbook materials to meet the needs and interests of learners in their classes, and regarding text contained in textbooks as "just text".

Seidlhofer (2017), taking a similar view, does not suggest that teaching practices can or should undergo immediate radical change. Instead she points out (p. 20) that teachers can:

- reflect on giving emphasis to appropriate communication rather than operating by a principle of conformity to correctness,
- give priority to the formal features of the language in proportion to their communicative worth, and
- allow learners to cultivate a "communicative capability".

Björkman (2013, p. 192) suggests teachers could consider including:

- listening comprehension materials with diverse accents and examples of communication which does not proceed smoothly,
- authentic recordings as course materials, allowing learners to practice comprehension activities and note taking, and
- pragmatic strategies during speaking and listening activities such as role plays.

She puts forward the view that teaching time may be spent better in ways than emphasizing grammatical accuracy in cases where the grammatical structures may not be critical for communicating the message.

Some ELF-aware teaching practices

The classroom activities described in the following section were used with first year Japanese university students at beginning to pre-intermediate levels of proficiency. English was a compulsory subject for these English language education and tourism majors, who shared Japanese as a first language.

A process writing task

Students were asked to write 200 words for each of three drafts to be posted on a class blog to be discussed between teacher and learner. The instruction was:

Find two TV advertisements for one product. The advertisements should be from different countries. There should be some spoken or written English. Short is best (20–30 seconds). You may choose one country (not two) where English is often used as a first language.
Step 1: Paste the product name, country, and two URLs.
Step 2: Write the English words.
Step 3: Describe what happens in each advertisement.
Step 4: (Comment) Would this advertisement be successful in Japan? Why/Why not?

Step 5: Comment on any linguistic or cultural points you notice, for example words, body language, clothes, music…
Step 6: (Comment) Which obvious (everyday/direct/easily seen) "messages" can you see in the advertisements?
Step 7: (Comment) Which hidden (ideological/indirect/not easily seen) "messages" are there?

Time was allocated in each class to work with students individually, discussing whether what they had written accurately reflected the content of the advertisements, and how they could provide evidence for their opinions. In my experience, attending to form with the purpose of accurately reflecting the nature of the advertisement is engaging for both teacher and learner. Accuracy in such a context can be determined in relation to the advertisement's content and meaning rather than to the degree of conformity to the conventions of native speaking communities.

Early in the semester students had read *Piggybook* by Anthony Browne. This children's story is comprehensible to learners not yet at pre-intermediate level. It conveys an easily identifiable message about gender roles and housework. By paraphrasing the message in one sentence students were practicing an ELF-related strategy. Students compared and contrasted messages in *Piggybook* with messages in the opening scenes of the Academy Award winning movie *Fiddler on the Roof*, concluding that in both, "Housework is done by the mother". The difference was that tradition was portrayed as having provided balance and stability in the case of the community in *Fiddler on the Roof*, but as having led to inequality in the case of the mother being responsible for most of the housework.

A degree of reconstruction and recontextualization of sometimes hidden ideological messages was achieved by watching some advertisements which students had selected. An Indian confectionery advertisement shows young women in positions of authority controlling sophisticated video surveillance equipment at an airport, publicly announcing to a middle-aged male passenger that he is late for his flight, and cleverly ensuring his compliance despite his initial unresponsiveness. Another advertisement for a car in South Africa shows native English speaking children being creative with language, as ELF uses are. Claiming that the car their family owned was "tougherer" (meaning *tougher*) or even "tougherest" (meaning *the toughest*), the children also used pronunciation which is unlikely to be familiar to the majority of English speakers regardless of their first language background, saying "Oh yah?" (meaning *Oh yeah?)* and "Oh yah!" as they contested the point.

Feedback was intended to help the learners decide for themselves on more appropriate forms of language to use. The writers were not required to conform to the conventions of communities where English is used as a first language.

Other classroom practices

Various classroom practices were also employed. As Björkman (2013) suggests, learners were informed that they do not need to conform to native speaker accents to receive the highest grade in speaking tests. According to a message to students

from the director at the Center where I am employed, learners were not penalized for not imitating native speaker English perfectly.

Introducing the work of Ike (2010), who concluded that a high frequency of backchannel behavior among Japanese speakers of English reflects cultural identity, I explained that although the frequent use of head movements to acknowledge an interlocutor may accurately communicate a Japanese speaker's thoughts and feelings, the frequency of such acknowledgments may be subject to negotiation as a conversation between Japanese and Australian speakers progresses.

After spending so much lesson planning time searching for online videos containing ELF interactions, I instead decided to ask students to search as homework. They used the content of their videos to suggest questions for use in speaking activities. Japanese ice skater Yuzuru Hanyu, for example, spoke in English with a French interviewer about winning a competition, prompting the question, "Can you tell me about something you are good at?" Communication strategies used by the skater were identified as being similar to those recommended for emphasis in teaching by Kaur (2016), namely, "repeat, paraphrase and ask direct questions in contexts where mutual understanding is under threat" (p. 251).

Having decided that class time would be profitably spent viewing and discussing online videos I tended to "flip" classroom activities, assigning reading and listening activities formerly done in class to be completed as homework activities. Instead we watched the videos not only as an introduction to speaking activities, but also to practice thinking critically about the writing task. For example, the ideological message conveyed by one Malaysian advertisement for a confectionery product could be interpreted as reinforcing negative attitudes about women's participation in physical activity. The advertisement features young men skillfully playing soccer while a female goalkeeper is distracted by falling flower petals, her performance not meeting the expectations of the male players. When the men tell her that their grandmother could play better than her, she tells them to go and get their grandmother to play. The image is one of frailty, disinterest, and ineffectiveness.

At other times the classes watched a video featuring former United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon speaking with an American child "celebrity" to explain the purpose of World Humanitarian Day. Students rated each of the speakers according to how easy it was to understand the language used in the video in terms of speaking pace, intelligibility, pronunciation, intonation, and word choice. Most students found that the non-native speaker's language was easier to comprehend.

Another activity I have used successfully in similar contexts, was suggested by Professor Anna Mauranen (personal communication, October 24, 2016). The activity was to record, transcribe, and analyze an interview with a person who has a different linguistic background (see Appendix 1).

Finally, I have employed a teaching idea suggested during a lecture about the pedagogic implications of ELF by Professor Widdowson (2017): Students construct sentences from prompts which convey only the essential aspects of the information to be communicated, for example, a noun such as *exercise* and a verb such as *do* in order to produce a question such as, "What kind of exercise do you like to do?" This idea forms the basis of speaking test prompt cards for my current classes.

Conclusion

Teachers and administrators contemplating a response to widespread ELF use might begin by considering how the needs and purposes of most users of English are different from those who use English as a first language. Teachers might reflect on their role in preserving, distributing, and legitimizing English as a native language as proper and correct regardless of communicative context, and reducing complex educational issues to merely technical dimensions. With the critical orientation of ELF in mind, teachers may integrate ELF into English language teaching, possibly exploring ideological functions of language, engaging learners by evaluating texts to show how texts may otherwise be presented or manipulated.

Some measures for teachers to consider, and some writing and speaking tasks involving videos found online were outlined, and a conversation analysis activity was briefly described. ELF-aware pedagogy may involve emphasizing language diversity and variability, processes of linga-cultural accommodation and adaptation, and communication strategies to enable intelligible communication.

Rather than introducing radical change, teachers bearing in mind the locally situated nature of ELF could, for example, extend and develop textbook materials, and make it clear that students who do not perfectly imitate native speaker English will not be penalized. By reconsidering "one size fits all" approaches they may enable students to benefit from learning experiences more closely aligned with current and potential communication contexts.

Appendix 1

Conversation analysis task

Instructions

1 Find someone who has a different first language (NOT a native speaker of Japanese).
2 Select a conversation topic (for example, travel, pets, food, hobbies…).
3 Record a 10-minute conversation.
4 Select 3 minutes of the recording and write the words.
5 Write an analysis* of the words (about half a page of notes or sentences).
6 Present your analysis in a small group and answer any questions (minimum 3 minutes).
7 Give your written analysis and your transcription to your teacher.

**** Suggestions for your analysis:***

1 Comment on speaking pace.
2 Comment on how well you understood each other.
3 Comment on pronunciation differences.
4 Comment on intonation differences.
5 Comment on pauses (How many were there? How long were they? Why did they happen?).

6 Comment on who spoke more and why.
7 Comment on cultural influences (For example, did you use acknowledgments [backchannels] as you do with a Japanese first language speaker?).
8 Did you have any trouble with speaking, or listening? What did you do then?
9 How did each speaker change their speaking to better understand each other?
10 Did you find any other patterns in the conversation?
11 What was your impression of the conversation's content?
12 How did you feel?

References

Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.

Barton, D. (2007). *Literacy: an introduction to the ecology of written language*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Browne, A. (1986). *Piggybook*. New York: Knopf.

Björkman, B. (2013). *English as an academic lingua franca: An investigation of form and communicative effectiveness*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

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

Canagarajah, S. (2013). Theorizing a competence for translingual practice at the contact zone. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education* (pp. 88–112). New York: Routledge.

Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2012). *Analysing English as a lingua franca: A corpus-driven investigation*. London: Continuum.

Dewey, M. (2012). Towards a post-normative approach: Learning the pedagogy of ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1(1), 141–170.

Drubin, D. G., & Kellogg, D. R. (2012). English as the universal language of science: opportunities and challenges. *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, 23(8), 1399–1399.

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

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. (C. Gordon, Ed.). New York: Pantheon.

Giroux, H. A. (2014). *Neoliberalism's war on higher education*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Harris, R., & Taylor, T. J. (1997). *Landmarks in linguistic thought: The western tradition from Socrates to Saussure* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

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

Ike, S. (2010). Backchannel: a feature of Japanese English. In A. M. Stoke (Ed.), *JALT2009: The teaching-learning dialogue: An active mirror* (pp. 205–215). Tokyo: JALT.

Ishikawa, T., & Jenkins, J. (2019). What is ELF? Introductory questions and answers for ELT professionals. *Center for English as a Lingua Franca Journal*, 5, 1–10.

Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a Lingua Franca from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 486–494.

Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. Abingdon, Oxon.: Routledge.

Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 281–315.

Kaur, J. (2016). Pragmatic strategies for ELF communication. In K. Murata (Ed.), *Exploring ELF in Japanese academic and business contexts: Conceptualisation, research and pedagogic implications* (pp. 240–254). London: Routledge.

Lillis, T. (2013). *Sociolinguistics of writing*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Locke, J. (1975). *An essay concerning human understanding*. (P. Nidditch, Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1689)

Luke, A., & Dooley, K. T. (2011). Critical literacy and second language learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research on second language teaching and learning: Volume II* (pp. 856–868). New York: Routledge.

Luke, A. (2013). *Critical thinking and critical literacy* [video file]. Retrieved from https://vimeo.com/87212871

Oda, M., & Toh, G. (2018). Significant encounters and consequential eventualities: A joint narrative of collegiality marked by struggles against reductionism, essentialism and exclusion in ELT. In B. Yazan & N. Rudolph (Eds.), *Criticality, teacher identity, and (in)equity in English language teaching: Issues and implications* (pp. 219–216). New York: Springer.

Sampson, G. R. (2007). Grammar without grammaticality. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 3(1), 1–32.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). 10. Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209–239.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seidlhofer, B. (2017). English as a lingua franca: Why is it so controversial? In *JACET International Convention Selected Papers: Volume 5* (pp. 2–24). Tokyo: JACET.

Sifakis, N. C. (2014). ELF awareness as an opportunity for change: A transformative perspective for ESOL teacher education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 3(2), 317–335.

Toh, G. (2016a). *English as medium of instruction in Japanese higher education: Presumption, mirage or bluff?*Basel: Springer Nature Switzerland AG.

Toh, G. (2016b). Doing justice to an English as a lingua franca paradigm. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 5(2), 355–367.

Turner, J. (2011). *Language in the academy: Cultural reflexivity and intercultural dynamics*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Turner, J. (2018). *On writtenness: The cultural politics of academic writing*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Walker, R. (2010). *Teaching the pronunciation of English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wang, Y. (2013). Non-conformity to ENL norms: A perspective from Chinese English users. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2(2), 255–282.

Widdowson, H. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377–389.

Widdowson, H. (2012). ELF and the inconvenience of established concepts. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(1), 5–26.

Widdowson, H. (2015). ELF and the pragmatics of language variation. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(2), 359–372.

Widdowson, H. (2016). Competence and capability: Rethinking the subject English. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 12(1), 1–17.

Widdowson, H. (2017, August). *Lingua franca and lingual capability: The pedagogic implications of ELF*. Lecture given at the JACET (Japan Association of College English Teachers) 44th Summer Seminar, Tokyo, Japan.

Widdowson, H. (2019). TESOL: What does the acronym stand for? *JACET Journal*, 63, 1–6.

WrEFLA. (2015). *The corpus of written English as a lingua franca in academic settings*. Director: Anna Mauranen. Compilation manager: Ray Carey. Retrieved from: https://www.helsinki.fi/en/researchgroups/english-as-a-lingua-franca-in-academic-settings/

Yamada, M. (2014). *The role of English teaching in modern Japan: Diversity and multiculturalism through English language education in a globalized era*. London: Routledge.

2 Knowledge construction in World Englishes

Ruanni Tupas and Alejandro S. Bernardo

Introduction

No matter what one's position is in relation to *World Englishes* (WE), it cannot be denied that it has had a huge impact on the teaching, learning, and researching of English around the world. Practically all the sacred cows of English – using the famous words of Braj Kachru – have been exposed as disempowering, racist, and unjust. WE is broadly concerned with all dimensions of the pluralization and the pluricentricity of English, and at the core of its intellectual habitus is a resistive predisposition—resisting the dominance of the "native speaker", resisting the privileging of Inner Circle norms, resisting the monolingual bias of English language classrooms, and so on. "World Englishes", according to Bhatt (2001), "in its most ambitious interpretation, attempts to decolonize and democratize applied linguistics" (p. 544). WE was envisioned as a liberative project, not only as a way to legitimize the colonized people's culturally shaped uses of English, but also to open up textual spaces for the articulation and affirmation of indigenous (but hugely unrecognized) voices and identities of these users of the language. Informed by postcolonial theorizing, WE as an academic discipline has deployed linguistic and sociolinguistic tools and concepts to make an accounting of the complex nature of the pluralization and the pluricentricity of the English language. In other words, the resistive predisposition of WE was and is aided by descriptive linguistic tools which surface empirically proven patterns of language use and which prove that English is not one monolithic language but, in fact, a plurality of legitimate culturally shaped varieties—or even "languages" (McArthur, 1987).

The purpose of this chapter is to track the nature of knowledge construction in the field of WE—essentially the epistemology of the field—by examining the methodological pathways undertaken by WE research. It describes and explains the *language-focus* orientation of many of the studies in the field, and identifies gaps and fertile areas in research, which can be addressed by exploring ways to capture the voices of "those who live their conditions of existence" (Willis & Trondman, 2002, p. 395). It seeks to expand the methodological reach of the field by exploring the possibility of taking on a *user-as-individual* orientation as well in order to enrich the knowledge base of WE by reframing users of Englishes as primarily individual participants in the daily practice of social life. Because of the

dynamic nature of English language use today, and given that opposition to so-called "non-native" norms of English in English language classrooms remains very much alive and formidable, descriptions of all forms, meanings and uses of localized, nativized, and indigenized Englishes continue to be very important. However, WE as lived and experienced by the individual users themselves—and not only as abstract collectivities—requires greater attention. There is a need, according to Lok (2012), "to observe the individual" (p. 423), thus to complement inquiries into beliefs, attitudes, and ideologies of WE users, learners and teachers through interviews, focused group discussions, questionnaire surveys, and, lately, corpus-based and linguistic landscape studies. WE research could also observe and work with individual users of English as they negotiate their daily lives through the languages and language varieties they learn, teach, and speak.

A *language-focus* orientation: Linguistic performance in WE

According to Bhatt (2001), "[t]he linguistic checklist of innovations in the outer-circle varieties of English is endless" (p. 536). This is not surprising because the textual (and broadly, *language-focus*) orientation of WE can actually be traced back decades before it was consolidated as an academic field in the 1980s. By *language-focus* we mean a research orientation that locates the study of language—in our case, WE—at the center of inquiry, thus making an undeclared and unexamined presupposition that language and the issues surrounding it occupy a central role in the lives of individuals. In other words, in much of the work in WE, methods of research are deployed to understand, describe, explain and/or critique the world of Englishes, and not necessarily the world of individual users of Englishes. Even in research with a heavy sociolinguistic slant, the language-focus orientation is sustained as the studies focus on "the manipulation of linguistic resources in language use to generate new meanings" (Bhatt, 2001, p. 536). In other words, text-based linguistics and, more eminently, the use of corpora have dominated the world Englishes research scene. Now, it is supposedly possible to be able to tell what is putatively British English and what is not, what is Philippine English and how it is not American English. There can be more confidence in making these distinctions as there is empirical evidencing possible and, even more, it is now possible to talk about ongoing nativization and norm stabilization among what used to be postcolonial, standard-dependent English language users.

Methodologically speaking, a focus on the world of individual users of Englishes would have required a decentering of "Englishes" in the probing of individual lives although, in the process, it could bring "Englishes" back in if the data called for it and map out its role in the daily life of the individual. The key question to ask is how certain individuals live their daily lives (or simply what they do to carry out particular tasks of the day), rather than what is the role of WE in the lives of these individuals. According to Bolton, Graddol, and Meierkord (2011), in WE research "relatively little is known as regards the uses of English at the grass roots of communities outside various elite domains" (p. 473). They add that "one of the most obvious deficits in knowledge and expertise is to be found among first-

world scholars who may comment on issues of ideology and power with reference to 'center' versus 'periphery' problems in English worldwide with little first-hand knowledge of the societies and the sociolinguistic realities where educational development issues are important" (p. 475). We are in complete agreement with their statements, and in our view, one way to respond to this deficit is to reconfigure our theoretical and methodological lenses towards users of English in grassroots communities around the world as they navigate their lives in conditions of (im)possibilities (Tupas, 2006).

In his accounting of the Indianization of English, Kachru (1965) engaged in a "study of the interrelation of context and the language features" (p. 409) by deploying linguistic tools to surface the unique forms of the variety, and locating the emergence of such unique features in the sociocultural context of India (see also Kachru, 1961). While it is not enough to compare structural differences between English in India and L1 English varieties (e.g. British English) in terms of phonology and grammar alone, it is important to make an accounting of such differences for as long as they are understood as "culture-bound in the socio-cultural setting of India" (p. 410). In other words, while we see here that language structure is deemed inseparable from its sociocultural moorings, it is clear that linguistic description is necessary as a tool to provide evidence of Indianness in Indian English. Note here the focus on Indianness and Indian English, and not on individual Indian speakers themselves who, depending on their educational, socioeconomic, geographical and sociopolitical trajectories, would have had differentiated access to and experience with Indian English. The accounting of context-bound language features is undertaken "essentially from a linguistic standpoint following a sociologically oriented linguistic model" (p. 392). To put it in another way, the focus is on language or the linguistic text and its sociocultural and pragmatic functions as produced by cultural collectivities of English language users such as "Indian", "Filipino", and "Singaporean" speakers.

In practical methodological terms, collocational, lexical, and syntactic descriptions of Indian English (IE) are undertaken to surface the formal features of IE before cultural factors are identified to explain its structural markedness. Thus, to give one specific example, hybrid formations of IE are described either as open-set items (Indianisms from English and one or more Indian languages) or closed-system items (Indianisms formed out of indigenous suffixation of an English word) (p. 408). Such description is then explained through a wide range of possible sociolinguistic lenses (collectively referred to as *Indianization*), such as transfer of context, acculturation, and distance. Kachru refers to the surfacing of linguistic or structural features (formal level) and functions (contextual level) of English language use as part of the study of *linguistic performance* (p. 392, italics in the original). Such performance is undertaken collectively by users of IE as a cultural group whose unique ways of using English can be traced back to the sociocultural functions they play in Indian society. We argue that research on linguistic performance of this nature was—and continues to be—a defining feature of WE studies, thus investigating the nature of the pluralization of English in the field typically implicates a textual or linguistic dimension of the variety or varieties

being studied which would then be ascribed to particular groups of speakers (see Bolton, 2005). After all, how else does one argue for the legitimization of an English variety—Singlish, for example—except when one first surfaces its internally and independently formalized linguistic system? The language-focus orientation of WE in this sense is predictable, as attested to by the fact that the WE field is defined primarily as the study of "varieties of English used in diverse sociolinguistic contexts" (Bhatt, 2001, p. 527), or as "an umbrella label referring to a wide range of differing approaches to the description and analysis of English(es) worldwide" (Bolton, 2006).

Kachru, of course, was not alone in the early accounting and elaboration of the *linguistic performance* of English language users around the world (see Halliday, McIntosh, & Strevens, 1964; Strevens, 1964), or "the Englishes of those whose English is a second language, *second* having now become often generic in the sense of 'non-native'" (Gove, 1966, p. 125, italics in the original). Llamzon (1969), for example, deployed methods of formal linguistics to assert the emerging legitimacy of "Filipino English", and his book paved the way for a series of linguistic studies on Philippine English in the 1970s and 1980s, leading Tay (1991) to declare then that the "Philippines has perhaps produced the most comprehensive research on an indigenized variety of English" in Southeast Asia (p. 323). Early works on Philippine English which argue for its legitimacy as a variety of its own served as an academic platform for Gonzalez (1976) to claim for the *linguistic emancipation* of Filipinos because they have now "taken the language for their own creative uses, an emancipation which is bound to result in novelty in the creative uses of the patterning of English at the lexical and syntactic level, in addition to semantic and phonological innovation" (p. 453).

Similar early attempts were also undertaken in other parts of the world with essentially the same aim of surfacing the structural systematicity of the different varieties (or dialects) of English, such as Walsh (1967) and Tiffen (1974) for Nigerian English, Tongue (1974) for English in Singapore and Malaysia, and Hopwood (1961) and Lanham and Traill (1962) for South African English. These studies—essentially unconnected from each other—focus on different formal aspects of the English language such as phonology, syntax, and lexicon, but they all share the belief about the *plural* nature of English because of changing contexts of use, and that such knowledge of plurality in the language could be proven through linguistic description or a language-focus orientation. In other words, the process of generating new knowledge in these studies has been through a focus on the linguistic dimensions of English itself with the view of configuring or mapping its dynamic system, which has been altered by new uses and users of the language. As will be discussed further in the next section, this focus has remained a core feature of WE work through the years, except that increasingly it has been deployed to provide evidence-based justification for postcolonial arguments about the pluralization and pluricentric character of English. WE has become a key platform for the sociolinguistic study of English language spread through its combined use of linguistic tools and postcolonial theorizing.

The durability of the language-focus orientation in WE

Since the 1960s, and especially the late 1980s when WE studies began to take root as a coherent academic field of study, work on the pluralization or diversification of English has expanded in terms of theory, methodology, application, and geographical reach (Bhatt, 2001; Bolton, 2005). We argue, however, that despite these variegated foci of research, the textual and language-focus orientation of WE continues to be a core feature of the work in the field, except that it has been increasingly clear that such orientation is not merely descriptive in nature, but has been deployed as a way to present broader and more sweeping arguments about the legitimization of culturally bound Englishes of the world. The focus remains on "Englishes", rather than users of English, *especially* individual users who negotiate everyday life in and through English(es) and possibly other languages and language varieties as well. This is especially so in recent years when scholars have begun to track the indigenization and legitimization of Englishes in the expanding circle countries such as China (Qiong, 2004; Yajun, 1995), Japan (Stanlaw, 2004; Morrow, 1987), Korea (Shim, 1999; Lawrence, 2012), Indonesia (Adityarini, (2014), and Thailand (Trakulkasemsuk, 2012; Sarmah, Gogoi, & Wiltshire, 2009) where there are now huge numbers of English language learners and speakers; however, they are typically described as "non-native" speakers with derogatory undertones. In the Englishes of the outer circle countries, there is increasing interest in the ontological status of these Englishes themselves; whereas the key issue has long been about their legitimacy as separate varieties of English, scholars have now inquired into and debated about their status as languages in their own right (Ansaldo, 2009; Bao, 2003; McArthur, 1987). These studies, to use the words of Bhatt (2001), "have a clear methodological agenda—to describe the structure of a 'nonnative' variety in its own terms, not as descriptions of aborted 'interlanguages'" (p. 534). Even with a broader coverage of varied work in the field of WE (Bolton, 2005), the great bulk of such work—English studies, English corpus linguistics, and various sociolinguistic approaches (including pidgin and creole studies) (p. 70)—is hugely oriented towards language-focus approaches and methodologies.

However, it must be clarified that this sustained attention to Englishes as linguistic systems of communication does not in any way disqualify any research orientation in the study of diversities of English. This, too, does not in any way reflect on the quality of the work in the field thus far. Work on the formal systems of WE such as phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, discourse, and pragmatics does indeed assume a language-focus orientation (Bhatia, 1989; Sridhar, 1992; Ho & Deterding, 2016), but so does work on attitudes (Wiebesiek, Rudwick, & Zeller, 2011; He & Li, 2009; He & Zhang, 2010; Chiba, Matsuura, & Yamamoto, 1995), intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability (Nelson, 1995; Smith, 1992; Smith & Nelson, 1985; Orikasa, 2016), ideologies (Buripakdi, 2008; Kamwangamalu & Tovares, 2016), and ownership (Seilhamer, 2015; Higgins, 2003), because not only does it continue to implicate questions about form, norms, standards, and grammar, but it also makes language—"Englishes" in the case of WE—a governing, central element in the life of an individual.

This work may not all be concerned with the formal features of English, but it is nevertheless oriented towards a language-focus—ways of using and thinking about English, as well as attitudes towards it. Parakrama's (1995) classic work on Sri Lankan English, focusing on forms and functions of English which fall short of the "educated" uses of a postcolonial variety of English, is one of the earliest articulate book-length criticisms of the WE paradigm, yet it heavily rests on its description of "uneducated" forms of Sri Lankan English. Individual users of such "uneducated" Sri Lankan Englishes are absent from the analysis. For example, how do they negotiate their lives with these particular forms of English? In specific contexts of everyday language use, to what extent are they liberated and/or marginalized by their use of such forms? They may claim (Tan, 2014) or reject (Seilhamer, 2015) ownership of their own English through interviews and questionnaire surveys, but in their everyday practice of using English, how does it shape their life choices?

Recent work in the sociolinguistics of public signs has seen a number of scholars focusing on the use of English in multilingual landscapes as well. However, from counting instances of English words and phrases and interpreting their functions in specific multilingual locations (Backhaus, 2005; 2007; Huebner, 2006), to reading off identities and ideologies from these signs (Taylor-Leech, 2012) and accounting for unequal Englishes (Pan, 2015), all these are bound together by a central interest in the linguistic sign. Although in practice English merges with the multilingual makeup of the linguistic and semiotic environment, the point of departure for these WE-oriented linguistic landscape studies is materially or symbolically an English word, phrase, or sign. This does not in any way imply an evaluative comment on the quality of such research; in fact, there are recently exemplary studies in *Linguistic Landscapes* which enrich our understanding of WE (see Table 2.1). The point we are making is that all of them take on an essentially language-focus orientation, even if they deploy a wide range of different research methods and critical lenses.

Indeed, it may appear that ethnography and ethnographic methods assume a better conceptualization of the nature of a language such as English and its varieties through data culled from the actual speakers and the data representing the lived experiences of a certain speech community. Employing an amalgam of methodological tools such as in-depth key informant interviews, descriptive surveys, archival documentation and document analysis, study of photographs, images, sketches, maps, and recordings, and systematic participant observation, ethnography affords one with excellent insights into the language use, linguistic choices, pedagogical decisions, and communicative needs of nonnative speakers of English hailing from different walks of life and representing linguistically complex identities (i.e. sociolinguistic and sociocultural backgrounds and contexts). To complement the rich research tradition in WE, therefore, an ethnographic approach to language description would indeed be very apt as ethnographies, in essence, tell of life as it happens. Nevertheless, a user-as-individual orientation demands more than ethnographic methods to achieve its aims. As will be explained below, the need is for an investigation of the "life" of users without a presumption of the centrality of English—and WE more specifically—in such a life. WE is about

Table 2.1 Recent exemplary studies in *Linguistic Landscapes* with a language-focus orientation

Study	*Focus of investigation*	*Methods/Methodology used*
"Translocal English in the linguascape of Mongolian popular music" (S. Dovchin, 2017, *World Englishes*)	English in popular music in Mongolia and how it is mediated by young Mongolian popular music artists	Linguistic (n)ethnography through observation of all kinds of online work by and on Mongolian artists; interviews
"English in the Japanese linguistic landscape: A motive analysis" (L. Rowland, 2016, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*	Motivations behind English language use on signage in the Japanese linguistic landscape	Motive analysis through gathering and characterization of college students' interpretations of signage
"Glocalization and the spread of unequal Englishes: Vernacular signs in the center of Beijing" (L. Pan, 2015, in R. Tupas, *Unequal Englishes: The Politics of Englishes Today*)	English shop signs on a famous street in Beijing	Placement and semiotics of signs through comparison of English language use in signs in (socio-economically) different types of commercial establishments
"Chinatown in Washington, DC: The bilingual landscape" (J. J. Lou, 2012, *World Englishes*, 31(1), 34–47.	Functions of English vis-à-vis Chinese in the bilingual landscape of a Chinatown in the US	Contextualized approach to Linguistic Landscapes using photographed signs, urban planning and policy documents, in-depth interviews, field notes and video recordings
"Towards a material ethnography of linguistic landscape: Multilingualism, mobility and space in a South African township" (C. Stroud & S. Mpendukana, 2009, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*)	Social circulation of languages across spaces and semiotic artefacts in present-day South Africa	Material ethnography of multilingualism through analysis of spaces and "semiotic artefacts" such as signs, newspapers, books, TV channels, and music videos

the pains, resistance, and victories of users of postcolonial Englishes, but in investigating enactments of the everyday lives of individuals, it is necessary to ask to what extent WE is central to, and to what extent it mediates or shapes, such life in the first place.

Performing life: A user-as-individual orientation

The language-focus orientation of WE is bound to dominate work in the field in the future, and should rightly so because of the dynamic nature of English language spread today and, as mentioned earlier, because of the need for WE to

reinforce the sociolinguistic and political legitimacy of the flourishing Englishes of the world. Having said so, however, we argue that such work must be complemented by user-as-individual studies that require a wider range of ways to probe the depth of the cultural penetration of Englishes in societies around the world. This would crucially first entail probing into the individual lives of people—not the Englishes they use—as they confront the daily challenges of life and seek to find out to what extent their use of localized Englishes occupies a central position in their lives in the first place.

For three years (2009–2012), Tupas (2014) worked closely with around 60 to 70 tertiary English language teachers in Singapore, Vietnam, Indonesia, and the Philippines to build a network of collaborative efforts to enhance the capability of teachers to develop their own teaching materials (for more information about the project, see http://www.nus.edu.sg/celc/research/temasek.php). The aim of the project was to build the expertise of teachers in curriculum development by starting with identifying their own problems and issues in the classroom and the communities in which they live, rather than subjecting them to a series of workshops on existing language pedagogical frameworks and theories of materials design which, more often than not, are disconnected from the everyday realities of teachers and students. For the duration of the localization project, quarterly reports were written to account for a wide array of issues, challenges, and successes experienced by teachers from different institutions and countries, and then submitted to the project's funding institution, Temasek Foundation of Singapore. These reports, in turn, were based on field notes prepared by the two project directors who worked with the teachers in their respective institutions, as well as in inter-institutional and international meetings, trainings, and strategic planning workshops. The project was not designed as a research endeavor, thus there was no alteration of work for the sake of collecting data. All field notes were prepared as part of the project directors' observations of and reflections on their close encounters with the teachers and their students. In one particular study, however, Tupas (2014) revisited his accounts of specific conversations with three teachers—one each from Vietnam, Indonesia, and the Philippines—as they went about doing their work for the day. One conversation occurred while he was riding on the motorcycle of one of his Indonesian collaborators who was then on his way to his place of work in a hinterland town in East Java. Another exchange occurred inside a car with a Filipino teacher on their way to another training site two hours away from Manila, while the encounter with a Vietnamese colleague transpired over lunch at a restaurant along the Mekong River in a city in the South of Vietnam. The teachers were sent copies of the verbatim field notes of the conversations, as well as reflections on these accounts, in order to countercheck the accuracy of the narratives and the analysis. One of the main trends that emerged from the conversations was the absence of concerns raised by teachers about the plural nature of English. The teachers' working conditions were challenging in so many ways but most of them were basic problems such as lack of current and appropriate materials, huge classes and, yes, barely sufficient salaries of teachers. The question about the pluralization of English and related issues concerning standards, norms, and pedagogical models did not figure prominently in the teachers'

narratives of daily life, both as teachers and users of English. As an example, here is an excerpt of the field notes on the motorcycle ride with the Indonesian colleague (pseudonym: Rizali):

> [According to Rizali] Everyone wanted to study English because to them it symbolizes modernity and a world 'outside' [words in inverted commas are Rizali's own words] these villages. However, they don't need English as a means of communication. They don't need English to catch fish. They only want English or anything that sounds like it. They want their children to study the language to 'listen to its sounds' and 'feel the rhythm of the sentences', because it is by doing these can they begin to say that the children are finally going to school … Rizali appreciates the plurality of English, but this seems to be not one of his immediate concerns. If children are able to pronounce basic words 'correctly', and write down 'correct' basic sentences, then he shall have accomplished his mission, 'they will be happy'. He believes that his main responsibility as a curriculum developer is to let both teachers and pupils 'experience' English; to make it meaningful to their daily lives is less valued as a teaching/learning objective.
>
> (p. 165)

From the point of view of this teacher and user of English, the very act of producing the sounds of English and of being associated with the learning of the language is what is meaningful to the community. English, at least according to him, does not appeal to the community as a communicative tool because it is the local languages which saturate their everyday fishing lives. The act of learning it—regardless of proficiency level—is imbued with semiotic power such that anyone engaged in such an act could claim a certain amount of privilege to which not everyone in the community has access. The fact that the production of the English sounds, words, and sentences is shaped by their vernacular speech does not seem to have any substantial political or ideological currency because what is most important is simply to listen to the sounds and to feel the rhythm of the sentences. Indonesian-ness in the use and learning of English (c.f. Kachru, 1965) may be a sociolinguistic reality but it does not consume the cultural character of individual learners and users of English. Viewed from within the internal logic of the local culture, the pluralizing phenomenon of English does not organize the rhythm of the daily life of individual English users and learners in this fishing community. They are users and learners of an Indonesian variety of English (or a semblance of it) but this is immaterial to them.

We see here how the study of WE departs from the dominant ethos of the field which is to describe, interpret, and/or evaluate the textual dimensions of the pluralization phenomenon of English language spread around the world, even if (as we declared in the introduction) it keeps true to the resistive intellectual habitus of the field. Such ethos assumes the centrality of Englishes in the lives of users of "English", which is perhaps understandably so because the field within which the research operates is that of WE, or broadly perhaps, of the sociolinguistics of

Englishes. In the case of the study of the three teachers, there was no such presumption of the preeminence of Englishes; it trains its focus on (dis)(un)covering the lineaments of daily life of users of English, thus we refer to this as the user-as-individual orientation. Such an orientation decenters WE as the object of analysis with the aim of gaining a fuller picture of individual lives negotiating the rugged terrains of multilingual contemporary societies and communities. The focus is not only on the voices of individuals talking and thinking about their use and learning of English, but more importantly, on the lives of these individuals themselves. What are central and urgent issues that they confront in their daily life? Again here, there is no guarantee that WE as a real-life issue is deemed significant, but it is always ready to find out how it is (or is not) implicated in these issues. In a sense, this study responds to the claim made by Bolton, Graddol, and Meierkord (2011) that "academic research on English worldwide has typically tended to focus overly on official accounts and elite contexts of use, and relatively little published research actually provides the space for accounts of the sociolinguistic realities of particular contexts from the points of view of the grass roots players themselves" (p. 473). We agree, and we add that even in research which gives prominence to marginalized speakers and voices, they are still dislocated from their specific sociocultural moorings; instead, their linguistic performance as described above remains the central lens through which the process and phenomenon of WE are understood, affirmed and/or critiqued. Bolton, Graddol, and Meierkord (2011) thus further assert that "[m]uch more might be done, we feel, to investigate the realities of English(es) in the world from the perspective of folk domains and less privileged communities at the grass roots of such societies" (p. 474). Again, we agree, and also propose that individual users of English(es) and how they negotiate their daily lives should be the entry point of mapping out or configuring "realities of English(es)" at the grassroots level.

Lorente (2010, in press) has done so in her research on the marginalized community of Filipino domestic helpers in Singapore, some of whom she followed for several years not only through interviews, but also through observations of their Sunday life activities (e.g. in church, among friends, in cultural performances), email and telephone conversations about life back home in the Philippines and in Singapore, document research about the stakeholders in the export of labor in the Philippines (such as maid agencies, government overseas employment offices, and the education department), and mapping of the linguistic and discursive landscape of Lucky Plaza in Singapore, the main center of activity among Filipinos, especially for domestic helpers who wish to change employers. It is also noteworthy to mention that as she followed some of the maids through several years, it was done through informal interactions (not formal interviews), meeting up with or bumping into them at Bayanihan Centre (a hub for short-time educational and vocational classes for domestic helpers, as well as for cultural programs), going to their picnics, eating out, and so on. A few became friends on Facebook, which was her way of keeping track of them after they (and she) left Singapore. From such a complex network of overlapping practices, discourses, and policies emerged what she refers to as *scripts of servitude* which frame the dynamic yet conditioned life of domestic Filipino helpers.

Because the scripts implicate different dimensions of servitude—capitalist globalization, institutionalized labor migration, complementing and conflicting labor and migration policies of both sending and receiving countries, dynamics of internal migration, the feminization of labor, neoliberal educational and language policies, national and transnational cultures (including those which mediate employer–employee relations)—the centrality of English in the life of a domestic helper is not a presupposed reality but one that gradually surfaced from the data themselves. In one aspect of her study focusing on maid agencies and the scripts maids are expected to perform as they sell themselves to prospective employers, Lorente (2010) describes the role of maid agencies in the perpetuation of servitude:

> By instructing the women to perform verbal acts of politeness, which, in turn, are to be ignored or unacknowledged by their employers, and by binding their linguistic behavior to the precariousness of their jobs, maid agencies manipulate the linguistic behavior of the women they have recruited and initiate them into a crucial aspect of servitude, namely linguistic deference. (p. 54)

The point here is that "English language skills" (p. 50) and "the script of servitude" are not one and the same, and that the maids' English language proficiency—itself a commodified product—must be understood within the individualized experience of servitude. The uses of English by the domestic helpers—ways of using English which are themselves products of a hierarchized educational system in the Philippines—are appraised more deeply not simply as linguistic capital as they enter the labor world of servitude but, in fact, as *fluctuating* linguistic capital if we view it from the maids' individual experience of servitude within the broad framework of capitalist globalization. The maids are not only segmented into different levels of English language proficiency; as some of them travel across international borders of domestic labor (for example, to leave Singapore and enter Canada as a nanny or caregiver), the same linguistic repertoire through which the scripts of servitude operate in Singapore takes on a different and perhaps an even more negatively valued character in Canada, with racialized discourses and forms of discrimination coming into play: "The recognition of the 'English advantage' of migrant Filipino workers depends very much on the linguistic and semiotic economies of the contexts in which migrant Filipino workers are inserted" (Lorente, in press). In other words, the experience of English(es) among Filipino domestic helpers leaks out as a meaningful part of the lives of domestic helpers because the research lens was, first and foremost, trained on tracking their lives as domestic helpers within which they are users of English, in a way that they too are mothers, girlfriends, sisters, Filipino women, and so on.

Conclusion: The individualization of experience

To quote Lok (2012) again, there is a need "to observe the individual" (p. 423), and this can, of course, be done in case and longitudinal studies which would

require the researcher to follow and work with the individual to gain deeper insights into his or her everyday life as a learner or user of English. A focus on the individual, however, does not in any way imply a view of the individual as a separate entity which does not share any experience, ideology, or culture with other individuals in the same community or nation. Rather, the assumption is that the individual embodies, enacts, and transforms social norms and biases, as well as cultural practices, thus making the individual the locus of social life. In other words, the focus on the individual is actually the study of the *individualization* of experience which is "a result of social processes of differentiation and diversification producing individualized feelings and forms" (Willis & Trondman, 2002, p. 397). If (social) experience is individualized, then the study of it recognizes that issues like poverty, freedom, social privilege, educational access, and so on are not mere abstract concepts but are lived experiences. Postcolonial resistance through WE can be profoundly articulated, and the same can be said about neocolonialism and imperialism through continued use of English, but what exactly do individuals do in their lives, and do (linguistic) resistance and domination feature prominently in it? WE has had a rich tradition of dynamic research on the roles of English in postcolonial (and recently in other globalizing) societies; now is the time to explore and unravel the daily individual struggles and victories of people through whom we may continue to accurately assess the complex role of WE in our lives.

References

Adityarini, H. (2014). *An examination of the suitability of a pluricentric model of English language teaching for primary education in Indonesia* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Curtin University, Australia.

Ansaldo, U. (2009). The Asian typology of English: Theoretical and methodological considerations. *English World-Wide*, 30(2), 133–148.

Backhaus, P. (2005). Signs of multilingualism in Tokyo: A diachronic look at the linguistic landscape. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 175/176, 103–121.

Backhaus, P. (2007). *Linguistic landscapes. A comparative study of urban multilingualism in Tokyo*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Bao, Z. (2003). Social stigma and grammatical autonomy in nonnative varieties of English. *Language in Society*, 32(1), 23–46.

Bhatia, T. K. (1989). Bilinguals' creativity and syntactic theory: Evidence for emerging grammar. *World Englishes*, 8, 265–276.

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

Bolton, K. (2005). Where WE stands: Approaches, issues, and debate in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 24(1), 69–83.

Bolton, K. (2006). Varieties of world Englishes. In B. B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, & C. Nelson (Eds.), *The Handbook of World Englishes* (pp. 289–312). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Bolton, K., Graddol, D., & Meierkord, C. (2011). Towards developmental world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 30, 459–480.

Buripakdi, A. (2008). *Thai English as discourse of exclusion and resistance: Perspectives of Thai professional writers on the notion of Thai English* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania.

Chiba, R., Matsuura, H., & Yamamoto, A. (1995). Japanese attitudes toward English accents. *World Englishes*, 14(1), 77–86.

Dovchin, S. (2017). Translocal English in the linguascape of Mongolian popular music. *World Englishes*, 36(1) 1–12.

Gonzalez, A. (1976). Content in English language materials in the Philippines: A case study of cultural and linguistic emancipation. *Philippine Studies*, 24, 443–454.

Gove, P. B. (1966). Englishes of other lands. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 52(2), 125–130.

Halliday, M. A., Mcintosh, A., & Strevens, P. (1964). *The linguistic sciences and language teaching*. London: Longman.

He, D., & Li, D. (2009). Language attitudes and linguistic features in the 'China English' debate. *World Englishes*, 28(1), 70–89.

He, D., & Zhang, Q. (2010). Native speaker norms and China English: From the perspective of learners and teachers in China. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44(4), 769–789.

Higgins, C. (2003). "Ownership" of English in the Outer Circle: An alternative to the NS-NNS dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37, 615–644.

Ho, D. G. E., & Deterding, D. (2016). The grammar of Brunei English. *World Englishes*, 35, 542–553.

Hopwood, D. (1961). South African English pronunciation. *English Studies in Africa*, 4(1), 68–74.

Huebner, T. (2006). Bangkok's linguistic landscapes: Environmental print, codemixing and language change. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 3(1), 31–51.

Kachru, B. B. (1961). *An analysis of some features of Indian English: A study in linguistic method* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh.

Kachru, B. B. (1965). The Indianness in Indian English. *Word*, 21(3), 391–410.

Kamwangamalu, N., & Tovares, A. (2016). English in language ideologies, attitudes, and educational practices in Kenya and South Africa. *World Englishes*, 35, 421–439.

Lanham, L. W., & Traill, A. (1962). South African English pronunciation. *English Studies in Africa*, 5(2), 171–208.

Lawrence, C. B. (2012). The Korean English linguistic landscape. *World Englishes*, 31(1), 70–92.

Llamzon, T. (1969). *Standard Filipino English*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University.

Lok, I. M. (2012). World Englishes and postcolonialism: Reading Kachru and Said. *World Englishes*, 31(4), 419–433.

Lorente, B. P. (2010). Packaging English-speaking products: maid agencies in Singapore. In H. Kelly-Holmes, & G. Mautner (Eds.), *Language and the Market* (pp. 44–55). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Lorente, B. P. (in press). *Scripts of servitude: language, labor migration and transnational domestic workers*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lou, J. J. (2012). Chinatown in Washington, DC: The bilingual landscape. *World Englishes*, 31(1), 34–47.

Orikasa, M. (2016). The intelligibility of varieties of English in Japan. *World Englishes*, 35, 355–371.

McArthur, T. (1987). The English languages? *English Today*, 3(3), 9–13.

Morrow, P. R. (1987). The users and uses of English in Japan. *World Englishes*, 6(1), 49–62.

Nelson C. (1995). Intelligibility and world Englishes in the classroom. *World Englishes*, 14, 273–279.

Pan, L. (2015). Glocalization and the spread of unequal Englishes: Vernacular signs in the center of Beijing. In R. Tupas (Ed.), *Unequal Englishes: The politics of Englishes today* (pp. 163–184). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Parakrama, A. (1995). *De-hegemonizing language standards: learning from (post)colonial Englishes about 'English'*. London: Macmillan Press.

Qiong, H. X. (2004). Why China English should stand alongside British, American, and the other 'world Englishes'. *English Today*, 20(2), 26–33.

Rowland, L. (2016). English in the Japanese linguistic landscape: A motive analysis. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 37(1), 40–55.

Sarmah, P., Gogoi, D. V., & Wiltshire, C. R. (2009). Thai English: Rhythm and vowels. *English World-Wide*, 30(2), 196–217.

Seilhamer, M. F. (2015). The ownership of English in Taiwan. *World Englishes*, 34, 370–388.

Shim, R. J. (1999). Codified Korean English: process, characteristics and consequence. *World Englishes*, 18(2), 247–258.

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). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Smith, L. E., & Nelson, C. L. (1985). International intelligibility of English: directions and resources. *World Englishes*, 4(3), 333–342.

Sridhar, S. N. (1992). The ecology of bilingual competence: language interaction in the syntax of indigenized varieties of English. *World Englishes*, 11, 141–150.

Stanlaw, J. (2004). *Japanese English: Language and culture contact*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Strevens, P. D. (1964). Varieties of English. *English Studies*, 45(1), 20–30.

Stroud, C., & Mpendukana, S. (2009). Towards a material ethnography of linguistic landscape: Multilingualism, mobility and space in a South African township. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 13(3), 363–386.

Tan, Y. Y. (2014). English as a 'mother tongue' in Singapore. *World Englishes*, 33(3), 319–339.

Tay, M. (1991). Southeast Asia and Hong Kong. In J. Cheshire (Ed.), *English around the world: Sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 319–332). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor-Leech, K. J. (2012). Language choice as an index of identity: Linguistic landscape in Dili, Timor-Leste. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 9(1), 15–34.

Tiffen, B. W. (1974). *The intelligibility of Nigerian English* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of London, London.

Tongue, R. K. (1974). *The English of Singapore and Malaysia*. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.

Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2012). Thai English. In E. L. Low, & A. Hashim (Eds.), *English in Southeast Asia: Features, policy and language use* (pp. 101–111). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tupas, R. (2006). Standard Englishes, pedagogical paradigms and their conditions of (im) possibility. In R. Rubdy, & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 169–185). London: Continuum Press.

Tupas, R. (2014). The unequal production of knowledge in the sociolinguistics of Englishes. In R. Marlina, & R. A. Giri (Eds.), *The pedagogy of English as an International Language* (pp. 159–173). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Walsh, N. (1967). Distinguishing types and varieties of English in Nigeria. *Journal of the Nigerian English Studies Association*, 2(2), 47–55.

Wiebesiek, L., Rudwick, S., & Zeller, J. (2011). South African Indian English: A qualitative study of attitudes. *World Englishes*, 30, 251–268.

Willis, P., & Trondman, M. (2002). Manifesto for ethnography. *Critical Methodologies*, 2(3), 394–402.

Yajun, J. (1995). Chinglish and China English. *English Today*, 11(1), 51–56.

3 TESOL and Tesology in East Asia

A critical review

Oryang Kwon

Introduction

Jeong (1929), a scholar in the early days of English teaching in Korea, during the period of Japanese control over Korea, mentions the ineffectiveness of English teaching in Korea as follows:

> The source of this problem lies in the fact that the outcome of studying English is minimal and has not cultivated a true competence, and such a criticism may be valid depending on the viewpoints. In Korea, English knowledge has been provided to the students by schools or publishers for several decades. However, as to the question whether the entire society or individuals have gained anticipated results, except for those very few who have experienced the mastering of the language in special living environments, most people have a feeling that, though they have a memory of learning English, it all became useless.
>
> (cited in Kwon & Kim, 2010, p. 54. Translation O. Kwon)

This problem is still very much alive in East Asian countries, although efforts are being made to improve the situation. This problem is at the heart of the English education system, and there are many factors that contribute to the outcome of English teaching in the region. The Asian context of English teaching has its unique and shared characteristics, especially in far Eastern countries such as Korea, China, and Japan. These characteristics can be viewed from linguistic, social, and educational perspectives.

The first languages of East Asia are among the most difficult languages for Western language speakers. Thus, from the perspective of those East Asian countries, the students in this region experience more difficulties in learning English than do other students in other countries. Although the Chinese language is a subject-verb-object (SVO) language like English, while Korean and Japanese are subject-object-verb (SOV) languages, the three countries share extensive common vocabulary (originating from Chinese) that make the three languages similar in many respects. Additionally, the Korean and Japanese languages have case markers, which make it difficult for their speakers to learn English (which has no such case markers).

The college entrance examinations of East Asia are the single most important factor for secondary school students studying English in those countries. The extraordinary enthusiasm for college education in East Asian countries is well-known, with students devoting extensive time and effort in studying for the college entrance examinations. Private institutes that help students prepare for the college entrance exams are prosperous, and many students are willing to study an extra one or two years after high school graduation in order to enter good universities which will help them with their job search efforts after they graduate.

The strong tradition of grammar-translation is still very much alive in East Asia. Although the general trend of English teaching in the world is in favor of communicative language teaching, Asian countries are still very much oriented to the Grammar-Translation Method, especially in the East Asian countries where college entrance examinations of English do not measure the students' abilities in speaking or writing.

Considering this, how much progress in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) has been made in this region, recognizing its own regional characteristics? From the early days, English teaching theories have been borrowed from those of the Western academia, yet, TESOL in East Asia seems to be one of the least effective efforts seen in the global context. Korea, China, and Japan, with their own problems in several areas of TESOL, have made some progress; still, the results are not so satisfactory.

In this paper, I will offer a new term "Tesology", to refer to the studies of TESOL. It is a cover term to indicate the disciplines related to the TESOL, such as teaching methodology, learning, testing, materials, administrations, and others that deal with TESOL. Strictly speaking from the viewpoint of terminology, Tesolology might be more accurate, but, for the sake of convenience, the shortened form of Tesology will be used in this paper.

The human and policy factors

In this section, the problems of teachers and students will be discussed, along with the policy issues related to English teaching. The teacher problem is principally related to the incompetence of teachers while the student problem is tied to low motivation.

Incompetent teachers

One of the problems in English teaching has to do with teachers. Underwood (1926), an observer of English education in Korea, noted:

> Under this sort of plan, it is not surprising that "the best teacher of English Grammar in the city of Seoul" should be an individual who cannot speak English intelligently but who has thoroughly mastered the puzzles and trick questions of the examinations for the advanced school in this subject.
>
> (cited in Kwon & Kim, 2010, p. 42. Translation O. Kwon)

A similar observation was made 80 years later (2006), by a newspaper reporter:

> There is a great scarcity of competent English teachers in school classrooms who can teach English properly. There are also many teachers who are having difficulty in catching up with advanced students. This is why school English education is still stuck to "reading- and grammar-centered English", not moving to "communicative English".
>
> (Ajikdo dokhae, 2006. Translation O. Kwon)

Although there are indeed "many" teachers who are competent and teach well in these modern day classrooms, the above observation is still relevant in many classrooms throughout the East Asian regions.

Students losing interest

Another problem with English language teaching in this region is the fact that students lose interest in learning English. In Korea, a survey shows that students' interest is very high when they start learning English in elementary schools, with 40.67% of the surveyed students indicating that they are (much) interested in learning English. However, by the time the students reach the 11th grade (2nd year of high school), their interest rate drops to 25.94% (Kwon et el., 2006). In Japan, many students start studying English in junior high school with eager anticipation. Unfortunately, due to the emphasis on memorization and learning about English for its own sake, rather than using English for the purpose of communication, many students lose interest (Iino, 2002, p. 88).

English education policy makers

Although the level (degree) varies slightly from country to country, major English language education policies have been changed by outsiders, mostly by politicians and government officials. For example, in the case of Korea, introduction of optional English instruction into elementary school began by the order of President Chun Doo-hwan in 1982. During the administration of President Kim Young-sam, English education in elementary school became obligatory in 1997. Then, in the year 2000, the Minister of Education issued an order to teach English in English (TEE), which became buzz words for a while, although it was not strictly implemented in the classrooms.

In 2004, English villages were built in many parts of Korea, originally initiated by Gyeonggi Province Governor Son Hakgyu. In the same vein, the Ministry of Education of Korea started a large English town on Jeju Island, featuring branch campuses of many foreign high schools. This English town is still popular in Korea.

The Korean Ministry of Education once planned to introduce English speaking and writing tests into the existing college entrance examination (known as the College Scholastic Ability Test), which has only listening and reading tests. The

new tests were supposed to be internet-based tests. Research teams developed and administered sample tests of speaking and writing, along with the listening and reading tests. However, the government administration changed, and the new administration cancelled the plan to introduce speaking and writing tests, after a preliminary test had a technical problem during its test administration.

Thus, the English policy changes are usually initiated by politicians and statesmen, who are more concerned with the popular vote than the real effects of English education policy changes. Although there are some variations in the degree of government involvement, this problem seems to be common to East Asian countries.

Teaching methods

In this section, the true reality of teaching methods in the classroom will be critically reviewed. First, the way the textbooks are covered in the classroom will be discussed, followed by the class hours devoted to the exam-oriented high schools. Then, the reality of communicative language teaching will be reviewed.

Piecemeal presentation of textbook materials

In Korea, in primary and secondary schools, except for the 12th grade classes which will be discussed below, school teachers usually finish one book chapter (called a "Lesson") in 8 hours. For example, an English chapter within a textbook usually consists of the following sections (Kwon et al., 2012): (1) Listen & Speak I & II; (2) Act Out; (3) Let's Communicate; (4) Before You Read; (5) Reading Text; (6) After You Read; (7) Focus on Language; (8) Think & Write; and (9) Project Work.

A teacher usually divides a chapter into 7 or 8 hours, and presents it to the students piece by piece. Generally, the reading text (2 to 3 pages long) is covered in 2 or 3 class hours. Such a piecemeal presentation and coverage of a chapter does not help students to build substantial communicative competence. Furthermore, as the lessons are offered mostly in the tradition of the Grammar-Translation Method (which will be discussed again later), students are bored and do not learn much from the lessons.

Class hours devoted to test preparation (high school seniors)

In countries where the college entrance examination is the most compelling motivator for students to study English, the teachers, especially in the upper year classes of high schools, are driven to prepare the students for the college entrance examination to the degree that classroom practices in English classes are shaped for the examination. Thus, in many 12th grade classes in Korea, the regular English textbooks are covered very briefly in one third or half of the school year. Then, for the remaining days of the school year, school-selected or school-prepared exercise books (mostly with the questions similar to those on the college

entrance examination) are covered during class hours. The purpose of this type of class is not to build communicative competence but to prepare for the college entrance examination. This practice is encouraged by the school administrators for good results at the college entrance examination which is, indirectly and informally, an assessment of the teachers and schools as well. Additionally, it is also expected and encouraged by the students and parents, who are very much concerned about the college entrance examinations. I suspect this problem is common in all three countries in Northeast Asia.

Communicative language teaching not employed

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has been introduced to the East Asian context, but its realization is questionable, as has been discussed earlier. Vasilopoulos (2008), made the following observation about the use of CLT in the Korean classroom: "Many years have passed since the introduction of the CLT approach in Korea; however, despite curriculum reform and the passage of time, many remain skeptical of the effectiveness of communicative methodology in the Korean English language classroom" (cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 105).

The situation is about the same in China. In Jin and Cortazzi (2011), the "Chinese context" could as easily be translated to "Korean context" or "Japanese context".

> In China in the 1980s and 1990s the national take-up of communicative approaches was slow; teachers often spoke of "the Chinese context" and of "the need for an eclectic approach," which took account of some communicative techniques but also maintained traditional approaches.
>
> (cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 104)

Like students in Korea, students in China also have an expectation that English classes should be Grammar-Translation Method oriented.

> Although a lesson like this may seem utterly boring and counterproductive to Western teachers working within the paradigm of CLT, many Chinese students expect a foreign language class to be taught in this way and feel that they can learn "real things" in such a class. There are deep-rooted expectations and beliefs that keep the Grammar-Translation Method alive in numerous classrooms.
>
> (Hou, 1987)

The Japanese context is the same, and the Japanese classrooms of English also are still very much grammar-translation oriented.

> Even though teachers are expected to adopt the oral communicative approach in the official curriculum, the truth is that the *juken-eigo* [English for test taking (O. Kwon)] and grammar-translation methods still prevail in Japanese

> classrooms today. Very few teachers have the necessary communicative competence to teach a more oral method and in a Japanese school that is traditionally rather teacher-centered, implementing methods that anticipate student discussions and so on has proved to be a challenging task. O'Donnell (2005) describes a typical English lesson: "Emphasising translation over grammar study, the *yakudoku* [translation and reading (O. Kwon)] classroom is teacher-centered on the word for word translation of English text into Japanese". (O'Donnell, 2005, p. 302). He also cites a Japanese teacher of English who is torn between wanting to focus on the communicative aspect of the language and preparing his students for the entrance exams, proving that the teachers themselves are not comfortable with the situation.
>
> (Løfsgaard, 2015, p. 25)

Teacher training

In this section, several aspects of English teacher training will be critically reviewed to see the sources of the problems. First, it will be pointed out that the pre-service training institutes are not doing their job properly in supervising the teaching of English in secondary schools. Then it will be observed that the teacher training system is inadequate to produce English teaching experts. Then, we find that the actual courses to teach the language teaching methods do not focus on CLT, but rather all the language teaching methods available in the profession. Finally, the medium of instruction for Tesology courses will be discussed.

Pre-service training institutes not doing their job

In many cases, the pre-service training colleges are impractical academia, separated from the secondary schools where English education is carried out. The professors' teaching of Tesology does not fully reflect the practice of actual secondary classrooms (this will be discussed later). The only connection they have with secondary schools is the one-day supervision tour to the secondary schools during the college students' teaching practicum. In this supervision tour, all professors, including the linguistics and literature professors, go out to the secondary schools, observe the student teachers' demonstrative classes, and comment on them, based on the professors' own experiences.

Teacher trainees not receiving enough training in Tesology

We have seen that the teaching of English in East Asian countries is still very much using the Grammar-Translation Method, for the conceptual reason that students have a specific view of learning English and the practical reason of the college entrance examinations. In addition, English teachers are not fully prepared to use the CLT methods. One of the main reasons seems to be that they are not fully trained to teach in the new methods. The teacher trainees do not seem to take enough courses in teaching, mainly because the courses that they take are

determined by the number of professors majoring in disciplines other than English teaching methods, and the materials in the English language education departments that train these would-be teachers.

Take a look at the case of the English Language Education Department, Seoul National University, where this author used to teach. The faculty has eight Korean professors and three English native-speaking teachers, as follows: Four professors in English language teaching, two professors in English linguistics (syntax, phonology), two professors in English literature (novels, poems), and three English native speaking instructors in conversation/writing.

Thus, the curriculum in the department should provide courses for linguistics and literature professors, as well as the courses in ELT and skill learning. The following courses are offered in the department year by year (Table 3.1).

As seen in the above lists, there are many courses in literature and linguistics, in order to provide enough courses to the professors in those areas. The English Education Department, Seoul National University, is relatively well-balanced in terms of the composition of the professors in different academic fields; there are many English education departments in Korea that have more professors in literature and linguistics than in Tesology. The situation is similar in other countries.

Using TESOL methodology textbooks not for CLT

In university teacher training programs, the courses in English Teaching Methods mostly use American or British books on language teaching as their textbooks. In case the professors write their own textbooks in the vernacular language, their

Table 3.1 Courses offered in the English Education Department, SNU

Title of the courses
Freshman: Introduction to English Literature/English Reading/Readings in British and American Prose
Sophomore: English Conversation 1 & 2/Applied English Phonetics/Theories in Teaching English as a Foreign Language/Introduction to English Linguistics/English Composition 1/British and American Culture/Understanding British Literature and Culture (A)/Readings in English Novels/Career Exploration Seminar
Junior: Understanding British Literature and Culture (B)/English Composition 2/English Conversation/Historical Survey of the English Language for TESL/English Grammar/Understanding American Literature and Culture/English Curriculum Practicum/Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language/Teacher Preparation for Student Management/English Syntax/Practicum for English Teaching Methods and Technology/Multimedia and English Education
Senior: Readings in British and American Poetry/Teaching Vocabulary and Grammar/British and American Literature and Popular Culture/British and American Drama/Materials Evaluation and Development in Teaching English as a Foreign Language/Applied Linguistics/Logic and Writing in Teaching English as a Foreign Language/English Phonology/Teaching English Four Skills/Practicum in English Teaching/English Testing Practicum

books are just introductions of the Western teaching/learning theories and methods. The use of American or British textbooks is not to blame, but the contents and the purpose of the courses often mismatch.

For example, the courses in English Teaching Methodology do not focus on CLT; all the language teaching methods are discussed across the semester. Thus, out of the 15 or 16 weeks of the course, the time covering CLT is only about a week, and the other teaching methods, such as the Grammar-Translation Method, the Silent Way, Suggestopedia, Community Language Learning, and so on, take up as much time as CLT during the course. Yet, we expect future teachers to use the CLT method.

The syllabi of two courses are included below to show the teaching methods introduced during the English teaching methodology courses. One is the syllabus that I used when teaching a course at a different university than Seoul National University. This course had been taught by a professor of that university, and, therefore, the textbook is the one that the professor had been using before me. I simply followed the advice of that professor in selecting and using the same textbook. The course was offered to junior year students. The other course is one taught by another professor at a university in Seoul. This course also is offered to junior year students.

A course syllabus in TEFL methodology (1)

The title of this course was Principles of English Language Teaching. It was a 3-credit course. The textbook used for this course was Richards and Rodgers (2014)' *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (3rd ed) from Cambridge University Press. The course syllabus can be seen below. As can be seen in the syllabus, CLT is covered in one week. Although other methods such as Content-based Instruction (CBI), Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), and Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT) are covered as new methods, the course still does not devote enough time to the teaching of communicative use of English (see Table 3.2).

A course syllabus in TEFL methodology (2)

The course below is another teaching methodology course offered at a university in Seoul. The course was designed as a junior year course. Its title is Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language. The course used three textbooks and one video: Larsen-Freeman, & Anderson (2011), *Techniques and Principles in Language teaching* (3rd ed) [LA]; Nunan (1999), *Second Language Teaching & Learning* [N1]; and Nunan (2003), *Practical English Language Teaching* [N2]; plus the Longman video, *Teacher Training Through Video: ESL Techniques* (Savage, 2007). In this course, CLT is covered for only one class period of 75 minutes (see Table 3.3).

As seen in the syllabi, the courses in Tesology methods use textbooks that do not focus on CLT, but rather almost all the teaching methods currently known to

Table 3.2 TEFL methodology course syllabus (1)

Wk	*Topics*
1	Introduction to the Course/New Direction in ELT
2	Chpt 1. A Brief History of Early Developments
3	Chpt 2. The Nature of Approaches and Methods
4	Chpt 3. The Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching
5	Chpt 4. The Audiolingual Method
6	Chpt 5. Communicative Language Teaching
7	Chpt 6. CBI and CLIL
8	Chpts 7. Whole Language/8. Competency-Based LT, and CEFR
9	Mid-term Exam
10	Chpt 9. Task-Based Language Teaching
11	Chpts 10. Text-Based Instruction/11. The Lexical Approach
12	Chpts 12. Multiple Intelligences/13. Cooperative Language Teaching
13	Chpts 14. The Natural Approach/15. Total Physical Response/16. The Silent Way
14	Chpts 17. Community Language Learning/18. Suggestopedia
15	Paper Presentation
16	Final Exam

Table 3.3 TEFL methodology course syllabus (2)

Wk	*Topics*
1	Intro to the Course/The Conceptual and Empirical Basis [N1]
2	The Conceptual and Empirical Basis [N1]
3	The Grammar-Translation Method [LA]/The Direct Method [LA]
4	The Audio-Lingual Method [LA]/Dialog/Drill & Early roduction [TV]
5	The Silent Way [LA]/No class
6	No class/Suggestopedia [LA]
7	Community Lang. Learning [LA]/Total Physical Response [LA]
8	Total Physical Response & Role Play [TV]/Communicative Language Teaching [LA]
9	Content-Based Instruction [LA]/Task-Based Lang. Teaching [LA]
10	Exam I/Political Dimensions & the Participatory Approach [LA]
11	Learning Strategy, Cooperative & Multiple Intelligences [LA]/Teaching Pronunciation [N2]
12	Teaching Vocabulary [N2]/Teaching Grammar [N2]
13	Teaching Discourse [N2]/Computers in the Lang. Classroom [N2]
14	Learner Autonomy in the Classroom [N2]/Review
15	Exam II

the field of Tesology. The number of class hours devoted to CLT is very limited, usually just one or two class hours.

Textbooks and medium of instruction: In English vs. in the vernacular?

As for the languages used in the Tesology classes, two issues emerge—one is the language of the textbooks and the other is the medium of instruction. These issues are important because they can define the nature of the Tesology classes and affect the would-be teachers' conception and English ability.

The first issue is about the language of the textbook. Should textbooks for Tesology classes in colleges be written in English or in the vernacular language? If the textbooks are written in English, they help future teachers improve their English competence and their professional vocabulary. However, some concepts in English might be too difficult for college students to understand, although the professor tries to explain them. On the other hand, if the vernacular textbooks (usually of the professor's own writing) are used, they help future teachers understand the content better. However, future teachers are deprived of the opportunities to improve their English competence in the professional field.

Another issue is the language the professor uses to deliver the content of the course. If English Tesology textbooks are used, should the medium of instruction of college Tesology courses be English or the vernacular language? If English is used as a medium of instruction, it helps improve the future teachers' English competence. However, there might be some student difficulties in fully understanding the content. Alternatively, what about using the vernacular language even though the textbooks are written in English? Here, as with the situation of textbooks, it helps future teachers understand the content better. However, the students miss opportunities to improve their professional English competence and vocabulary.

As for my own case, I always used Tesology books written in English by Western scholars. However, I also used the vernacular language (Korean) to explain the content of the books. But that changed one day, when a teacher at an in-service training session asked, "Why should the English teachers teach in English while the university professors do not use English when they teach the Tesology courses?" When I encountered that question, I changed my medium of instruction into English for graduate and undergraduate courses.

Tesological research and researchers

There have been changes in the initiatives of English language teaching because of the changing composition of scholars in language teaching. Before the 1960s, English literature professors were the main driving force of English teaching, as there were not many professors specializing in linguistics, let alone Tesology. During the 1970s and 1980s, the number of English linguistics professors (with PhDs in English linguistics from American or British universities) increased, and they occupied leading roles in the ELT profession. In the 1990s, this changed,

when the leading roles in the language teaching profession were taken by an increasing number of scholars in Tesology who received their masters and doctorates in the United States and the United Kingdom. By this time, literature and linguistics professors were not so much seen or heard in the area of Tesology.

However, Tesology was already introduced in the early 20th century, as a Korean scholar, Professor Inseop Jeong (1928) from Yonhee College, wrote about language teaching methodology in the West, in a newspaper article.

> Several theories and modern teaching methods have recently been discussed in Western countries, such as the Reformed Method, New Method, Natural Method, Psychological Method, Scientific Method, Oral Method, The Grammar Method, and so on. Among the countries, Germany and the Scandinavian countries are especially strong. England and America also show remarkable development as shown in the Government Report for England and the Report from the Modern Language Association in America.
>
> (cited in Kwon & Kim, 2010, p. 50. Translation O. Kwon)

In modern Korea and Japan, Tesology has established itself as a solid academic field. Many scholars in this region received their Tesology training in the USA or UK, accepting the Western academic tradition and are now teaching as they have been trained. Although China is a little slower than Korea or Japan, the country's fast development in Tesology is evident, as more and more Chinese students are receiving their master's and doctoral degrees in western countries as well as in China.

However, among the subfields of Tesology, the research on teaching methods is less significant, accounting for only 12% (610 papers) of all research papers (5,317 papers) published in the 11 journals by the Tesology-related associations in Korea (Kwon, 2014). The most widely researched area is English learning/acquisition (19.3%), followed by English linguistics (17.9%), materials (14.5%), English teaching methodology (12.03%), and learning psychology (10.11%). Among the papers on English teaching methodology, the number of papers on teaching methods in general was 182 (28.84%), teaching methods by skills was 388 (63.61%), and others was 9 (2.73%) (Table 3.4).

Since teaching methodology is the most important area for students to improve their English abilities, efforts should be focused on the improvement of teaching methods in the Asian context. Asian scholars (i.e. university professors) of English education need to establish a new type of connection (or activity) so that they can and do actually and practically help change the teaching practice.

Conclusion

Although efforts have been made to improve the situation, the general trends of English teaching in East Asia are still very much grammar-translation oriented. The students' and the parents' reasons for English education is learning linguistic knowledge for the college entrance examination, not gaining practical abilities for

Table 3.4 Papers and themes in 11 Tesology journals in Korea (Kwon, 2014)

Rank	*Topic of Research*	*No. of Papers*	*%*
1	Acquisition/Learning	979	19.30%
2	English Linguistics	908	17.90%
3	Materials	740	14.59%
4	Teaching Methodology	610	12.03%
5	Learning Psychology	513	10.11%
6	Teacher	355	7.00%
7	Evaluation	330	6.51%
8	ELT Status	262	5.17%
9	Policy/Curriculum	161	3.17%
10	English Literature	154	3.04%
11	Research	60	1.18%
	Total	5,072	100%

use of the language. Furthermore, teacher training institutes do not train the teachers well enough to teach using CLT methods. For a more desirable development of English teaching, the basic concept of English learning/teaching should be changed from "subject matter" learning/teaching to language learning/teaching.

References

"Ajikdo dokhae nunbeop jungsim—siheomen 'bareum giho sseora'" (Still focusing on translation and grammar—Test requires students to write phonological symbols). (2006, April 13). *Joon-Ang Ilbo*. Retrieved from: https://news.joins.com/article/2263028

Hou, Z. M. (1987). English teaching in China: Problems and perspectives. *TESOL Newsletter*, 21(3), 25–27.

Iino, M. (2002). Language and English education in Japan. In R. E. Silver, G. Hu, & M. Iino (Eds.), *English language education in China, Japan and Singapore* (pp. 52–96). Singapore: National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University.

Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (2011). Re-evaluating traditional approaches to second language teaching and learning. In E. Hinckley, (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 558–575). New York: Routledge.

Kwon, O. (2014). Hanguk yeongeo gyoyuk hakjadeuleui hakmun yeongu teukseonggwa gyeonghyang [Characteristics and trends of academic research by Korean scholars of English education]. *English Teaching*, 69(2), 199–225.

Kwon, O., Boo, K. Y., Shin, D., Lee, J. K., & Hyun, S. B. (2006). *A survey on the ten years of English education in Korean elementary schools, and suggestions for the improvement of English education: A research report to the Ministry of Education*. Seoul: Ministry of Education.

Kwon, O., & Kim, J. R. (2010). *Hanguk yeongeo gyoyuksa* [History of English education in Korea]. Seoul: Hankuk Munhwasa.

Kwon, O., Lee, M. W., Choi, M. Y., Chung, W. G., Yang, S. Y., Park, L. W., & Gray, E. R. (2012). *Middle school English*. Seoul: Kyohaksa.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Løfsgaard, K. A. (2015). *The history of English education in Japan - Motivations, attitudes and methods* (Unpublished master's thesis). The University of Oslo, Norway.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Nunan, D. (Ed.). (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York: McGraw Hill.

O' Donnell, K. (2005). Japanese secondary English teachers: Negotiation of educational roles in the face of curricular reform. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 18(3), 300–315.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Savage, K. L. (Series Editor) (2007). *Teacher training through video: ESL Techniques* [DVD-ROM]. New York: Pearson Education ESL.

4 Unequal Englishes

Re-envisioning the teaching of English in linguistically diverse classrooms

Ruanni Tupas and Willy A. Renandya

Introduction

The teaching of English accompanies and is implicated in processes of globalization today. Theoretically, globalization refers to the breaking down of national and sub-national political, economic, and cultural boundaries such that movements of people, information, and goods have created new spaces for the mixing, interaction, and/or clash of cultures, languages, identities, and ideologies. In a sense, globalization is not really a new phenomenon because there have always been movements of people across the globe (Piller, 2016), but what is possibly different with globalization today is the intensity and depth of exchanges and interactions between people due to the combined forces of technological advancement (including online/internet infrastructures), well-developed transportation systems, which make travel much faster, and politically and economically motivated movements of migration (Vertovec, 2007). Thus, in arguing for the continued relevance (and for some people, the imperative for the teaching and learning) of English today, there are key questions that require immediate attention.

First, what is the nature of English language use today? The sociolinguistic landscape of English today can best be described, according to Matsuda & Matsuda (2017), as "messy". If English accompanies or facilitates movements of people and cultures across now-blurred boundaries, how and why do people use language? The "how" question brings us to cultural and rhetorical dimensions of English language use which are deeply and unequivocally embedded in multilingual—or translingual (Horner et al., 2011)—contexts, thus betraying the multivoiced and plural nature of English itself. The language cannot simply be viewed as one, monolithic language used by everyone from all linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Thus, what we are arguing here is "the need to reconceptualize the 'E' in ELT [English language teaching]" (p. xiii).

The "why" question implicates the political and ideological dimensions of English language use. People have different motivations for the learning of English and some of these motivations have more impact on other people's lives than others. This is because people—and that includes practically all of us speakers of any language—do not simply make language choices on our own, alone.

Institutions and cultures within which we operate shape our own motivations for learning (or not wanting to learn) particular languages. For example, if the language policy of a particular country seeks to introduce Mandarin or Putonghua as an official language and as the language of instruction, it is highly plausible to expect parents to require their children to speak only in Mandarin or Putonghua and ban the use of their own native languages. What this means is that we cannot assume that we all use English simply to "communicate" with one another. There are forces behind our use of English and these shape the way we use the language. In interactions between speakers of different languages, in other words, there are speakers whose cultures, ideologies and yes, ways of using English, are more powerful than others.

The second question that needs to be addressed concerns the classroom within which the teaching and learning of English also happens. If the use of English is largely shaped by globalization processes, so is the teaching and learning of English inside the classroom. This does not simply refer to the multilingual or plurilingual nature of English. Globalization has also constituted classrooms in such a way that teachers, students, textbooks, and other artefacts are diverse in different ways. Technologies of learning and teaching have diversified beyond the chalk and the blackboard, and even beyond the physical presence of the classroom; thus, interactions and instruction must adjust to this multimodal landscape of teaching and learning. English-mediated interactions and instruction in multimodal platforms do have linguistic implications as users and learners respond to changing demands of space and time (check out *netspeak*, for example). We must also add that precisely because of globalization, the classroom has become a deeply diverse context. Even if we assume that students and teachers speak only one language (other than learning English), this would still shape the way English is taught and learned in the classroom. In other words, the English language classroom today is a language contact zone. In fact, it has always been a contact zone considering the bilingual or multilingual repertoires that teachers and learners brought into the classroom, but this time around, users of English cross borders of all kinds more intensively than ever, generating instructional and learning practices which are not equally valued because these users (teachers, students) are not equally valued in and outside the classroom in the first place.

Therefore, there are sociolinguistic realities today which make re-envisioning the teaching of English a pedagogical imperative, rather than a choice one has to make. As Pennycook (2008) correctly asserts, "[t]he changing cultural and linguistic worlds in which many English users live pose challenges for how we conceive of culture, ethnicity, and language" (p. 4), and these thus also pose challenges for how we conceive of the teaching of English. Because the nature of English-mediated communication today has been changing, the classroom within which English is taught and learned is also changing. How then should English language teaching (ELT) in general be reconceptualized or re-envisioned in order to account for these changing realities of English language use, teaching and learning? This question has been addressed quite extensively for at least two decades now (Matsuda, 2003; Martin, 2018) but as we will find out later on, much of

this reconceptualization involves the proposal to embrace a much wider range of Englishes in the classroom, and less attention is given to how embracing Englishes helps redress various forms of linguistic inequality in the classroom (Tupas, 2015). The ELT classroom today is diverse in linguistic and cultural ways, but such diversity does not happen on an equal playing field. Particular ways of teaching and using English are still considered more desirable than others, thus making learning English difficult for those whose languages and English-mediated language repertoires are devalued or ignored in the classroom. ELT today, therefore, must be re-envisioned according to three main considerations: The change/changing nature of English language use, the pedagogical uses of multilingual English, and ELT's response to linguistic inequality.

Multilingual English

There is much discussion on the appropriateness of the term "multilingual" because according to some scholars this does not capture the fluid and overlapping nature of language and communicative repertoires produced by people today. Different terms have been put forward to reflect the view away from "language as a discrete, separate boundary" (Lee & Canagarajah, 2019, p. 17)—plurilingual (Lüdi & Py, 2009), translingual (Canagarajah, 2012), translanguaging (Li, 2017)—all aiming to capture the sociolinguistic reality of communication as irreducible to separate, identifiable languages. Rather, when we communicate with one another, we draw holistically on linguistic and communicative resources, and if we see traces of what may be referred to as "named" languages—say, English, Malay, Tagalog—they are meaningful only because they are viewed as one unified communicative repertoire. There is much value in engaging in this discussion (see Matsuda, 2014; Pennycook, 2008; Saraceni & Jacob, 2019, for critical discussion around this notion), but our use of "multilingual" to describe English is strategic, political, and perhaps more practical in nature. The term is one that teachers, parents, and the general public, including political and policy makers, are familiar with. Thus, if we want to introduce an idea that supplants discriminatory practices such as native-speakerism and English-only instruction, we need a counter-term which accomplishes this plan in a clear and straightforward way. "Multilingual" positions and constructs English as plural in nature; that is, multilingual English is shaped by the different languages and cultures of people who use it, thus different voices and identities are also inscribed in the language. In teaching English, therefore, we actually also teach different identities, worldviews, accents, cultures, and even sounds, all of which are embedded in English language use, and this does not only include the diversity of Englishes among the so-called "non-native" speakers of the language, but also among "native" speakers of English whose versions or varieties (such as Singlish or African-American Vernacular English) have traditionally been marginalized in schools.

According to Bakhtin (Holquist, 1990), an utterance—say, a word uttered in a particular context—is both a new and old word. Before we utter it, the word already has a history of use which we inherit as we use it ourselves but, in the

process of doing so, we put our individual or unique stamp on the word which thus becomes a part of its history. In this sense, multilingual English is multivoiced. On the one hand, we should be mindful of how English has been historically produced—giving students access to meanings which have been associated with certain words, phrases, sentences, or even particular rhetorical strategies—but we should also allow opportunities for students to inject new meanings into these particular uses of language. More often than not, teachers prohibit explorations and use of new meanings in language, but perhaps understandably so because educational regimes in general do not tolerate "non-standard" uses of language.

Recently, there have been attempts to expand the lexicon of varieties of English in Southeast Asia as represented in the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) (Salazar, 2014)—for example with inclusion of 40 Filipino-coined words in the dictionary (Quismundo, 2015)—because the lexical (and yes, more broadly the communicative) repertoire of a community essentially represents "the communicative needs of its members at any given time, needs that are largely determined by their social, cultural, and political environment" (Salazar, 2018, n.p.). Embracing these words in the ELT classroom not only opens up spaces for the deployment of a broader array of teaching strategies, as well as the affirmation of new identities and cultural practices of both teachers and students, but it also reconfigures the study of language in the classroom as it becomes intertwined with culture and history. According to Salazar, one can read Philippine history through the Philippine English words in the OED, thus incorporating these words into ELT lessons and activities will allow Philippine history (of course, only aspects it) to add a new dimension to the learning of English by Filipino students. If contrastive analysis can be deployed, not only between Philippine English words and, say, British English words but, more importantly, between the lexical repertories of Southeast Asian varieties of English (e.g. see Singlish words in the OED as well, Chen [2016]), then ELT becomes a new platform for the negotiation of "regional" identities and cultures among Southeast Asians. Of course, the example here is on the level of lexicon, but this is not only about the introduction of new words but, broadly speaking, about the introduction of other dimensions of language as well such as syntax, rhetoric, and accompanying ideology through strategies such as contrastive analysis and other pedagogical strategies (Decker, 2000; Harrison, 2004; Rose & Galloway, 2017).

Multilingual English is an easy target of intolerant language ideologies, educational policies, and pedagogical practices—for example, see the petition to drop an allegedly derogatory Singlish term from the OED (Leong, 2016), or the public denigration of "Multicultural London English" (Cheshire et al., 2017). However, if our premise that multilingual English emerges from globalization processes is correct, then such policies and practices must be reconfigured to account for the changing nature of English language use (Kirkpatrick, 2011). Note that governments, state, and regional policies (including language-in-education policies), the media, parents, students, and the general public at large, demand more (not less) teaching of English on grounds that it is the language of globalization. Yet, not

much is done to unpack the nature of globalization itself and how it impacts on the nature of English language use today. Thus, if we follow the argument that the teaching of English is necessary to prepare our young children for the challenges of globalization, then what happens in the classroom must also take account of multilingual English as a sociolinguistic fact. Similarly, if we follow the same argument, then what happens in the classroom is a case of the localization or indigenization of English. Even with teachers who are solely invested in the teaching of just one "standard" English, the multilingual nature of teaching and learning is what shapes the English language in the classroom. According to Bernardo (2017), local appropriations of English in the classroom abound whether we acknowledge them or not. As soon as a teacher begins to teach Standard English and students begin to learn it, the localization process has also begun. Cultural appropriation is undeniable in an English language classroom which serves as an intersection of different languages, cultures and identities brought forth by globalization (Kirkpatrick, 2011; Martin, 2014).

Therefore, the first step towards re-envisioning the teaching of English today is to embrace the notion of multilingual English. At this point, there are many available paradigms in understanding the multilingual nature of English—World Englishes (Kachru, 1992), English as a Lingua Franca (Jenkins, 2007), English as an International Language (McKay, 2002), and translingual English (Lee & Canagarajah, 2019). We do not endorse any one of them as there are certain merits for the choice of one over the others, although Pennycook (2008) reminds us that "we need to choose carefully between the available models of pluricentric Englishes" (p. 7). Such paradigms, nevertheless, all aim towards the embrace of multilingual English in all its forms, and we acknowledge the role of teachers and their institutions in making informed decisions on what is most appropriate in their respective contexts (Martin, 2014). What is necessary at this time is to highlight the importance of unframing our pedagogies away from monolingual views of English and the teaching of it, which are thus intolerant of new meanings and new structures in English language use.

The pedagogical use of multilingual English

Embracing multilingual English in the classroom, however, is not enough. "Whatever ELT policy and practices are introduced", according to Martin (2014, p. 483), "these will still be unsuccessful if teachers are not allowed to make their own decisions on the ground". Nevertheless, while teachers should be empowered to make decisions on the ground, it remains to be seen what sort of options teachers have (and know) upon which they make such decisions. What we are asserting here is that when teachers make a choice in the classroom, it is important to unpack the basic premises of such a choice. What options do they have, in the first place, from which their choice has emerged? These options, of course, do not simply refer to what they can do, but also to *why* they choose one particular option over others. It is for this reason that apart from reconceptualizing our understanding of the nature of English today, reconfiguring ELT practice around the

idea of a pluralizing English necessitates the surfacing of the pedagogical aims (or functions) of the teaching of multilingual English.

In the case of Singapore, for example, teachers are convinced of the cultural appropriateness of Singlish (or Colloquial Singapore English), but do not endorse its use in the classroom because of the fear (or misconception) that it will interfere in the learning of Standard English (Tan & Tan, 2008; Wee, 2014). Without addressing this misconception, there will not be substantial reconfiguration of English language classrooms in the country. Similarly, in Indonesia and other countries where English is taught as a foreign language or as a lingua franca, multilingual English is frowned upon as the majority of stakeholders (i.e. teachers, policy makers, curriculum developers) remain convinced that the "native" variety of standard English continues to be preferred (Floris & Renandya, 2020), Therefore, in embracing the notion of multilingual English and making it central to activating classroom practice, there need to be clear and evidence-based justifications (Godley et al., 2006; Tan & Tan, 2008; Wheeler, 2006) on why the use of multilingual English in all its forms in the classroom is pedagogically and ethically sound. Consequently, the teaching of multilingual English must be re-envisioned as leading towards three overlapping objectives: (1) changing attitudes, (2) affirming cultural identities, and (3) facilitating learning.

Attitudinal change

To reiterate what Matsuda & Matsuda (2017) claim above, the reality of English language use today is that it is messy, and this "messiness" has led us to rethink our idea of English as belonging to the so-called "native speakers" alone. Although Kachru (1992) and Phillipson (1992) many years ago already reminded us of some dangerous and harmful sacred cows in ELT, such ideologically sticky views and practices continue to be prevalent in the ELT profession today (Jenkins, 2005; Litzenberg, 2016). For example, there remains a strong belief that the "native speaker" of English is the de facto ideal English teacher. Views of competence here are drawn from native-speakerism (Holliday, 2006), or the untenable belief in the superiority of the "native speaker" when it comes to the teaching of English, and this pervades even the hiring practices of ELT institutions around the world today (Floris & Renandya, 2020; Mahboob & Golden, 2013). Moreover, there is also the pervasive belief that the teaching of English must be done only through "standard" English. This view of ELT ignores or devalues all other varieties of English which are present in the classroom, and these varieties are usually uses of the language which have been found to be "corrupted", "uneducated", or "ungrammatical". These are the varieties which are marginalized in the classroom, and because they are associated with particular groups of students, these students experience marginalization as well.

Such marginalized non-standard Englishes, however, are linguistic systems on their own, which means that their use is rule-governed and, thus, grammatically sound. They only become "ungrammatical" if they are subjected to the grammar or rules of the standard variety. In other words, if grammatical and semantic order

is observed among the so-called non-standard Englishes in the classroom, it is then possible to demonstrate and argue that condescending or negative values associated with these Englishes have *no* linguistic basis, that these are products of misconceptions, cultural biases and stereotypes, and standard language ideologies. Labov (1972) five decades ago already strongly highlighted this problem among teachers, thus proving that non-linguistic (negative) valuation of particular uses of language remains a great educational challenge today: "…the child's teacher has no systematic knowledge of the non-standard forms which oppose and contradict standard English. Some teachers are reluctant to believe that there are systematic principles in nonstandard English which differ from those of standard English" (p. 4). If such confusion or bias is addressed successfully, this will then at least lead to some teachers' (and consequently students') changed attitudes towards such non-standard Englishes and, in the case of our paper, multilingual English (Sifakis, 2007).

Sharpening our views of "non-standard" Englishes as linguistically and communicatively legitimate (that is, there is nothing wrong with them in so far as their grammatical and functional systems are concerned) also leads us to the unpacking of prescriptive discourse in ELT, such as the use of opposite terms like correct or wrong, good or bad, and standard or non-standard. Their use cannot be justified on linguistic grounds if Englishes are evaluated on their own terms, and not through the lens of the preferred school variety. For example, there is nothing in the linguistic system of a "non-standard" variety which can be described in linguistic terms as "non-standard". Thus:

> The most useful notion of "correct English grammar" is that a correct English grammar accurately describes how English is used by a community of its speakers. This implies that there are as many correct grammars as there are communities of speakers.
>
> (Fasold, 1971, p. 83)

It is people and institutions that are involved in the politics of labelling, thus it "is no coincidence that social groups who speak marginalized varieties are themselves often marginalized or disadvantaged in society" (Siegel, 2006, p. 158). In other words, we cannot separate people from the languages and language varieties they speak, thus by labelling their uses of language as "corrupt", what we are doing in fact is describing the speakers as "corrupt", thus "institutionalizing linguistic inequality" (Sato, 1989 p. 264). This is the point made by several scholars both in sociolinguistic and educational studies for at least five decades already (Labov, 1972; Nero, 2006; Wolfson & Manes, 1985), but when teachers are exposed to or sensitized into the logic and reality of non-standard English(es) (Fasold, 1971; Kachru, 1992; Labov, 1969; Litzenberg, 2016; Trudgill, 1979), their attitudes towards non-standard Englishes and their speakers become more positive and sympathetic (Ahn, 2014; Litzenberg, 2016; Siegel, 2006). This in turn translates to changed attitudes, and more realistic learning expectations and improved academic results, among students (Godley et al., 2006; Kubota, 2001; Lee, 2019).

This does not mean the disregard of the teaching of the school-preferred variety of English; in fact, it is a misconception to think in this way. The embrace of non-standard forms of English is meant to simultaneously address questions of attitude, identity, and learning, as will hopefully become clearer in the sections below. How does one learn the school-preferred variety while affirming students' cultural identities and values? Attitudinal change, in this sense, does not mean ignoring the importance of Standard English (even if scholars continue to debate on what exactly constitutes the "standard"), but it leads to how we reframe the way we teach it in the classroom:

> When teachers engage in the teaching of Standard English, it is important that they frame Standard English as an addition to students' linguistic repertoires, rather than as a more prestigious, more "correct" substitution for the varieties that students already speak.
>
> (Godley et al., 2006, p. 33)

In this way, we keep true to the ideal of embracing the notion of multilingual English as this involves the recognition of multiple English linguistic repertoires in the classroom, which can then be organized in a way that also embraces multiple identities and cultures in the classroom.

Cultural affirmation

The identity-affirming role of the pedagogy of multilingual English is another reason why recognition of non-standard or marginalized varieties in the classroom is important. The research literature is replete with firm statements about the need to embrace students' identities through the incorporation of their vernacular English speech repertoires (Cheshire et al., 2017; Godley et al., 2006; Higgins, 2016; Nero, 2006; Siegel, 1997). The identity-affirming role of marginalized Englishes in the classroom is actually one of the most common reasons provided by both teachers and students when asked about the value of such marginalized varieties in their lives (Nero, 2006; Tan & Tan, 2008). At the very least, these Englishes are reflections of the speakers' local cultural identities and practices, thus this line of argumentation is not difficult for teachers, parents, and administrators to accept.

However, much of the research into teachers or students' acceptance of non-standard Englishes describes their attitudes and beliefs as conflicted or ambivalent (Chisholm & Godley, 2011; Godley & Escher, 2012; Jenkins, 2005; Litzenberg, 2016; Sung, 2016; Tan & Tan, 2008) precisely because the cultural affirmation that the use of marginalized Englishes generates is not strong or sufficient enough to supplant teachers and students' deeply embedded standard language ideologies and/or inability to link non-standard Englishes with pedagogical efficacy. This is made more difficult by the fact that educational regimes do not only promote such ideologies but, in fact, diminish the importance of linguistic and cultural diversity in the classroom, and consequently discourage or even ban the use of non-

standard forms of English. "It is hard to argue", according to Cummins et al. (2005, pp. 38–39), "that we are teaching the whole child when school policy dictates that students leave their language and culture at the schoolhouse door".

Therefore, in reconceptualizing ELT along the lines of the identity-affirming argument, it is necessary to surface studies which show that nurturing (instead of denigrating) students' identities within linguistically diverse classrooms (here including English, its different varieties, as well as multiple languages) actually helps improve their overall attitude towards schooling in general, minimizes youth delinquency, encourages more class participation, and promotes intercultural respect and harmony. A recent study on linguistically diverse classrooms, involving 67 Flemish primary schools, 1255 teachers, and 1761 pupils, has shown that despite the challenges of teaching in diverse classrooms, embracive attitudes and classroom practices towards cultural and linguistic differences have a positive impact on students' sense of school belonging (SSB) (Van Der Wildt et al., 2017), an important connection to make as SSB has been found to correlate with school dropout rates, behavioral problems, delinquency, and even drug use (p. 869) (see Godley et al., 2006; Kelly, 2013; Kubota, 2001; Siegel, 2008, for a variety of impact of attitudinal change towards English linguistic diversity on students' school performance and intercultural competence).

Facilitation of learning

The impact of the use of multilingual English in the classroom—whether realized as Englishes, English as a Lingua Franca, marginalized or non-standard English(es), or translingual English—on student learning is perhaps the least articulated justification for the need to embrace non-standard forms of English (and in fact, all other languages, and dialects other than English) in the classroom. As mentioned above, the interference argument (Siegel, 1997; Wee, 2014)—that multilingual English interferes in the learning of "Standard English"—is still pervasive in ELT today, even if sociolinguistically speaking the learning of English in the classroom automatically localizes the language due to the multilingual repertoires of both teacher and students. Embedded in this argument is standard language ideology which refers to a language belief system that accords unquestioned privilege to what is accepted as the standard language or dialect in society (Bacon, 2017; Litzenberg, 2016; Rose & Galloway, 2017). According to this ideology, the standard language promises good life, social mobility, and economic prosperity, among other things, even if such a promise remains an idealization because systemic inequalities in society do not open up equal opportunities for the learning and use of the standard language or dialect to all groups of people. In other words, the promise of Standard English does not translate into the fulfilment of the promise for all of those who choose to learn English because not everyone has the economic and symbolic resources to access quality education in English. But precisely because the belief in the superiority or desirability of Standard English is an ideology, it does not bring to the surface all these issues of unattainability through the study of Standard

English. What this tells us about the interference argument is that, while teachers (and other educational stakeholders, for that matter) find it relatively easy to accept that non-standard Englishes are legitimate forms of communication, as well as repositories or generators of much-valued cultural identities, the ideology of standard English makes it difficult for teachers to endorse their use openly in the classroom (Litzenberg, 2016). There is a lack of an alternative view which reconceptualizes multilingual English as directly useful in student learning, one that does not only deploy a sociolinguistic argument (e.g. "the pluralization of English is real"), but also explicitly demonstrates the effectiveness of non-standard use in facilitating students' learning of English.

This is unfortunate because there has, in fact, been substantial research for many decades now which empirically has shown that rather than impeding the learning of "Standard English", the use of students' non-standard English(es) does in fact facilitate the learning of the school-preferred English (Godley et al., 2006; Labov, 1969; 1972; Sato, 1989; Siegel, 1997; 2006; 2008), including higher test scores in *English language* tests for students who learned "standard" English through the strategic use of non-standard varieties than those who were taught without the use of such varieties in the classroom (Decker, 2000; Godley et al., 2006; Siegel, 2008). "So much research, so little change", according to Wheeler (2016, p. 367). In other words, if used strategically and judiciously, the use of students' own-language or own-language variety simultaneously affirms their cultural identities *and* supports their learning in English language classrooms, such as the positive impact of the use of colloquial English (as opposed to the use of standard English) on enhancing listening comprehension (Karimi, 2018), non-standard English on raising awareness of and improving proficiency in Standard English (Wheeler, 2006), and English in codeswitching situations on developing academic literacy skills (Martínez, 2010). In the end, what we need, according to Alfaro & Bartolomé (2017), is "ideological clarity", and this should feature a reconfigured argument about the pedagogical desirability of non-standard Englishes which includes—and celebrates—the positive impact of their use on student learning.

From multilingual English to unequal Englishes

Now that we have (hopefully) established the sociolinguistic basis of multilingual English (in all its forms and realizations), and upheld its pedagogical efficacy of its incorporation into classroom practice, the last but equally important question which needs to be addressed to account for a fuller re-envisioning of ELT today is this: "Why should we be concerned about the status of non-standard or marginalized Englishes in the classroom?" This is a seemingly straightforward question but, as we will elaborate below, this is a complex interrogation of the classroom as a battleground for linguistic (in)justice. The fact that multilingual English is constituted by non-standard or marginalized forms of plural English(es) is already indicative of the marginalization or minoritization of their speakers in and outside the classroom. We urge the use of multilingual English for pedagogical purposes

precisely because we hope to increase or improve the chances of the students to do better in school, including in their English language classrooms, since they (or their sociolinguistic and socioeconomic profiles) have historically experienced linguistic discrimination and educational marginalization. The linguistic justice dimensions (Piller, 2016) in the teaching and learning of English emerge out of the fact that the "victims" of standard language ideologies, including native speakerism, are precisely those who do not or cannot speak the standard (and thus must require culturally sensitive ways to scaffold their learning), and those who have been excluded from the definition of who qualifies as "native speakers" of English. Many studies which we have cited earlier in the paper (e.g. Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017; Godley et al., 2006; Kelly, 2013; Labov, 1969; 1972; Martínez, 2010; Sato, 1989; Siegel, 1997; 2006; 2008) all point to unequal spaces and opportunities in English language classrooms, with some groups of speakers, learners, or students more vulnerable to disadvantage than others.

Thus, in re-envisioning ELT today in the midst of escalating globalization, a key consideration is to deploy multilingual English in the classroom as a means to rectify—and transform—linguistic and cultural inequalities in the classroom. In so doing, multilingual English must be viewed not simply as multiple Englishes which circulate in the classroom but, more importantly and more realistically as *Unequal Englishes* (Ha, 2015; Henry, 2015). There is wisdom in celebrating the plurality of English(es) in the world today, but we should not be deluded into thinking that these Englishes (linguistically and culturally legitimate uses and varieties of English) are created equal (Dovchin et al., 2016; Sabaté-Dalmau, 2018; Tupas, 2015; Tupas & Salonga, 2016).

Consequently, the ELT classroom is an arena for the activation of inequalities of English where different Englishes are unequally valued, and their speakers unequally treated as well. Therefore, re-envisioning ELT demands that we not only think of ELT practice as helping students and learners do well in school, but also as working towards teaching and learning as more just and less discriminatory—ensuring that teachers have "ideological clarity" (Alfaro & Bartolomé, 2017) in implementing policies in the classroom. There are many ways to rectify linguistic injustices in the classroom (although admittedly it is not enough), some of which include the use of contrastive analysis for additive bidialectalism (Nero, 2006; Wheeler, 2006), debates on real life language campaigns to help students interrogate standard language ideologies (Rose & Galloway, 2017), classroom-based investigations of linguistic landscape (Sayer, 2009; Rowland, 2013), use of hip-hop for literacy skills development (Kelly, 2013; Pennycook, 2003), use of alternative forms of assessment which utilize a wider range of varieties of English (of course, including the standard variety) (Nero, 2006), and incorporating English linguistic diversity into textbooks and lessons (Matsuda, 2012). If we frame these concrete classroom strategies within an understanding of *Unequal Englishes*, our new vision of ELT thus will have to be one that embraces linguistic diversity and correct historically constructed linguistic and cultural injustices in the classroom (Henry, 2015; Martin & Morgan, 2015).

Conclusion

We have hopefully presented a convincing argument for the need to reconceptualize the way English is taught today. We have also provided research evidence that supports the view that the multilingual approach to teaching and learning English not only reflects the sociolinguistic reality in our classrooms, but it can also lead to more positive learning outcomes, especially for those whose linguistic backgrounds differ markedly from those of the mainstream students. However, it is worth noting that while language scholars are eager to whole-heartedly embrace the multilingual English model, language teachers (regardless of which variety/varieties of English they use) seem to continue to hold a less enthusiastic attitude towards this new approach to language teaching. This perhaps helps explain why there continues to be "so little change" at the classroom level despite the fact that "so much research" has been done in the past two decades (Wheeler, 2016, p. 367). Thus, Cheshire et al. (2017) urge "for a clearer dialogue between linguists and schools, so that schools are well informed about the properties of local linguistic varieties, and their relation to standard English" (p. 6). Similarly, we also urge language scholars to regularly engage teachers and other stakeholders (e.g. policy makers, curriculum, and materials developers) in a reflective and critical discussion on the importance of adopting a sociolinguistically more sensitive approach to language teaching.

References

Ahn, H. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards Korean English in South Korea. *World Englishes*, 33(2), 195–222.

Alfaro, C., & Bartolomé, L. (2017). Preparing ideologically clear bilingual teachers: Honoring working-class non-standard language use in the bilingual education classroom. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 26(2), 11–34.

Bacon, C. K. (2017). Dichotomies, dialects, and deficits: Confronting the "Standard English" myth in literacy and teacher education. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 66(1), 341–357.

Bernardo, A. (2017). Philippine English in the ESL classroom: A much closer look. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 19, 117–114.

Canagarajah, S. (2012). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. London & New York: Routledge.

Chen, H. (2016). "Chinese helicopter": Singlish OED entry baffles Singaporeans. *BBC*. Retrieved from: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-36283670

Cheshire, J., Hall, D., & Adger, D. (2017). Multicultural London English and social and educational policies. *Languages, Society & Policy*. doi:10.17863/CAM.9804

Chisholm, J. S., & Godley, A. J. (2011). Learning about language through inquiry-based discussion: Three bidialectal high school students' talk about dialect variation, identity, and power. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 43(4), 430–468.

Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Chow, P., & France, S. C. (2005). Affirming identity in multilingual classrooms. *The Whole Day*, 63(1), 38–43.

Decker, K. (2000). *The use of Belize Kriol to improve English proficiency*. Paper presented at the 5th International Creole Workshop, Florida International University.

Dovchin, S., Sultana, S., & Pennycook, A. (2016). Unequal translingual Englishes in the Asian peripheries. *Asian Englishes*, 18(2), 92–108.

Fasold, R. W. (1971). What can an English teacher do about nonstandard dialect? *English Record*, 21(4), 82–91.

Floris, F. D., & Renandya, W. A. (2020). Promoting the value of non-native English-speaking teachers. *PASAA*, 59(1), 1–19.

Godley, A., & Escher, A. (2012). Bidialectal African American adolescents' beliefs about spoken language expectations in English classrooms. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 55(8), 704–713.

Godley, A. J., Sweetland, J., Wheeler, R. S., Minnici, A., & Carpenter, B. D. (2006). Preparing teachers for dialectally diverse classrooms. *Educational Researcher*, 35(8), 30–37.

Ha, P. L. (2015). Unequal Englishes in imagined intercultural interactions. In R. Tupas (Ed.), *Unequal Englishes: The politics of Englishes today* (pp. 223–243). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Harrison, N. (2004). Self-recognition and well-being: Speaking Aboriginal English in healthy classrooms. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 33, 7–13.

Henry, E. S. (2015). "Just an old joke": Chinglish, narrative, and linguistic inequality in the Chinese English classroom. In R. Tupas (Ed.), *Unequal Englishes: The politics of Englishes today* (pp. 95–110). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Higgins, C. (2016). Towards sociolinguistically informed language teacher identities. In G. Barkhuizen (Ed.), *Reflections on language teacher identity research* (pp. 45–50). New York: Routledge.

Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, 60(4), 385–387.

Holquist, M. (1990). *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his world*. London: Routledge.

Horner, B., NeCamp, S., & Donahue, C. (2011). Toward a multilingual composition scholarship: From English only to a translingual norm. *College Composition and Communication*, 63(2), 269–300.

Jenkins, J. (2005). Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: The role of teacher attitudes and identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 535–542.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Karimi, L. (2018). Effect of using colloquial versus Standard English to teach EFL listening comprehension. *International Journal of Listening*. doi:10.1080/10904018.2018.1443009

Kelly, L. L. (2013). Hip-hop literature: The politics, poetics, and power of hip-hop in the English classroom. *English Journal*, 102(5), 51–56.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). English as an Asian lingua franca and the multilingual model of ELT. *Language Teaching*, 44(2), 212–224.

Kubota, R. (2001). Teaching world Englishes to native speakers of English in the USA. *World Englishes*, 20(1), 47–64.

Labov, W. (1969). The logic of nonstandard English. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *20th Annual Round Table: Linguistics and the teaching of Standard English to speakers of other languages or dialects* (no. 22). Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lee, E., & Canagarajah. S. (2019). The connection between transcultural dispositions and translingual practices in academic writing. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 14(1), 14–28.

Lee, J. S. (2019). Teacher as change agent: attitude change toward varieties of English through teaching English as an international language. *Asian Englishes*, 21(1), 87–102.

Leong, W. K. (2016, May 28). Petition to drop derogatory Singlish term from OED. *Asia One*. Retrieved from: https://www.asiaone.com/singapore/petition-drop-derogatory-singlish-term-oed

Li, Wei (2017). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30.

Litzenberg, J. (2016). Pre-service teacher perspectives towards pedagogical uses of non-native and native speech samples. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 26(2), 168–189.

Lüdi, G., & Py, B. (2009). To be or not to be…a plurilingual speaker. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6(2), 154–167.

Mahboob, A., & Golden, R. (2013). Looking for native speakers of English: Discrimination in English Language Teaching job advertisements. *Voices in Asia Journal*, 1(1), 72–81.

Martin, I. P. (2014). English language teaching in the Philippines. *World Englishes*, 33(4), 472–485.

Martin, I. P. (Ed.). (2018). *Reconceptualizing English education in a multilingual society: English in the Philippines*. Singapore: Springer.

Martin, I., & Morgan, B. (2015). Preparing teachers for "unequal Englishes": The D-TEIL experience in Cuba. In R. Tupas (Ed.), *Unequal Englishes: The politics of Englishes today* (pp. 244–264). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Martínez, R. A. (2010). Spanglish as literacy tool: Toward an understanding of the potential role of Spanish-English code-switching in the development of academic literacy. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 45(2), 124–149.

Matsuda, A. (2003). Incorporating world Englishes in teaching English as an International Language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 719–729.

Matsuda, A. (2012). Teaching materials in EIL. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay, G. Hu, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for the Teaching of English as an International Language* (pp. 168–185). New York: Routledge.

Matsuda, A., & Matsuda, P. K. (2017). Teaching English as an international language: A WE-informed paradigm for English language teaching. In E. L. Low & A. Pakir (Eds.), *World Englishes: Rethinking paradigms* (pp. 104–117). London: Routledge.

Matsuda, P. K. (2014). The lure of translingual writing. *PMLA*, 129(3), 478–483.

McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nero, S. (2006). Language, identity, and education of Caribbean English speakers. *World Englishes*, 25(3-4), 501–511.

Pennycook, A. (2003). Global Englishes, rip slyme, and performativity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4), 513–533.

Pennycook, P. (2008). Translingual English. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 1–9.

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

Piller, I. (2016). *Linguistic diversity and social justice: An introduction to applied sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Quismundo, T. (2015, June 26). 40 Filipino-coined words now in Oxford dictionary, *Inquirer.net*. Retrieved from: https://globalnation.inquirer.net/125245/40-filipino-coined-words-now-in-oxford-dictionary

Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2017). Debating standard language ideology in the classroom: Using the "Speak Good English Movement" to raise awareness of global Englishes. *RELC Journal*, 48(3), 294–301.

Rowland, L. (2013). The pedagogical benefits of a linguistic landscape project in Japan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(4), 494–505.

Sabaté-Dalmau, M. (2018). "I speak small": Unequal Englishes and transnational identities among Ghanaian migrants. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 15(4), 365–382.

Salazar, D. (2014). Towards improved coverage of Southeast Asian Englishes in the Oxford English Dictionary. *Lexicography*, 1(1), 95–108.

Salazar, D. (2018, Jan 5). From datus to trapos: reading Philippine history in the OED. *new mandala: New perspectives on Southeast Asia*. Retrieved from: https://www.newmandala.org/datus-trapos-reading-philippine-history-oed/

Saraceni, M., & Jacob, C. (2019). Revisiting borders: named languages and de-colonization. *Language Sciences*, 76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2018.05.007

Sato, C. J. (1989). A nonstandard approach to standard English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(2), 259–282.

Sayer, P. (2009). Using the linguistic landscape as a pedagogical resource. *ELT Journal*, 64(2), 143–154.

Siegel, J. (1997). Using a pidgin language in formal education: Help or hindrance? *Applied Linguistics*, 18(1), 86–100.

Siegel, J. (2006). Language ideologies and the education of speakers of marginalized language varieties: Adopting a critical awareness approach. *Linguistics and Education*, 17(2), 157–174.

Siegel, J. (2008). Pidgin in the classroom. *Educational Perspectives*, 41, 55–65.

Sifakis, N. (2007). The education of teachers of English as a lingua franca: A transformative perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17(3), 355–375.

Sung, C. C. M. (2016). Exposure to multiple accents of English in the English Language Teaching classroom: From second language learners' perspectives. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(3), 190–205.

Tan, P. K., & Tan, D. K. (2008). Attitudes towards non-standard English in Singapore. *World Englishes*, 27(3-4), 465–479.

Trudgill, P. (1979). Standard and non-standard dialects of English in the United Kingdom: Problems and policies. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 21, 9–24.

Tupas, R. (Ed.). (2015). *Unequal Englishes: The politics of Englishes today*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Tupas, R., & Salonga, A. (2016). Unequal Englishes in the Philippines. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 20(3), 367–381.

Van Der Wildt, A., Van Avermaet, P., & Van Houtte, M. (2017). Multilingual school population: Ensuring school belonging by tolerating multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20(7), 868–882.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024–1054.

Wee, L. (2014). Linguistic chutzpah and the Speak Good Singlish movement. *World Englishes*, 33(1), 85–99.

Wheeler, R. (2016). "So much research, so little change": Teaching Standard English in African American classrooms. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 2, 367–390.

Wheeler, R. S. (2006). "What do we do about student grammar—All those missing - 'ed's' And -'s's'?" Using comparison and contrast to teach Standard English in dialectally diverse classrooms. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 5(1), 16–33.

Wolfson, N., & Manes, J. (1985). *Language of inequality*. Berlin: Mouton.

Part 2

Practices

5 Intercultural Communicative Competence development in an EFL context in Thailand

Pragasit Sitthitikul and Malinee Prapinwong

Meaning of Intercultural Communicative Competence

Before discussing the concept of Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC), it is important to agree on the meaning of the term *culture* (Moeller & Nugent, 2014; Olaya & Rodriquez, 2013) because ICC is built on the complex concepts of culture and communicative competence. The meaning of culture has been reconceptualized by scholars in different fields of study which subsequently makes a profound impact on the direction of English language teaching. The term *culture* has been understood and interpreted differently by different people as its meaning has been constantly challenged and explored by people from different fields of study. Culture is presently understood as something complex, fluid, and continuously evolving, and it is no longer seen as a fixed, static entity (Furstenberg, 2010; Moeller & Nugent, 2014; Rui, 2012). Moreover, the proponents of critical theory believe that the concept of culture is ideologically driven (Holliday, 2012). Ideology is defined as the presentation of ideas, values, and beliefs of an individual or group produced and shared by the majority in a society. Ideology can be distorted in order to promote a particular cultural and ethnic group interest. For example, national culture is driven by a political ideology that reinforces patriotism (Prapinwong, 2018). Recently national culture which ties to geographical territory has been called into question as it does not explain the complexity and reality of culture in which the diversity is the norm (Holliday, 2012; Ryan, 2012). People may belong to different cultures and change cultures many times in their lives (Kramsch, 2014; Risager, 2012). Jandt (2013) states that culture is a "process of social transmission of thoughts and behaviors from birth in the family and schools over the course of generations" (p. 7). Byram (2006) uses the term "social identities" in order to avoid the oversimplified and stereotypical views of culture. Based on this view, a person's social identity may include multiple identities such as race, gender, and linguistic and economic backgrounds, as well as the social organizations that the person belongs to. Knowing a person's cultural identity, including one's own, helps us to understand thoughts, patterns of behaviors, values, assumptions, and worldviews, as well as the opportunities and challenges that each individual in a particular group faces. (Jandt, 2013). This view corresponds to the non-essentialist view that avoids the focus on national and ethnic groups (Holliday, 1999).

Risager (2007), in her book *Language and Culture Pedagogy: From a National to a Transnational Paradigm*, distinguished the difference between cultural teaching and intercultural teaching. Cultural teaching is based on the national paradigm in which the culture is tied to the native speaker's norm. Thailand's foreign language curriculum's key performance indicators, for example, define English language and culture as that which matches the linguistic and cultural norm of native speakers of English. So, the cultural teaching may reflect the essentialists' view while rejecting the notion that the English language is presently diverse and multicultural (Noels, Yashima, & Zhang, 2012). Essentialism can be explained as a belief about social groupings associated with a country or a language, and this belief could lead to cultural stereotyping (Bradley, 2018). So, cultural essentialism is typically viewed as a negative or even dangerous influence. However, in practice, the national paradigm still has an influence in the teaching approach in foreign language classrooms because cultural teaching is historically established and a mentally fixed approach for learners to learn about the knowledge of certain ethnolinguistic groups.

Risager (2007) offers an alternative perspective—the *transnational perspective*—for intercultural teaching. Based on this view, English language learning and teaching is placed within a global context. English does not belong to a particular group of users, but instead the ownership of the English language belongs to the speakers who use it. Therefore, the language and culture taught should draw on the complex relationship between globalization and localization. This notion corresponds to what Baker (2011), a strong proponent of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), suggests, and places intercultural competence (IC) within the context of sociocultural process in which language and cultural teaching can be diverse, complex, and emergent (p. 200). English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers should position themselves to promote a more diverse and inclusive classroom environment in which critical reflections are encouraged. Therefore, an EFL teacher does not need to be a native speaker, but one who possesses a high level of proficiency in the language (Ryan, 2012) and assumes the role in a multicultural world (Olaya & Rodriquez, 2013).

Besides the complex nature of culture, ICC is also built on the notion of communicative competence developed by Hymes (1972). Communicative competence requires the appropriateness or sociolinguistic component as an integral part. Van Ek (cited in Lázár, Huber-Kriegler, Lussier, Matel, & Peck, 2007) asserts that sociocultural competence is the ability to function in several cultures, so a communicative competent user needs to communicate with others from different social/cultural customs with confidence and respect. An aim for the ICC approach is to develop competent speakers who appreciate and tolerate the differences among people (Jandt, 2013).

This conceptualization leads to the idea of global citizenship, which refers to "an awareness of and commitment to society justice for marginalized groups, grassroots environment, nonviolent and authentic democracy, environmental care, and North-South relations based on the principles of equity, respect, and sharing". (Toh as cited in Jackson, 2014, p. 300). This definition partially corresponds to

Byram's ICC model which similarly stresses the fundamental position of ICC development, that is, equality according to democratic value.

Jackson (2014) highlights the requisite competencies for today's global citizens by categorizing them into three kinds: Knowledge, attitude, and skill. For example, global citizenship requires one to have knowledge of world geography, languages, issues, and events while having sensitivity and respect for personal, linguistic, and cultural differences. As a result, a person with global citizenship has the critical and communication skills to effectively interact with people from different backgrounds (Jackson, 2014).

Byram's Intercultural Communicative Competence model

Due to the complex issues in studying the topic of interculturalism, which is approached by a wide range of disciplines and practices, researchers need to be aware of the new developments in related fields such as applied linguistics, communication studies, language education, psychology, etc. (Jackson, 2012). To add to the complexity, there are also a number of similar terms being used to talk about IC such as intercultural communication, intercultural communicative competence, cross cultural competence, multicultural competence, cultural fluency, intercultural sensitivity, cultural intelligence, etc. (Jackson, 2012). Byram's Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) has emerged in recent years as a prominent framework for the integration of an intercultural approach to language teaching.

A recent theoretical shift in foreign language teaching and learning involves an emphasis on the intercultural aspect of communication (Baker, 2011; Byram, 2012; Kramsch, 2014; Lavrenteva & Orland-Barak, 2015; Moeller & Nugent, 2014; Karabinar & Guler, 2013). In order to guide theory and practice, a number of models have been proposed, such as Chen and Starosta's model of intercultural communication competence (2000), Bennett's developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS), and Deardoff's process model of intercultural competence (Jackson, 2014; Moeller & Nugent, 2014). A common feature highlighted in these models is the internal transformation of individual or self-awareness. All agree that understanding cultural differences and developing tolerance are key to intercultural competence. It is also important to note that in order to understand others' cultures, one needs to reflect on his/her own culture by seeing the world from the perspectives of others. (Hanson & Lynch, 1998; Deardoff, 2009; Moeller & Nugent, 2014). Additionally, the models all pinpoint intercultural experiences as a journey or life experience. Therefore, the process of one person's intercultural transformation may not be the same as another's due to an individual's background, context, and situation.

Byram's ICC model is built on a concept of the communicative language teaching (CLT) (Byram, 2012), which states the appropriate use of knowledge of both rules of grammar and rules of language in a given context (Hymes, 1972). The ICC approach aims to develop the knowledge, attitude, and skill learners need to effectively communicate with people from different cultural backgrounds. This definition makes the ICC approach different from CLT whose goal is to enable learners to communicate like the native speakers. ICC, however, focuses on

the development of intercultural interlocutors. An interculturally competent speaker was originally made up of three competences: Linguistic, sociolinguistic, and discourse competence (Jackson, 2014; Matsuo, 2012). Later intercultural competence was added. Byram, Gribkova, and Starkey (2002) made the recommendation for foreign language teachers by emphasizing the purposes of learning a foreign language to prepare learners to "interact with people of other cultures; to enable them to understand and accept people from other cultures as individuals with other distinctive perspectives, values, and behaviors; and to help them see that such interaction is an enriching experience" (p. 6).

According to Byram (2012), the ICC model consists of five elements: Intercultural Attitudes, Knowledge, Skills of Interpreting and Relating, Skills of Discovery and Interaction, and Critical Cultural Awareness. The model is based on the idea of promoting human dignity and equality in democratic value (Byram, Gribkova, & Starkey, 2002). This underlying notion in Byram's ICC model theoretically reflects the influence of Western historical and social values and movements in equity and human rights. The embedded concepts such as openness to multiple viewpoints, acceptance, and respect for other people's voices are clearly echoed in the model. In Byram's book, *Developing the Intercultural Dimension in Language Teaching: A Practical Introduction for Teachers,* written for the Council of Europe, intercultural competence was introduced as an additional dimension to the widely known communicative competence, which focuses on how to use language appropriately in social situations (Byram, Gribkova, & Starkey, 2002). Based on this viewpoint, language teachers do not need to completely change their practices from the previously used communicative lessons; instead they need to prepare learners to understand the interconnected relationship between language and culture and to interact effectively and appropriately in social contexts. In contrast to CLT, Byram's model disrupts the notion of native speakers. His model gives a more realistic view of intercultural interaction in the globalized era where English is used among non-native speakers more often than between native and non-native speakers.

Byram's model also prioritizes curiosity and attitude as a first step into ICC development because if a learner has no curiosity or desire to learn about other cultures, there will be no skill or knowledge to develop (Vos, 2018). The skills of interpreting and relating facilitate learners using their existing knowledge to understand and relate to a different cultural issue such as the value of freedom in Western cultures and in the local context in Thailand. Many intercultural scholars and experts in the field agree that an key component in intercultural communication is critical intercultural awareness (Byram, 1997; Chen & Starosa, 2000; Jackson, 2014), which is defined as "an ability to evaluate, critically and on the basis of explicit criteria, perspectives, practices, and products in one's own and other cultures and countries" (Byram, 1997, p. 63). When learners are taught to critically examine cultural aspects, "it reduces the proliferation of stereotypes, prejudices, and misrepresentations of others" (Olaya & Rodriquez, 2013, p. 51).

An interculturally competent person should have the attitudes of openness, respect towards others, curiosity, and discovery (Deardoff, 2006). Also, intercultural competence should be transformative in nature, that is, a person should

go through stages of development. As Byram (1997) states, intercultural communicative competence is something that requires the life-long learning process (Deardoff, 2006).

Nonetheless Byram's ICC model has not been received without criticism. Some critics argue that the IC elements in Byram's model do not clearly link with the linguistic features (Cheewasukthaworn & Suwanarak, 2017), while some critics of ICC argue that Byram's ICC model is not so much different from CLT. Studies found that the implementation of the ICC approach undesirably increases the use of L1, which is perceived to be a drawback for L2 communicative development (Prapinwong, 2018). Moreover, research revealed many reasons for the unsuccessful implementation of ICC in a foreign language classroom. Among the most stated reasons include the stress on decoding skills in EFL classrooms, lack of learner interest, lack of curricular support, a lack of suitable material, a lack of ICC assessment, and even a concern about engaging with controversial issues (Lavrenteva & Orland-Barak, 2015; Young & Sachdev, 2011). These problems may have stemmed from putting too little emphasis on the important role and connection of culture in foreign language pedagogy (Richardson, 2012).

Consequently, the model itself is difficult apply in the classroom context. (Matsuo, 2012). Some view Byram's framework as a hybrid approach from two fields of study: Language teaching and intercultural communication (Cheewasukthaworn & Suwanarak, 2017). The realization of the interconnectedness of language and culture is of the utmost importance because this understanding will shape the whole concept of, and perspective on, language teaching and learning. Byram (2012) points out that the language–culture nexus results in a psychological perspective based on Risager's (2007) foreign language teaching dimension. A person's lived experience is individually unique due to their linguistic and cultural experiences. Therefore, learning a foreign language inevitably involves the development of a person's unique cultural identity. This is the reason Byram's ICC model is viewed to be an individual-oriented model which may not directly yield practical classroom implications (Matsuo, 2012).

Moreover, being an interculturally competent teacher does not guarantee an effective approach to intercultural teaching (Mitchell et al., 2015). Baker (2011) argues that languages come into contact all the time and influence each other so it is difficult to draw a line between one language and culture and another. Therefore, the national conception of culture does not reflect the real world's linguistic and cultural phenomena.

Baker's argument corresponds with Matsuo (2012) who criticizes Byram's model for potentially leading people to believe in the cultural hegemony of nations. The implementation of the framework seems to simplistically equate intercultural competence with national cultures, so the pedagogy built on such notion can lead to stereotypes and superficiality. In order to avoid such negative impact, one must pay attention to the last element of the ICC model—critical cultural awareness in the development of intercultural communicative competence—by engaging learners in critical reflection on cultural aspects that they have been taking for granted. Similarly, other scholars in the field of applied linguistics

support this critical position on language and culture teaching. Many even say that it should be the center of the model (Matsuo, 2012).

Background of ICC in Thai education

The role of ICC in the context of Thailand can first be discussed from its educational policy. The Basic Education Core curriculum specifies English as a mandatory foreign language subject in Thailand. From the first grade, students are required to learn English as a subject in the standard-based curriculum, which includes performance indicators for each grade level. The foreign language national standards of Thailand follow the communicative language approach that includes four areas known as "the four Cs": Content, Culture, Content Area, and Community (Office of the Basic Education Commission, 2008). The four areas are similar to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) standards for foreign language education known as "the five Cs" (ACTFL, n.d.). Under the area of Language and Culture, there are two standards, as follows:

Standard F2.1) Appreciation of the relationship between language and culture of native speakers and capacity for use of language appropriate to occasions and places,
Standard F2.2) Appreciation of similarities and differences between language and culture of native and Thai speakers, and capacity for accurate and appropriate use of language.(Ministry of Education, 2008)

Additionally, the standards set performance indicators for each grade level. For example, a grade 8 indicator states that "learners should be able to compare and explain similarities and differences between the lifestyles and culture of native speakers and those of Thais" (Ministry of Education, 2008, p. 273).

The aforementioned standards raise three problematic issues involving ICC development that need to be addressed. First, understanding ICC involves both linguistic and cultural competence. However, there is no performance indicator in the curriculum that clearly specifies the interrelationship between language and culture. All indicators under the area of Language and Culture separate linguistic performance and cultural competence. For instance, an indicator for grade 10–12 states that students can explain/compare differences between the structures of sentences, texts, idioms, sayings, proverbs, and poems in foreign languages and the Thai language. There is a separate indicator for students being able to discuss similarities and differences between the lifestyles, beliefs, and culture of native speakers and those of Thais, and apply them appropriately (Office of the Basic Education Commission, 2008).

As a result, teachers often treat language and culture separately in their syllabi and in their classroom teaching. In fact, the separation between linguistic skill practice and cultural learning is quite a common practice in EFL classrooms. For instance, Olaya and Rodriquez (2013) found that EFL teachers in Columbia saw the role of cultural teaching for the sake of learning a language and gaining

general knowledge of a culture, but they did not see it as a determinant component in authentic communicative practices (p. 9). Thus, it is recommended that the foreign a language curriculum should be designed to integrate a sophisticated cultural component into the linguistic dimension (Karabinar & Guler, 2013) so that learners can see the intertwined relationship between language and culture.

The second issue involves the notion of native speakerism and ownership of the English language. The standards identify the culturally relevant performance for each grade level that emphasizes a native/non-native dichotomy. The standards indicate that learners appreciate the relationship between language and culture for a native speaker. This issue lies at the center of the debate in the field about the meaning of native speakerism and whose linguistic and cultural version we should adopt. Studies have shown growing awareness and advocacy for teaching varieties English in many parts of the world (Ahn, 2014; Bernaisch, 2012; Matsuda, 2003; Xu, 2006). The movement towards varieties of English has called for a critical reflection on current EFL practices in Thailand. A number of studies showed that the existing EFL paradigm may no longer serve the communicative needs of the global and local contexts. Nomnian (2013), for example, calls for a paradigm shift from EFL perspectives to ELF, which acknowledges the multilingual model of English, in order to reduce the emphasis on a native/non-native dichotomy. In the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) era, it is also a question of how English learners in Thailand should be prepared for using ELF to communicate with the ASEAN members (Suwannasom, 2016). The predominant view of English lessons based on "Western" views and anglophone materials has been called into question and found to be not responsive to the sociocultural realities of local contexts (Jindapitak & Teo, 2010). Foreign language learners should be able to develop competence based on a wider view of cultural contexts in which the language they are learning is used (Laopongharn & Sercombe, 2009).

The last curricular issue is the focus on "Big cultures" or cultural products, such as festivals, celebrations, lifestyles, customs, and traditions. The standard indicators view cultural teaching as that in which the knowledge about native speakers should be transmitted to learners rather than focusing on the acquisition of attitudes and development of awareness when interacting with people from different cultural backgrounds. The main focus on material cultures also leads to stereotypical views and biases. This third issue is also echoed in other foreign language curricula where national standards often do not entirely represent the dynamic nature of culture (Drewelow & Mitchell, 2015; Olaya & Rodriquez, 2013).

Moreover, the status and circumstance of foreign language as a learning area in the Thai basic curriculum presents a big challenge for intercultural communicative development. Typically, EFL learners in a monolingual context lack opportunities to communicate in English on a daily basis, yet the learning time in schools is limited. The core curriculum indicates that academic learning time is allocated based on the length of a school day and does not exceed five hours each day for primary levels and six hours for secondary levels. Therefore, the learning time for the foreign language areas is fixed to the minimum of 40 hours out of 1,000 hours of the total learning time per year for grade 1 to grade 3, and the minimum of 80

hours out of 1,200 hours for grades 4 to 6, and the minimum of 120 hours for grades 7 to 9 (Office of the Basic Education Commission, 2008). Compared to other subject areas, the allotted time for learning English in the curriculum is much lower. For example, the learning time for Thai language or mathematics is set at the minimum of 200 hours (grade 1 to 3), 160 hours (grade 4 to 6), and 120 hours (grade 10 to 12). Although the learning hours are specified as minimums, and schools can adjust the national curriculum to the local needs, schools might not have capacities, resources, and personnel available to promote the successful implementation of English language teaching with integrated ICC.

ICC in teacher preparation program

Apart from the curricular issue for learners, the ICC development for teachers of English does not receive sufficient attention. Cultural/intercultural competency has not been explicitly stressed in other areas of teacher preparation programs except in the foreign language teaching major in which intercultural competence may be integrated in the language skills courses. Typically, pre-service teachers in other subject areas are generally not prepared for the IC in the teacher preparation programs. IC in this case refers to an ability to mediate between people who may speak the same language but have different cultural and social discourses. However, in 2013, the Teachers' Council of Thailand (TCT), which monitors professional standards in teacher education programs, announced new standards that included *culture* as a competency requirement in one of eleven professional standards. That particular standard identified language and culture competencies to promote peaceful and harmonious coexistence. These competencies were inclusively required for all teachers regardless of the subject matters they taught. These standards corresponded to the UNESCO call for the intercultural competence development from teacher training institutes (UNESCO, 2013). It is important to note, however, that the TCT's standards have been constantly revised. A recent draft of the TCT's standards have not included cultural competencies vis-à-vis the language, but identified a standard in another domain targeting the ability to understand and get involved with the community in order to be able to live harmoniously with people from different cultural backgrounds. This revised set of standards separates the once-established connection between language and culture. Language is again seen an instrument rather than a carrier to learn a foreign culture. Regardless of what the policy is, teachers in the 21st century are highly expected to be interculturally competent and to be able to work with learners from diverse backgrounds.

ICC issues in ESL/EFL

A large amount of research related to ICC in an EFL context like Thailand stems from the field of intercultural communication in which the studied interactions occurred in international business sectors such as hospitality and tourism. This research aimed to explore cross-cultural awareness among hotel workers and international tourists. A common finding of these studies was an inadequacy of

ICC development in Thai hotel industries and a requirement for a higher level of ICC to be put into action. This means that ICC cannot only be learned in theory; it needs to be put into practice (Jäämaa, 2015; Ming, 2018; Suthaipiyapathra, 2009; Sucher & Cheung, 2015; Inkaew, 2016). In addition, cross-cultural experiences, such as those of sojourners spending a period of time abroad, have also been explored by a number of researchers. The questionnaires are often employed to collect data and measure the intercultural adaptability and sensitivity of the participants. This methodology limits the pedagogical recommendations that can be made from their findings. Little is yet known about how ICC can be effectively taught in language classrooms.

A common issue in the implementation of ICC in language classrooms involves the teachers' understanding of the meaning of ICC. ESL/EFL teachers often find ICC development in conflict with the goal of a language classroom (i.e. to develop students' linguistic fluency), therefore, there is not adequate time to focus on teaching cultures. For example, Young and Sachdev (2011) found out that language learners in the UK, US, and France preferred to prioritize speaking skills in their EFL course curriculum while intercultural skills were ranked the second lowest priority despite the fact that the teachers agreed on their importance. A number of studies found that language teachers have not been able to meaningfully integrate cultural aspects into communicative lessons due to the lack of specific pedagogical models related to ICC (Reid, 2015; Rui, 2012; Zerzová, 2018). Loo, Trakulkasemsuk, and Zilli (2018) discovered that English teachers working in Thailand implemented ICC in varying degrees of depth due to the fact that an ICC teaching approach had not been formally expected in language classrooms. As a result, there is no clear direction in ICC teaching practices.

A study done by Karabina and Guler (2012) revealed that EFL teachers in Turkey found themselves lacking support in teaching cultures. The EFL materials are grammar-focused and present narrow cultural perspectives based on only British or American culture. In fact, the materials used in EFL contexts could serve as an important element for successful integration of intercultural perspectives so that values such as empathy and respect towards other cultural groups can be developed. Olaya and Rodriquez (2013) also addressed another issue of EFL teachers' perspectives in the Columbian context. They discovered that EFL teachers still understood the concept of culture in a traditional sense, that is as static and tangible. As a consequence of such an understanding, the cultural topics chosen in class involved mostly surface cultures such as foods, arts, and entertainment, rather than topics related to deep cultures such as politeness, discrimination, etc. Based on this study, Olaya and Rodriquez (2013) recommend preparing pre-service teachers to address issues of deep cultures, particularly the values and belief systems that are different from their own cultures, and trying to connect those to individual identities.

How culture influences Thai students in the US: A case study

This case study was conducted with the purpose of exploring the voices and reflections of Thai students who studied at an American institution as it often

helps to know that thousands of other international students have faced similar experiences and thus we can learn from them. In this section, a unique set of experiences and comments provided by Thai students when studying in an American university is reported, including how they adjusted to the differences from their home countries. The informants were purposively selected for this study. They were the two female Thai graduate students who studied in the Graduate School of Nursing. Their fictitious names were Vila and Duang. The criteria established for the informant selection included no previous experience within a US educational institution and enrollment in a program for the first semester. Vila came to the United States on a government grant to do her master's and doctorate degrees in nursing. Before coming to the United States, Vila worked as a registered nurse in a government hospital, and a nurse instructor. She was a shy person. Her English proficiency was very limited. She was in her first semester of the graduate program for geriatric nurse practitioners in the Department of Nursing. Duang, the other informant, was pursuing her doctorate degree in nursing. She had an outgoing personality. Her inadequate English hindered her from interacting with her schoolmates and class discussion. She seemed willing to learn to absorb and adapt to the new cultural environment.

The investigation was a qualitative case study to provide an in-depth understanding of the problems and experiences of Thai students studying at US educational institutions. The data were collected via open-ended interviews and observations. In general, the informants were asked to discuss their experiences and what they saw as the major problems of studying in the US. The transcriptions of the interviews served as the main data source. Observations were also carried out for this study by making frequent visits to the informants. The observation notes, through field notes and personal notes, were recorded to capture the feelings, responses, and reactions of the informants in the observed situations and events. The data analysis involved reducing the data inductively rather than deductively. Analytic induction was used to search for recurring issues related to the process of adapting to a new academic life in an American university. The repeated analyses of the data seemed to suggest that common issues encountered in the process of a new life adjustment could be categorized under the following four major domains: linguistic differences, cultural differences, educational systems, and unconscious actions of professors and peers.

What follows are some of the informants' responses:

Vila's expressed that in her country, students would have a few tests, papers, and smaller assignments to complete for each class. But in the US the classes seem to be more comprehensive with one or two major papers and exams for each class.

She further stated,

> I was excited about studying in America before I came. I was hopeful that I could be integrated into the local educational culture. On my first days in class, I could barely understand the lecture. I understood about fifty to sixty per cent of what the professors said. To be a student in a different environment, I did not know that why I felt so tired by the end of the day even

> though I did not use much energy. To sort this doubt out of my mind, I tried to think and found out that because of the different language I had to produce to communicate was the reason. This is because whenever I had to say something, I had to think of not only the content, but also how to use the language understandably. The flow of the language was not automatic; it was a conscious process. That is why my brain had to work harder than usual and it made me more tired. This resulted in lowering my work and study productivity. More than that, it took me a long time to read each piece of article, and to write something was very time consuming.

The reason she gave to support her view was the fact that, because of linguistic difference, international students with different language backgrounds are very stressed in class. It is important for teachers to know this in order to encourage international students to work successfully. Linguistic difference also has an effect on classroom discussion and management. Language is the medium of communication, and discussion is part of communication. Hence, in order to discuss well, students have to be able to read texts with comprehension, and to share ideas by using the common language intelligibly. These tasks are not easy at the beginning. They are very challenging.

Vila concluded,

> The different social and cultural backgrounds and the way of thinking require some time for me to learn how to discuss well, and how to draw the right interpretation of the question in order to answer it with the apt concept. However, these differences are not to be used as an excuse for students if they want to fit in. We have to learn how to make progress and development as hard as we can, and our success also depends on the teachers in understanding the differences in social and cultural diversities.

Duang, another participant, voiced that it was fun, and it was different. It was definitely worth it. She was out of her normal life. In the US, she went to classes and met new friends from different places in the university. She said,

> There is a preconception at home that American sincerity is somewhat fake, but to me, it has come across as being really genuine. I think I have gained a more positive image of America because it has shown me that the US isn't all big-city crime and social breakdown, but that it is actually built up from its small towns. I guess I had some misconceptions before I came here. I've found that just living and finding a reality has been a really good experience. It has taught me to be a bit more open-minded.

She additionally commented, "I have gained a lot of self-confidence". She noted, "Whatever way you put it, it's a tough thing to do, to go away from your family and all your friends, and still do reasonably well and still have a good time as well".

Duang also noted,

> I think the school rewards an overall, continuous effort, and it took me a semester to realize this. I think the overall level of academic standards weren't as high maybe as I expected. The method of teaching is something which takes a while to get used to it if you have never worked independently. Often you will be asked to work in group for assignments. In most doctorate courses, the classes are conducted towards the evening. The reason is that many American students work full-time and do the study in a part-time basis. I was not used to it at first because I preferred to study during the day. However, it is something I have to learn to adapt. However, the best thing about the American education system is its practicality. It is not what you learn, it's how you use it in real life. It took me some time to get used to the fact that assignments are more important than the actual exam. The American education system is in no way confined to only books, most of the courses give more weight to the research and case studies than to actual exams. In my case, the assignments and research accounted for ninety per cent of the total mark; hence ensuring that students understand the subject and can carry it out in actual life. Also, the material I am studying is more interesting and specific to what I am interested in, with much better facilities and resources available. What I really like, though, is that the professors are really here for the students. They are very nice and kind to me. I am lucky to have a good advisor. But it is always tough. These difficulties are doubly increased by the language barrier. Some professors like to use slang in class unconsciously and treat me like an American student. At the beginning, I felt I was left alone and I was not part of the conversation because the professors and American students used the words I had never heard before. It was slang.

Duang concluded,

> I know that I have the communication problem because my English is not good enough. The most difficult and challengeable part for me is when I have to make a presentation. I would try to make my speech more naturally, but clearly. I have to be aware of the word stress, and pronunciation, which I am not very good at. I always speak with intended words and phrases and need the second thoughts to speak in English.

She concluded that,

> The best method of overcoming the problem is to get involved. The first opportunity to do is at Orientation Week. The session is a series of events and activities introducing students to aspects of life at university. It is a great way to get to know the university, make some friends and acquaintances, and settle in.

Discussion

Deardoff (2006) advocates a cognitive approach to international students focused on psychological adaptation to "acculturative stress". The acculturation process is described by Byram (2012) as developing through five stages from:

1 the honeymoon stage, when the student feels like a tourist, to
2 depression, when the student is overwhelmed by personal inadequacy in the new culture, to
3 hostility, when the student blames the host culture, to
4 autonomy, when the student sees both good and bad aspects in the host culture, and finally to
5 biculturalism, when the student is as comfortable in the host culture as back home.

Using Byram's model, Vila's case can be classified into stage two, depression, when the student is overwhelmed by personal inadequacy in the new culture. Duang seems to have fewer problems and less concern about her new life in America. She seems to adjust her life with fewer problems than Vila. According to the acculturation process, Duang is likely to be put under category four, autonomy, when the student sees both good and bad aspects in the host culture.

From this study, it could be concluded that the common challenges that these two informants faced can be placed into four categories: Linguistic differences, cultural differences, different academic systems, and unconscious actions of professors and peers. An international education executive memorandum identified the challenges the country and the education community face:

> To continue to compete successfully in the global economy and to maintain the role as a world leader, the United Sates needs to ensure that its citizens develop a broad understanding of the world, proficiency in other languages, and knowledge of other cultures.
>
> (Committee on Foreign Relations, 2001, p. 52)

This asks for American educational institutions to try to understand the challenges that international students face and to facilitate solutions. In this study, the four main domains of challenges are presented as guidelines for support in order to fulfill the above objective and make international students move from stage one to stage five in the acculturation process in a short time.

Guidelines for ICC implementation

Studies related to implementing the intercultural approach in classroom language learning are still scarce (Loo et al., 2018; Inkaew, 2016; Young & Sachdev, 2011). In order to make the ICC integration in the classroom successful, one must completely change how the EFL curriculum is viewed in relation to ICC

development. We have to stop assuming that culture is something for an advanced language course and that linguistic development can only be fostered for beginners. This section below provides guidelines for implementing ICC in EFL classrooms.

1 It has been generally agreed that successful implementation of ICC takes place in a communicative, learner-oriented curriculum (Young & Sachdev, 2011). Even at the curricular level, students are expected to be independent culture learners while teachers acts as guides rather than as sources of cultural knowledge (Lavrenteva & Orland-Barak, 2015). So, the goal of ICC lessons should not be the memorization of facts about the target culture by learners (Vos, 2018). Rather, the teacher can follow Byram's framework by introducing activities that respond to those five skills. For instance, the teacher can ask the students to read and compare the stance and viewpoint about gun control in a newspaper from an American context and discuss it from different cultural viewpoints even comparing different family values (Vos, 2018).
2 Teachers need a more comprehensive understanding of the term "culture". The lesson that we can learn from the ACTFL's five Cs is to position culture at the forefront of foreign language learning. The emphasis should be placed on connecting culture to all aspects of the curriculum. Teachers can introduce the concept of the three Ps of cultures (products, practices, and perspectives) and try to show how a broader meaning of culture is integrated in each, especially connecting practice and perspectives (Drewelow & Mitchell, 2015). The main message is to educate learners to understand that culture is something that is ever-changing, dynamic, and multifaceted. A worldview can be created and shared by a group of people, not necessarily by a country. The lesson must be designed so as to avoid ethnocentrism. Learners can compare and contrast cultural perspectives between themselves and others in order to avoid "the touristic communicative approach to culture" (Drewelow & Mitchell, 2015). According to Kramsch (2014), instructional activities should adopt "reflective, interpretive, historically grounded, and politically engaged pedagogy (p. 296). There are myriad ways that the instructors can foster a language and culture connection. Karabinar and Guler (2013) recommend the inclusion of local cultures as a starting point in an EFL teaching context so as to aid EFL learners' understanding of "cross-cultural perspective, intercultural awareness, and the ability to compare local cultures to target cultures" (p. 1326).
3 Teachers need to understand the interconnectedness of culture and language. The cultural perspective can be integrated into basic grammar or vocabulary by comparing the meaning in the local culture and the target culture. For example, the words associated with family members like *brother* or *sister* can be translated into two words in the Thai language: One for the older and the other for the younger. A different perspective can be brought into a discussion of the cultural value placed on the choice of words or phrases used in cultural groups (i.e., the seniority system). That Thais prefer asking each other "Have

you eaten yet?" as a form of greeting (Suwannasom, 2016) illustrates how meaning is contextualized. However, this cultural integration must go beyond comparing and contrasting cultural knowledge. It is important to note that the aim of learning a language and culture should be to understand our own identities. An identity can be made up of race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and the social status of a person. So, EFL teachers should invite the students to critically examine their lives. The aim of instructional activity should be on eliminating bias and prejudice in order to accept others' cultures, as Jandt (2013) states that our experience and understanding of other cultures "are limited by the perceptual bias of our own culture" (p. 8). Baker (2008) suggests a critical approach to intercultural teaching by inviting students to explore the cultural views in EFL textbooks and materials and compare them to Thai culture.

4 Intercultural instruction can be done through different approaches. One can understand others through what Byram described the act of interpreting documents or other mediums. It can occur through readings or evaluating a movie clip depicting an intercultural interaction (Reisinger & Clifford, 2015). So, the term intercultural interaction does not mean just participating in a dialogue. The interpretive mode is even more powerful in the digitized world where we can learn about other cultures from people. Drewelow and Mitchell (2015) suggest an instructional activity that allows learners to develop their global competence and find connections between their own culture and other cultures through a digital archive project where learners engage in constructing their own digital artefact using Pinterest based on a selected theme. So, learners "create their own interpretations and … develop an understanding of themselves and the world around them" (p. 254). Gaining ICC is more than simple exchanges; it must involve building relationships and engaging in communication (Moeller & Nugent, 2014). Teachers can follow what Loo et al. (2018) recommend as intercultural pedagogy, which consists of noticing, comparing, and interacting skills.

5 Even though it is hard to avoid discussing and giving examples of national cultures in the classroom practice of ICC, teachers should avoid treating national cultures as fact (Matsuo, 2012). Teachers can bring the concept of global competence into the classroom. Reynolds (2015) recommends using service learning projects to address global and local issues such as "poverty, racism, economic gaps, global warming, etc. in order to allow learners to explore and interrogate connections between their own experiences and those of others from the target culture. Bringing in the cross-cultural experiences through the discussion on sociocultural issues can encourage learners to develop multiple perspectives, and thus enhance their world views and encourage self-reflection on their own culture (Prapinwong, 2018; Liddicoat, 2011).

These suggestions lead to the question of how teacher education institutions prepare the future teachers of English to deal with complexity involving language, culture, and learning. Kramsch (2014) suggests that teachers should be educated

to be more reflective on "their own personal experiences and professional trajectories" (p. 309). Teachers of English need to be constantly aware of the rapidly changing world and be open to multidisciplinary perspectives.

Conclusion

The role of interculturalism has increasingly gained recognition in education worldwide. The integration of intercultural competence into English language practice through the use of several ICC models suggested by scholars has been explored, researched, and implemented in order to prepare language learners to recognize diversity and be competent linguistically and interculturally. In Thailand, the implementation of ICC has encountered a number of difficulties, especially one that involve deep, critical understanding of what is meant by culture and its interrelationship with the language. The implementation requires a paradigm shift in the perspectives of all people involved in order for ICC to be successful in English language teaching in EFL contexts such as Thailand.

References

Ahn, H. J. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards Korean English in South Korea. *World Englishes*, 33(2), 195–222.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). (n.d.). *World-readiness standards for learning languages*. Retrieved from: https://www.actfl.org/publications/all/world-readiness-standards-learning-languages

Baker, W. (2008). A critical examination of ELT in Thailand: The role of cultural awareness. *RELC*, 39(1), 131–146.

Baker, W. (2011). From cultural awareness to intercultural awareness: Culture in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 66(1), 62–70. doi:10.1093/elt/ccr017

Bernaisch, T. (2012). Attitudes towards Englishes in Sri Lanka. *World Englishes*, 31(3), 279–291.

Bradley, N. (2018). Essentialism in the concept of culture: Gauging belief. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 21, 1–21.

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

Byram, M. (2006, October). *Languages and identities*. Paper presented at the Intergovernmental Conference: Languages of Schooling Towards a Framework for Europe, Strasbourg, France.

Byram, M. (2012). Conceptualizing intercultural (communicative) competence and intercultural citizenship. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 85–97). New York: Routledge.

Byram, M., Gribkova, B., & Starkey, H. (2002). *Developing the intercultural dimension in language teaching: A practical introduction for teachers*. Language Policy Division Directorate of School, Out-of-School and Higher Education DGIV. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Cheewasukthaworn, K., & Suwanarak, K. (2017). Exploring Thai EFL teachers' perceptions of how intercultural communicative competence is important for their students. *PASAA*, 54, 177–204.

Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (2000). The development and validation of the intercultural communication sensitivity scale. *Human Communication*, 3, 1–15.

Committee on Foreign Relations. (2001). *Exchange programs and the national interest*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Deardoff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10, 241–266.

Deardoff, D. K. (2009). Implementing intercultural competence assessment. In D. Deardoff (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of intercultural communication* (pp. 477–491). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Drewelow, I., & Mitchell, C. (2015). An exploration of learners' conceptions of language, culture, and learning in advanced-level Spanish courses. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(3), 243–256.

Furstenberg, G. (2010). Making culture the core of the language class: Can it be done? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 329–332.

Hanson, M. J., & Lynch, E. W. (1998). *Developing cross-cultural competence*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks.

Holliday, A. R. (1999). Small cultures. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(2), 237–264.

Holliday, A. (2012). Culture, communication, context and power. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 37–51). New York: Routledge.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz, & D. H. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 35–71). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Inkaew, M. (2016). An analysis of intercultural communicative competence: Hotel front office personnel in Bangkok. *PASAA*, 11, 185–214.

Jäämaa, S. J. (2015). Cross-culture management for foreign managers at hotel industry in Thailand. *Journal of Advanced Management Science*, 3(2), 103–108.

Jackson, J. (2012). Introduction and overview. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 1–13). New York: Routledge.

Jackson, J. (2014). *Introducing language and intercultural communication*. New York: Routledge.

Jandt, F. E. (2013). *An introduction to intercultural communication identities in a global community*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jindapitak, N., & Teo, A. (2010). Thai in blood, American in taste: English learners' preferences for varieties of English. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Humanities and Social Sciences*. Faculty of Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Songkla, Thailand.

Karabinar, S., & Guler, C. Y. (2013). A review of intercultural competence from language teachers' perspective. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 1316–1328.

Kramsch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(1), 296–311.

Laopongharn, W., & Sercombe, P. (2009). What relevance does intercultural communication have to language education in Thailand. *ARECLS*, 6, 59–83.

Lázár, I., Huber-Kriegler, M., Lussier, D., Matel, G. S., & Peck, C. (2007). *Developing and assessing intercultural communicative competence: A guide for language teachers and teacher educators*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Lavrenteva, E., & Orland-Barak, L. (2015). The treatment of culture in the foreign language curriculum: An analysis of national curriculum documents. *Curriculum Studies*, 47(5), 653–684.

Liddicoat, K. R. (2011). Introduction: From the learner to the speaker/social actor. In G. Zarate, D. Lévy, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Handbook of multilingualism and multiculturalism* (pp. 17–23). Paris: Éditions des Archives Contemporaines, Ltd.

Loo, D. B., Trakulkasemsuk, W., & Zilli, P. J. (2018). The state of the intercultural communicative competence: An exploration through trajectories in English teachers' discourse. *PASAA*, 56, 33–64.

Matsuda, A. (2003). International understanding through teaching world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 21(3), 436–440.

Matsuo, C. (2012). A critique of Michael Byram's intercultural communicative competence model from the perspective of model type and conceptualization of culture. *Fukuoka University Review of Literature & Humanities*, 44(2), 347–380.

Ming, H. (2018). Cross-cultural differences and cultural stereotypes in tourism: Chinese tourists in Thailand. *Journal of Hotel and Business Management,* 1(1), 1–5. doi:10.4172/2169-0286.S1-001

Ministry of Education. (2008). *The Basic Education Core Curriculum B.E.2551 (A.D2008)*. Thailand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from: http://www.act.ac.th/document/1741.pdf

Mitchell, P.J., Pardinho, L.A., Yermakova-Aguiar, N. N., & Meshkov, L.V. (2015). Language learning and intercultural communicative competence: An action research case study of learners of Portuguese. The XXVI Annual International Academic Conference, Language and Culture. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 200, 307–312.

Moeller A., & Nugent, K. (2014). Building intercultural competence in the language classroom. In S. Dhonan (Ed.), *Unlock the gateway to communication: 2014 report of the central states conference on the teaching of foreign languages* (pp. 1–18). Richmond, VA: Robert M. Terry.

Noels, K. A., Yashima, T., & Zhang, R. (2012). Language, identity and intercultural communication. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 52–66). New York: Routledge.

Nomnian, S. (2013). Review of English language basic education core curriculum: Pedagogical implications for Thai primary level teachers of English. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Science*, 34, 583–589.

Office of the Basic Education Commission. (2008). *Basic education core curriculum B.E. 2551 (A. D. 2008)*. Bangkok, Thailand: Ministry of Education.

Olaya, A., & Rodriquez, L. F. G. (2013). Exploring EFL pre-service teachers' experience with cultural content and intercultural communicative competence at three Colombian universities, *Profile*, 15, 49–67.

Prapinwong, M. (2018). Developing intercultural awareness for pre-service teachers in Thailand. *ABAC Journal*, 38(2), 21–35.

Reynolds, A. (2015). Educators' global competence development: Implications for teacher education and language teaching. *The Language Educator*, 10(3), 51–53.

Reid, E. (2015). Techniques developing intercultural communicative competences in English language lessons. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 186, 939–943.

Reisinger, D., & Clifford, J. (2015). Transforming learners through intercultural competence. *The Language Educator*, 3, 70–73.

Richardson, A. (2012). *The cultural boundary: How awareness informs teaching practice* (Unpublished master's thesis). SIT Graduate Institute, Brattleboro, VT.

Risager, K. (2007). *Language and culture pedagogy: From a national to a transnational paradigm*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Risager, K. (2012). Linguaculture and transnationality: The cultural dimensions of language. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication*. (pp. 101–115). New York: Routledge.

Rui, L. (2012). Practical use of Moran's theoretical frameworks in teaching culture: A case study in an EFL university reading and writing class. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 9(3), 988–995.

Ryan, P. (2012). The English as a foreign or international language classroom. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 422–433). New York: Routledge.

Sucher, W., & Cheung, C. (2015). The relationship between hotel employees' cross-cultural competency and team performance in multi-national hotel companies. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 49, 93–104.

Suwannasom, T. (2016). Intercultural competence: A critical competence for Thai learners of English in the ASEAN community. *Journal of Humanities Naraesuan University, 12 (3)*, 1–12.

UNESCO. (2013). *Intercultural competences: Conceptual and operational framework*. Paris: UNESCO.

Vos, L. (2018). *Teaching intercultural communicative competence alongside language proficiency* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from Utrecht University Repository. https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/360047

Xu, Z. (2006). Rectifying 'Chinese English'. In A. Hashim & H. Norizah (Eds.), *Varieties of English in Southeast Asia and beyond*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.

Young, T., & Sachdev, I. (2011). Intercultural communicative competence: Exploring English language teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Awareness*, 20(2), 81–98.

Zerzová, J. (2018). Opportunities to develop intercultural communicative competence in Czech lower-secondary schools: Findings of the IRSE video study of German. *Journal of Language and Cultural Education*, 6(3), 101–121.

6 English across the curriculum

Four journeys of synergy across disciplines and universities

Julia Chen, Christy Chan and Angela Ng

Background and literature review

English language education in Hong Kong universities

The introduction of Hong Kong's new four-year curriculum in 2009 has fostered a certain uniformity in English language education in the higher education sector. Hong Kong is home to eight government-funded universities, most of which require six credits of English foundation subjects. Following the recommendations of the University Grants Committee (UGC), many universities redesigned their courses to focus more strongly on academic English to prepare students for research-based learning. Differences exist, however, in the provision of English support between various disciplines, which some academic departments highly value, as final-year or capstone dissertations are regarded by accreditation bodies and broader industries as evidence of students' graduating standards. Several of Hong Kong's eight higher education institutions, such as City University of Hong Kong (CityU) and Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU), have incorporated English for General or Specific Academic Proficiency (EGAP/ESAP) elements into the English foundation curriculum; however, any English for Specific Purposes (ESP) provisions, such as dissertation writing, have become a self-funded burden (or option) for academic departments. Other universities, such as the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU), the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST), the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK), and the University of Hong Kong (HKU), offer some centrally funded ESP courses in the third or fourth year of study; however, this thoughtful approach has recently come under review in at least one of these universities and may be subject to change at the time of writing. Even when ESP courses are centrally funded, they face several restrictions. For example, most departments want only one ESP course, so some schedule it at the beginning of the third year of study to get it out of the way. Other departments do not wish to devote much curriculum space to ESP and so only include 11 to 13 hours of English across the whole of the third and fourth years of study. A few other departments do not want discipline-specific academic literacy skills in their ESP courses at all and instead focus on workplace English. Together, these realities mean that, in many academic departments,

discipline-specific language support is left to either faculty or teaching assistants, who usually do not have formal training in English teaching, and self-access materials on different public or language center websites.

Part of the mission of academic departments and language centers is to help students develop the desired graduate attributes set by respective institutions. Three common graduate attributes set by the eight universities in Hong Kong[1] are related to communicative, cognitive, and attitudinal features—to be an effective communicator, a critical thinker, and a competent professional, respectively. To measure the fulfillment of these graduate attributes, employer opinion surveys are a common way to keep track of the quality of graduates and employers' views of them over time. From the *Survey on Opinions of Employers on Major Aspects of Performance of First Degree Graduates in Year 2016* [2] of the seven UGC-funded universities in Hong Kong at the time of study, the five attributes Hong Kong employers perceived as most important out of 43 were the following: Expression of ideas (85%), time management and organization of work (84%), problem-solving ability (80%), and comprehension of verbal and written communication (79%). However, the survey results showed consistent gaps between what employers perceived as the important qualities of their graduate employees and what they perceived the actual performance of Hong Kong university graduates to be, as seen in Table 6.1.

The four attributes with considerably lower perceived performance scores than their corresponding perceived importance scores were Analytical and Problem-Solving Abilities, Work Attitude, Interpersonal Skills, and Language Proficiency. The results unfortunately confirmed the fact that the graduates of Hong Kong universities somehow failed to meet their employers' expectations and fell short of the three desired graduate attributes set by the universities (i.e. an effective

Table 6.1 Comparison of employers' perceived importance score and performance score of 2016 first degree graduates[3]

Aspect	*Importance Mean Score (a)*	*Performance Mean Score (b)*	*Difference between (a) & (b)*
Language Proficiency	4.17	3.75	0.42
Numerical Proficiency	3.75	3.67	0.08
Information Technology Literacy	3.97	3.82	0.15
Analytical and Problem-Solving Abilities	4.19	3.57	0.62
Work Attitude	4.49	3.88	0.61
Interpersonal Skills	4.17	3.71	0.46
Management Skills	3.92	3.52	0.4
Technical Knowledge Required for the Job	3.89	3.65	0.24
Knowledge in Current Affairs and Business Issues, Self-Learning Ability and Self-Confidence	3.88	3.57	0.31

communicator, a critical thinker, and a competent professional). The transition from university to working life is one of the primary foci of the senior years of study. A capstone course is intended to promote the integration of knowledge and skills acquired throughout the undergraduate program (Holdsworth, Watty, & Davies, 2009; Huber & Hutchings, 2004; Rowles, Koch, Hundley, & Hamilton, 2004). According to the Hong Kong Education Commission (2000), "[T]he core objective of a capstone is to foster graduate capabilities such as problem-solving skills, organizational skills, and presentation skills, as well as a good team member" (Thomas, Wong, & Li, 2014). In spite of the desired graduate outcomes and clear aims of the final-year/capstone experience, the employer opinion survey seems to indicate a low transfer of expected knowledge and skills and to imply a lack of training and support in the capstone process to bring students' capabilities and employability up to par.

A review of the English courses offered by the language centers of the eight UGC-funded universities of Hong Kong may reveal the cause of the perceived gap between employers' expectations and the perceived performance of the Hong Kong university graduates, particularly in terms of language communication skills. As discussed in the first part of this chapter, only half of the eight Hong Kong universities fund English courses in the third and fourth years. In other words, English language support for the capstone process is scarce, and if there is any at all, it is often left to the faculty staff or teaching assistants, who often have no formal training in English language teaching and have many priorities other than addressing students' language needs. Worse still, English is often the second or even third language of the faculty staff and assistants. Confronted with the lack of an English-speaking environment and a diminishing curriculum space for English competency training in senior years, employers' concerns over graduates' language performance are not surprising. To synthesize discipline-specific knowledge and apply it to real-world scenarios, it is essential to educate "with a variety of communication skills embedded and scaffolded" throughout the four-year study program (Tudor, Penlington, & McDowell, 2010; Sageev & Romanowski, 2001) through the collaboration of faculty academics and English teachers to develop networks, systems, and resources to promote Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC).

Previous WAC developments in Hong Kong

The lack of disciplinary-specific academic English support gave rise to the development of WAC in Hong Kong. Two large-scale WAC attempts were funded from 2002 to 2013; however, the first lasted only three to four years, and the second lasted only two years. The first WAC effort began in 2002, when one university received a $4 million grant from the government of Hong Kong to start it. That university aimed to include more writing tasks in the discipline, as second-language students in Hong Kong tend to have less writing practice than native language students in the USA (Braine & McNaught, 2007). The university employed students with MPhil degrees in applied linguistics to serve as teaching

assistants to conduct writing mini-workshops and help the faculty implement WAC in their subjects at both the undergraduate and postgraduate levels. The second WAC program was implemented in another university between 2011 and 2013. Its objective was to help ten discipline faculties provide genre-based reading and writing guidance to their students (Cheng et al., 2014). This WAC program stopped at the end of the project period.

Interdisciplinary collaborations in Writing Across the Curriculum

The existing literature comprises studies discussing models and systems for the implementation of WAC in schools and higher education institutions (Cox, Galin, & Melzer, 2018). There is evidence that its implementation is not always easy and that, if it is not executed carefully, the whole WAC program could fall apart. Higher education is particularly vulnerable in this respect, as discipline faculty members are not always ready to collaborate with language teachers and are frustrated by students' poor writing skills, yet very few would discuss writing with their students in class or hold individual conferences with them (Davis, 1987).

Some studies of WAC collaboration have focused on the role of discipline faculty and language teachers (Dick & Esch, 1985; Braine, 2001), while others have been more interested in understanding what discipline teachers perceived as the weaknesses among students in their writing assignments and what kind of help they would like students or discipline faculty to be offered (Eblen, 1983; Davis, 1987; Braine, 2001).

Other scholars have discussed the WAC approaches one could use to collaborate with discipline teachers. Dick and Esch (1985), in planning and organizing linked courses between language teachers in the English department and faculty in other disciplines, provided a venue for discussing questions about writing in a discipline. The answers to questions about nomenclature, audience, purpose, stylistic conventions, and contexts helped faculty on both sides to understand the writing requirements and their own expectations of student writing (Dick & Esch, 1985). They also found that sensitivity to the attitudes of discipline teachers and their comfort zones is imperative for the success of WAC.

One strategy to achieve faculty buy-in is to emphasize the benefits of collaboration; one such benefit provided by WAC teams is professional development workshops, such as training to help faculty develop writing-intensive courses. Faculty indicate that they treasure the opportunity in these workshops to "listen to others' stories" and share their challenges in implementing WAC initiatives (Chapin, 2018).

Kuriloff (1992) suggested a working model for disciplinary collaboration. Using an example of collaboration with a colleague in engineering, the researcher described the details of the different stages of collaboration from joint goal-setting, inquiry, and self-study to creating the context, implementation, and evaluation. As he put it, the engineering colleague represented the needs of "his discourse community" while the writing specialist would take care of the "cognitive processes that inform writing (e.g. planning and goal setting), including how to write for diverse purposes and meet the needs of a variety of audiences" (p. 99).

The mutual benefits of cross-disciplinary collaborations to both the language teachers and discipline experts in WAC collaboration are evident in the literature. For example, Harvey, Russell-Mundine, and Hoving (2016) discovered that, in an attempt to work with cultural competence experts to help students develop cultural competence through developing assignments, such as a critical review of a journal article and an analytical essay, the experts found themselves learning linguistic theory and its application to students' learning. The understanding and conviction that collaboration was possible and meaningful, as well as an acknowledgement of the role of the language and learning experts, were also found to be crucial for the success of such a collaboration (Harvey et al., 2016).

With more institutions offering interdisciplinary courses in their programs/curriculum, some have made suggestions more recently on transdisciplinary approaches in WAC that would involve stakeholders in various disciplines working with language teachers. Rademaekers (2015), for example, recommended that WAC experts work with faculty to introduce "disciplinary genres as social systems" to help students interact with their peers in other disciplines. It was claimed that such training could benefit both WAC personnel and discipline teachers. Similarly, Ware et al. (2019) suggested exploring the potential of collaborating with teachers in multiple disciplines in developing assignments and learning activities that would require students to solve real-life problems using their knowledge in more than one discipline. The demand on students and faculty to master the language and epistemologies of different disciplines provides a new area for the development of interdisciplinary collaboration in WAC.

Aim of this article

This chapter provides a brief review of the WAC developments at the authors' three universities, namely, the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU), City University of Hong Kong (CityU) and Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU), that involve collaborations between English language teachers and discipline faculty. It first describes how each of the authors connected with WAC on a small scale in their own university before all three worked together on an inter-university project to provide technology-enhanced WAC support to faculty staff and senior students working on their final-year capstone project. This support is facilitated through a mobile app that offers ubiquitous, "one-stop" English language resources in bite-sized, tailor-made learning units, as well as a personalized learning experience with progress-tracked exercises and text communication with supervisors. The feedback from faculty on the outcomes of their WAC collaborations is also reported.

Synergies across disciplines in three universities: A critical review

With a deep conviction that writing is a powerful learning tool (Zawacki & Rogers, 2011) and that students must develop effective communication skills in discipline courses (Ware et al., 2019), the authors, who are affiliated with three

different English-mediated Instruction (EMI) universities in Hong Kong that adopt English as the medium of instruction, realized the necessity "to create a new approach" (Chapin, 2018) instead of depending entirely on standalone English for academic purposes (EAP) courses to develop discipline-specific writing skills. Knowing that "collaborat[ion] with other groups on campus to offer support for L2 writers writing across the curriculum" (Cox, 2011, p. 11) is vital, the authors set out to involve faculty who taught in different disciplines. After all, it is faculty academics who publish in their field who should know most about writing in their discipline. The authors' universities, however, are research-intensive, where "it is difficult to reach instructors whose primary concern is their research … and who may not be philosophically committed to the benefits of [Writing Intensive] WI courses" (Wolfe-Quintero & Segade, 1999, p. 201). The sub-sections below review the authors' efforts to achieve faculty buy-in, create synergy with faculty in designing additional support for their students, and collect faculty and/or student feedback where possible.

EAC development in the first university (PolyU)

Receiving a small, start-up Community of Practice (CoP) fund in 2013 from the Hong Kong Government's UGC provided the support to slowly but gradually develop an interdisciplinary community of English language teachers and faculty academics at PolyU to support students with their English in an innovative way. Given the wide range of English proficiencies among students (Chen, 2018), the limited use of English outside the classroom (Census and Statistics Department, HKSAR Government, 2016b; Evans, 2017), the lack of language transfer from foundation subjects to discipline assessments, and the examination-oriented mentality of the local educational context (Braine & McNaught, 2007), the first author decided to focus the CoP fund on introducing English Across the Curriculum (EAC) to help students perform better in their discipline assessments. The initiative was called EAC instead of WAC for two reasons: To align with PolyU's directive to start the CoP on English learning rather than on Chinese (the other official language in Hong Kong) and to clarify that the focus of the CoP went beyond writing to include other skills such as speaking, which is a much-needed productive skill in Hong Kong.

For many faculty academics and teachers in the English Language Centre, the EAC CoP was their first introduction to WAC; therefore, the CoP, with its small grant, did not dare to have ambitious objectives. Rather, it aimed to build a small community of English language teachers and academic faculty and introduce them to the development of students' English literacy skills in discipline-content subjects. To build this community, the EAC CoP team (hereafter, "EAC teachers") consulted WAC literature, such as Zawacki and Rogers (2011), McLeod and Soven (2000), Zawacki and Cox (2014), and Townsend (2008), ultimately deciding to follow the WAC method in the USA of reaching out to discipline faculty via organizing a series of staff development workshops (Ferris & Smith, 2000; Cox, 2011; Ware et al., 2019) to direct their attention to both their own

English needs and those of their students. Workshops were organized around the themes of helping staff with their own research writing (e.g. publications and doctoral studies), improving the setting of assessment questions and rubrics, and such topics as common errors in student writing (which seemed to be about addressing students' language errors, but, in reality, also addressed the staff's own language problems). The workshops were well attended, and some were even re-run due to popular demand.

At the end of each workshop, faculty were invited to meet with the EAC teachers to discuss ways to help their students with the English skills necessary to complete their assessments. During these follow-up meetings, faculty talked about their perceptions of their students' English needs and the kinds of resources that would help students improve. They were asked to supply the EAC teachers with their assessment handouts and anonymous samples of student writing so that the EAC teachers could learn about discipline assessment requirements and students' strengths and weaknesses in using English to complete them. The latter was an important step for the EAC teachers to "place themselves inside the other academic disciplines" (Ferris & Smith, 2000, p. 59). After these initial meetings, three academic staff from three departments expressed a willingness to work with the EAC teachers, and after more "outreach", four more discipline academics indicated interest in trying EAC. Subsequent meetings focused on the content of the EAC support that could be rendered to students in light of the problems observed by the faculty and the EAC teachers. In the meetings, faculty members emphasized that they were busy and their role did not include teaching writing, so the EAC teachers had to devise "time-saving strategies … to entice faculty" (Ware et al., 2019) to continue the EAC collaboration, deciding to shoulder the responsibility of drafting handouts on the linguistic areas in which students were observed to need the most urgent help (e.g. essay writing skills, common language errors, and transitions in group oral presentations). Faculty members were mainly responsible for checking the content of the EAC handouts, informing their students of the EAC support, and distributing the handouts either in class or via the online learning management system.

A further opportunity to expand and strengthen interdisciplinary EAC collaboration occurred when a larger government grant called for proposals in 2014, and the first author was asked by her university to bid for it. She invited other universities to join her, and, eventually, a four-university team secured a grant to focus on professional development in EAC and to persuade faculty to adopt a language-supportive approach in their subject assessments (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010). This four-university project adopted the CoP method of reaching out to faculty as the first step, doing so via staff development workshops on topics that would attract faculty, such as "Writing effective assignment questions" and "The use of concordances in research writing". Faculty academics gave the workshops high evaluation ratings, earning on average 4.54/5 for learning experience and 4.64/5 for usefulness. The workshops served as an entry point to establish connections with faculty, and, after each workshop, the project team invited selected attendees to join EAC. After two years of hard work, over 50 faculty

members across the four universities implemented EAC in around 25 subjects, including business, clothing, applied sciences, environment, architecture, engineering, social sciences, humanities, and hotel management. EAC resources in the form of tips and checklists were produced across several genres, including lab reports, executive summaries, reflective writing, commentaries, and operating procedures. Of the participating faculty, 28 expressed their views concerning EAC via an anonymous survey and open-ended comments as seen in Table 6.2.

Faculty comments were positive. They found that "students get a more thorough explanation" of the English skills for the assignment and "students have done better". They felt that the EAC tips were "important" and "timely and relevant", and they "incorporated [the tips] into the assignments and projects". Some comments that delighted the EAC team concerned how the faculty made use of the EAC materials. For example, one faculty member gave students an "email as a retentivity check" a year later; another wrote, "When I developed my marking rubrics, I made reference to the materials provided" and another reported that EAC "has given [him] better insight into common mistakes committed by students". Not all faculty were pleased, however. One commented that students "still ask questions about how to write lab reports, [and she] suspect[s they] do not read through the guidelines". Another faculty member wanted the EAC teachers to grade all his students' assignments, which the EAC team could not do given the high workload of English teachers and the significant demands on their time. Despite the EAC team's eagerness to develop synergies with discipline faculty, they had to remind themselves to heed Ferris and Smith's advice to avoid "the pitfall" of "exploitation" (2000, p. 57).

EAC development in the second university (CityU)

EAC collaboration with faculty academics has been historically offered by two academic departments at CityU: The Department of English (EN) and the English Language Centre (ELC). Back in the 1990s, when genre specialists were leading the academic department, such as Professor Vijay Bhatia, Professor Ken Hyland, and Professor John Flowerdew, a plethora of EAP and ESP courses was

Table 6.2 Faculty survey on EAC

	Mean (SD)	*Distribution of Scores (%)*				
		5	4	3	2	1
1 I have benefited from the collaboration in and support from this project.	4.50 (0.65)	57.14	35.71	7.14	0.00	0.00
2 I have used the ideas generated from this project.	4.57 (0.76)	71.43	14.29	14.29	0.00	0.00
3 My students can benefit from the support of this project.	4.43 (0.85)	57.14	35.71	0.00	7.14	0.00

(5 = *Strongly agree* and 1 = *Strongly disagree*)

created to support the English writing and speaking needs expressed by individual departments for junior, sophomore, and final-year students. English courses, such as business communication, business negotiation, and dissertation writing, were offered by the EN to suit the levels and the needs of students of different disciplines. The ELC was later set up in 1997 with the mission to offer extensive English proficiency and EAP courses delivered by non-faculty, teaching-grade staff to students who entered the university with the minimum English entry requirement, that is, a grade of D in the Hong Kong Advanced Level of Education (HKALE). Subsequent restructuring of the EN and the expansion of the ELC resulted in the shift of all ESP and advanced EAP courses to the EN, while the ELC took over the English enhancement courses and the foundation EAP courses.

The first ELC-led EAC initiative was started a year after the Centre's inception when the Department of Applied Physics (AP) made a request for a model of non-credit bearing, self-financed English support for improving the dissertation-writing skills of final-year students in response to the suggestions of the external reviewer of their final-year program. A series of three dissertation-writing seminars was scheduled at the start of the capstone process to frontload Final Year Project (FYP) students with essential knowledge of the structure, language use, and academic conventions for both interim and final report writing. Meetings were held between the FYP Coordinator, some supervisors, and teaching assistants on the course outline, aims, objectives, and content. To assist the language center teaching staff to tailor the course to the writing needs required in the discipline, student writing samples, the assessment rubrics, and the FYP guidebook were given as references. The seminar series was highly commended by faculty academics and students for its flexible and "just-in-time" nature to fit in the hectic schedule of the final-year curriculum.

This initial success led to further collaboration with the same department to provide individual writing consultations for weaker FYP students. In 2003, a joint study was conducted by a physics professor and an ELC teacher to explore the perception of supervisors and supervisees of the consultation service. Eighty-eight FYP students were divided into two groups: 30 received writing consultations with an ELC teacher, while the remaining 58 received consultations with peer tutors or faculty teaching assistants. Surveys and focus group interviews were conducted to measure the effectiveness of genre-awareness building through seminars and consultation with trained teachers in comparison to faculty teaching assistants and peer tutors. The results showed that genre-awareness training was needed for both peer tutors and faculty teaching assistants who helped to mentor the research work of final-year student and even helped to grade some of the assignments. The synergy between the AP and the ELC has now lasted more than two decades and has given rise to many exciting ad hoc projects, such as marker training sessions for faculty teaching assistants to standardize the marking of lab reports and the development of the first ELC elective course, *Writing Effective Lab Reports*, which later became a "compulsory" elective subject for several science and engineering departments until 2012. With the implementation of the new 3–3–4 curriculum,

yet another round of credit-unit redistribution brought this long-lived elective to an abrupt end.

From 2012 until the present, the collaboration between the ELC and academic departments has been evolving into an entirely self-funded entity, which challenges the survival of EAC. Occasional intra-university funding schemes have revived the synergy of faculty academics and English teachers, however. In 2014, the second author took up the role of a self-funded project manager, promoting EAC via seminars and informal meetings to raise faculty awareness of the new matching fund model for ELC support. Seizing the university's generous subsidy as a low-cost option to provide discipline-specific English support, new collaborations have sprung up within the past two years, such as business seminars for computer science summer interns, dissertation-writing workshops for FYP students in the School of Energy and Environment, and writing workshops for the administrative and executive staff in the Human Resources Office. Active responses from academic departments and administrative units indicated both the need for more English support and the inadequacy of the existing English language curriculum.

The subsidy scheme also helped young departments set up English bridging courses for senior-year intakes. The Department of Biomedical Sciences (BMS) requested a hybrid EAP-ESP course for its Advanced Standing II students targeting International English Language Testing System (IELTS) preparation and the writing of Standard Operations Procedures (SOPs), a highly discipline-specific writing genre required in the profession of lab technologists. Positive impacts were noted in both students' writing and evaluation. In the pre- and post-tests to gauge writing progress, 72% of the students showed improvement in writing about statistics and on a given health problem. The majority of the students found the SOP-writing guidance notes and samples very useful, as no textbooks or teaching materials on this genre were commercially available.

A successful and lasting collaboration that was started with the subsidy scheme is a typical example of content-language-integrated learning (CLIL). All management science students were required to take a course in which the faculty staff taught the content knowledge of case study analysis while the English teacher covered report writing and presentation skills. This method is a non-traditional learning approach in which business students learn through directly discussing cases, constructing logical decisions, and devising innovative solutions. Core competences at all stages are the abilities to read, write, and present effectively. The positive impact of the interdisciplinary collaboration was evident in the encouragingly high university-wide teaching evaluation (6.2/7).

Despite the eventual withdrawal of the subsidy scheme in late 2016, 50% of the above-mentioned services continue to be offered on a 100% self-financed basis by the department, as all the groundwork was covered by the university subsidy.

EAC development in the third university (HKBU)

In the past two decades, the core English language curriculum offered to undergraduates at HKBU has undergone a series of changes and major revisions, from

EAP/ESP to General English and then to General Academic English, and from a skill-based curriculum to a theme-based approach and then back to a skill-based curriculum. The need for EAC/WAC became more apparent in HKBU with the UGC's merging of the funding for teaching development and language enhancement in 2016, requiring more synergy between the Language Centre (LC), the Centre for Holistic Teaching and Learning, and the discipline faculty in various departments.

There used to be constant collaboration between language teachers and discipline faculty when HKBU offered both EAP and ESP courses back in the 1990s. These were courses run by the LC that were tailored to students in different disciplines. Some of the required courses for first-year students were English for Combined Sciences, English for Communication, EAP for Arts & Social Sciences, EAP for Chinese Medicine, EAP for Physical Education & Recreation Management, English for Computer Science, and English for Business. Lecturers at the LC worked closely with academic staff in the respective departments to analyze needs and share expectations to develop these courses. Language teachers often served as members of departments' Boards of Examiners, as the tailor-made language courses were considered core courses in the overall curriculum. In a course coordinated by the third author of this paper, for example, students majoring in Physical Education and Recreation Management would submit the first drafts of their papers for Sports Psychology to the language teacher as an assignment for this EAP course before submitting their final papers to their subject professor. The requirements for each assignment were discussed and made clear to students. There was constant interaction between the LC and the faculties/departments, and course revamp would often involve the professors in the discipline to ensure that both student and faculty needs were met. In the same course, for example, after consulting with colleagues in the Department of Physical Education and Recreation Management, some ESP skills, such as describing gestures, giving instructions, and event proposal writing, were included to prepare students to be teachers of physical education and sports event organizers. Likewise, a different syllabus for the EAP course for Chinese Medicine was devised for the students in the Pharmacy stream during the course revamp after consulting the professors in the School of Chinese Medicine, who opined that the needs of the students in the Pharmacy stream were different from those in the Chinese Medicine stream. This continuous interdisciplinary interaction greatly benefited both discipline faculty and language teachers in terms of professional development and improved student learning.

In 2005, there were concerns among senior management and some academic staff about the general English proficiency of students, which was believed to be the foundation of English in any discipline. Instead of adding more English credits to the curriculum, this concern resulted in the total abolishment of all EAP/ESP courses and the offering of University English I and II, which were General English courses. The departments were asked to deal with students' English in the discipline using their own resources or incorporating the skills in existing courses. From that time onward, only the School of Business would invite the LC to report

on the performances of their students in University English I and II; collaboration with other departments was minimal.

With the implementation of a new secondary curriculum ten years ago, HKBU conducted a major review to address different student profiles. There was also a call for the return of Academic English for first-year students and a compulsory Writing Enhancement Course for students who had reached Level 3 in English in the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education. The increasing awareness of students' insufficient English proficiency to meet their departments' requirements also led to a proposal for each HKBU program to identify or offer a writing-intensive subject to help students write academic papers and their final-year projects. This proposal, however, was met with some resistance from faculty members, and, for some time, little was achieved.

Inspired by the initiatives and provisions of sister universities in Hong Kong, in November 2015, the third author of this paper conducted a survey using Qualtrics to gauge faculty perceptions towards the implementation of EAC/WAC in general. Faculty members were asked about their practices in dealing with writing assignments, their perceptions of students' major needs, and how they saw the role of language teachers. A total of 81 academic staff members completed the survey, and the results showed that the teachers felt that the main problems with students' writing lay in the clarity of ideas (71%) and grammatical accuracy (67%). More than half (59%) did not feel that it was their responsibility to deal with students' writing or that they did not have the expertise to do so (51%). Furthermore, more than half (56%) were not interested in helping students with their English, as they saw this as the job of language teachers. Some also admitted that they were not experts in language training and so did not think they should be involved. Yet, more than half (53%) of the respondents wished to see cooperation among colleagues in the academic departments and the LC. The respondents felt that the best approach was to have courses jointly offered by home departments and the LC. They also suggested having language teachers offer help to the students currently taking their courses and expressed a desire for language teachers to read drafts of their students' assignments.

The third author, therefore, began to approach interested colleagues in 2016 to explore collaborations based on models implemented by sister institutions. Thus far, these efforts have led to some EAC/WAC initiatives on business-proposal writing with the Department of Marketing, video resume script writing with the Department of Sports and Physical Education, and term paper and honors project writing with the Department of Government and International Studies, the Department of Computer Studies, and the Department of Humanities and Creative Writing. The involvement of language teachers takes the form of student consultations, mini-lectures given in the presence of the discipline faculty, co-development of assessment rubrics, and language teacher involvement in assigning marks.

Based on our experience in these initiatives, a common element that seems to be crucial to their success is the commitment of the discipline faculty and their emphasis of the importance of language teacher involvement in their courses.

It seems important for these collaborations not to be top-down or mandatory. On several occasions, for example, our interaction with some colleagues stopped halfway when it was the department heads who asked the colleagues to work with the LC. Having said that, institutional or departmental funding and support certainly help. The feedback from colleagues and students who worked with us so far has been overwhelmingly positive, and all our collaborators have asked to continue with the initiatives. With their positive comments at meetings at the institutional level, the LC was later given the mandate and funding to involve more language colleagues in the EAC initiatives to serve more department faculty.

Synergies across universities and disciplines: EAC in final-year projects via a mobile app

One repeated suggestion or request from faculty has been English support for final-year projects. Hong Kong's new four-year undergraduate curriculum, which was implemented in 2012, requires most senior-year students to write a final-year or capstone project report (hereafter, FYP), about which they must also give interim and final oral presentations. This is a daunting task for many students and puts them on a steep learning curve to acquire research skills and associated English skills over the course of several months. A number of faculty have frankly admitted that grading FYPs is often a painful task, and some have said that it can be challenging to contact their supervisees. In light of faculty suggestions and the situation of the FYPs, the three authors decided to join hands with some English language teachers and discipline faculty from five universities to apply for yet another government grant to develop a mobile app to support students in acquiring the English skills they need to report their FYPs. The idea of a tailor-made mobile app emerged in discussions, and a subsequent review of the literature on ubiquitous mobile-learning support in the digital age (Alvarado, Coelho, & Dougherty, 2016; Chen, Hsu, Li, & Peng, 2006; Chen, Chau, Lim, & Li, 2016; Liaw, Hatal, & Huang, 2010) showed that 98 of 99 university students in one poll owned at least one mobile phone (Lam, Wong, Wong, & McNaught, 2010) and that 97.7% of the Hong Kong population over the age of ten uses smartphones to connect to the Internet (Census and Statistics Department, 2016a). Given these statistics, the five-university team agreed that a mobile app may be a single answer to both the faculty requests for more English support for FYPs and their need to connect with supervisees during the FYP process. While an app on a small mobile device may not motivate students to engage in lengthy writing, it can provide them with a timely, ubiquitous, and personalized FYP English support experience.

Baseline data collected from PolyU, CityU, and HKBU

Soon after securing funding in 2017, the project team conducted two surveys to collect baseline data from 15 early adopters in three universities (discipline faculty who were happy to test the mobile app) and 226 students from all five universities

involved in the project. The participants were asked to indicate the areas in which they thought students needed the most help in their FYPs within each of the following categories: Language, content, structure and organization, referencing, and oral presentations. They were also asked about their discipline-specific concerns and difficulties when working on the FYPs and the functions they wanted to see in the mobile app. The present article presents the data collected from the three authors' universities only: PolyU, CityU, and HKBU.

Within the area of language, teachers felt that students needed the most help with clarity of ideas (67%), while students seemed to find appropriate word choice (30%) and use of appropriate style and tone (30%) more challenging. With respect to content, early adopters considered narrowing down the topic (40%) and formulating research questions (40%) challenging to students, whereas students felt that they needed more help synthesizing different sources for the literature review (24%) and supporting their arguments (24%). There was a huge discrepancy between teachers and students in the area of structure: Whereas teachers thought students needed the most help with idea organization and coherence (67%), most students did not seem to think they had a problem with these skills (22%). With respect to referencing, teachers generally did not think students needed much help (6.7% to 13.3% for the various sub areas); however, students thought they needed help with all aspects of referencing: Using appropriate citation styles (24%), in-text citations (23%), and end-of-text references (21%). Finally, with respect to oral presentations, teachers seemed to think students needed the most help with organization (26%), while students thought they needed more help with delivery (20%), content (19%), use of appropriate spoken language (19%), and pronunciation (19%).

When asked about the types of materials they accessed to help them narrow down the topic for the final write-up, more than half of the students indicated that their most preferred method was a web search (52% to 67%). Books were the second most popular type of information source (13% to 18%). Most of the websites students used were citation generators, online dictionaries, search engines, library websites, and websites for specific disciplines. Only around 5% of the respondents indicated that they had ever used apps in their FYP completion process.

Regarding the features they would find desirable in a mobile app for FYP completion, students indicated that they would like the app to have social media functions, such as notifications and alerts. They said that the app should also enable them to "check in" when they completed a task and should also support communication, both with their supervisors and among themselves. Students preferred the content to be presented in stages rather than in the form of lengthy paragraphs. They also said that the style of the app should not be too formal and that they should not be asked to write too much using their phones.

App characteristics

The feedback from faculty and students suggested that they viewed the app as a potential asset for both the FYP writing process and language learning. Based on

their comments, the project team decided that the app would incorporate the following four features:

1 Interdisciplinary and inter-institutional collaborations: Both discipline faculty and English language teachers need to contribute their expertise in deciding the content of the mobile app, which includes the number of subjects the app would cover, the learning content, other FYP-related details, and the discipline-specificity of language resources. Together they would develop a "greater awareness—a mindfulness—of student-centered goals and instructor-centered goals" (Chapin, 2018) to be achieved through the app. Synergies have to be developed, not only across disciplines, but across universities. As the participating disciplines vary across the universities, and each university has its distinctive strengths and levels of manpower, each university should focus on different subject areas, collaborate with their own discipline faculty, and draw on their own writing guidelines, assessment rubrics, student writing samples, citation styles, and other useful resources for content development. A central repository should be set up for the five universities to share the content they develop.
2 Human-app and human-human interactivity: To foster active user engagement, learning modules should be designed with pre- and post-tests to allow for self-assessment of learning, chat functions should be developed to enable communication and exchanges between students and supervisors, and gamified consolidation exercises should be included to make it fun and thus deepen student engagement with the app's content and features.
3 A "bite-size", micro-teaching/learning approach: An essential asset of the app is to make learning mobile-friendly and accessible to students. Student responses in the baseline survey showed that they did not want extensive reading on a small device; rather, they preferred tips, advice, and highlighted content. This is best achieved via an app in which the small screen is leveraged to help the user focus only on key messages and navigation, which is easily achieved via one-handed phone operations. Even more importantly, learning should be truly "on-the-go", in contrast to web-based learning and other traditional means.
4 A personalized app experience: One objective for this app is to provide a one-stop shop where students can find everything related to their FYP, such as language learning tips (including learning content, exercises, samples, and references), some fun (gamified exercises), networking and communication (text messaging with group members and supervisors), and self-management tools (a progress bar, a to-do list, notes, bookmarks, and push notifications for reminders and deadlines).

The intention of these app characteristics is to increase collaboration between English staff and discipline faculty to create a better language learning experience for students as they prepare for the FYP, their most daunting undergraduate writing assignment. The interactive and personalized learning features offer an

additional and alternative channel for supervisor–supervisee communication. The English learning content on the app can offer ubiquitous EAC support to both faculty and final-year students in a digital age in which students demand handy, just-in-time help anytime and anywhere. At the time of writing this article, almost all of the four features above have been built into the mobile app, except for gamified activities, which the project team is planning to develop next year.

Faculty feedback on developing the FYP mobile app

Developing the discipline-related mobile app has offered the authors more opportunities to reach out to academic staff for collaboration. While some faculty members are willing to be early adopters of the app, as they see it as a handy language resource for students, some have expressed worries about the additional work and effort that would be incurred by the app, for instance, learning how to use the app and responding to questions that students send them using it. Some supervisors have insisted that they will not use the app or engage in interdisciplinary collaboration to write the learning content until the app is completely developed, fully tested, and bug-free. Supervisors in one department did not want to install the app, as they feared that it would bring an unwanted increase in the workload of FYP supervision via its chat and other interactive functions. Rather, they asked the project team to give them simple, standalone language tools that they could forward to their students once and for all. Developing interdisciplinary synergies is a feat that requires engagement from both English language teachers and faculty academics.

Conclusion

The above cases illustrate the different approaches taken and challenges faced by three universities in Hong Kong to build EAC within complex institutional structures. We have learned how they develop, grow, and fare across time from the narratives of three senior language center staff. These narratives also demonstrate that how EAC programs are shaped and structured is highly variable and dependent on the fabric of the university. The PolyU case exemplifies a relatively successful EAC program at the institutional level with "strong faculty staff, strong administrative support [and] ongoing faculty development" (Anson & Dannels, 2018). The first author worked closely with university senior management and a cross-disciplinary group of faculty who consented to integrate writing into the curriculum and expand writing expertise on campus. Key successes in the PolyU case were marked by the launch of faculty writing development events, such as workshops on publications and doctoral writing, and the integration of some writing-awareness activities in content subjects, such as the development and dissemination of language tips relevant to discipline assignments. EAC developments in this university have allowed for continuing dialogues between faculty staff, English-teaching staff, and students on the further development of literacy skills in the disciplines.

The cases of CityU and HKBU, on the contrary, show the challenges and threats facing EAC/WAC programs from both the macro- and micro-level landscapes of higher education. Without central funding support for EAC initiatives, the second and the third authors reached out to individual faculty staff who expressed concern over the writing quality in their disciplines, such as business proposals, video resume scripts, term papers, and final-year dissertations. Both cases share two features. First, these initiatives were usually prompted by the concerns expressed over the communication abilities of the undergraduates as evaluated by external or industrial reviews. Language center staff were subsequently approached to help meet student writing and speaking goals through tailor-made, self-funded training and support. Second, the collaborations tended to depend heavily on language center staff to lead, own, and deliver the courses, workshops, or consultations with the limited participation of faculty staff beyond the initial or evaluative meetings. Over time, university plans and department priorities displaced these efforts. The effort to spread writing more fully across the university curricula was also negated by budget crunches or by changes of faculty deans or department heads. In the CityU case, writing consultations with final-year students had been suspended for one year and scaled down for two years during the 14 years of collaboration between the ELC and the AP due to funding issues and a change of final-year program leader. The HKBU case illustrates how the EAC initiative had been dwarfed by language credit–unit redistribution and only revived by the enthusiasm of WAC advocates.

The wisdom of experience led the project team to see sustainability as a primary objective in the development of the capstone project app and to bring together faculty staff, English-teaching staff, educational technologists, and students to agree on a framework and work out the first capstone project writing app for Hong Kong university students. The proposed app was intended to have an all-in-one design with learning units, communication platforms, and self-management tools. The baseline data gave insights into the most appropriate content of the learning units, such as structure, language, and citations. The interview results also highlighted the desired features of the proposed app: Learning content tailored for different subject areas; interactive and self-paced learning units; a "bite-size", "micro-learning" approach; and an "all-at-one-glance" project progress check.

Our separate and collaborative endeavors show that it is indeed possible to develop EAC in the Asian context, where many students learn English as a second or foreign language and so are not confident or equipped to complete discipline assessments in English. EAC, like WAC, is a pedagogy situated in the context within which it operates. A similarity between the three EAC cases described here is the importance of working within one's own university context to find spaces, which may start as merely interstices, to provide additional support to improve students' English skills. What started off as separate journeys have now merged into a collaborative effort to connect English teachers with faculty, students, and educational technologists via the development of an FYP mobile app. The journey is long and challenging, but the goal is meaningful and worthwhile. One thing is certain—without interdisciplinary collaboration between English teachers and

faculty academics, we would not have been able to provide students with additional, relevant, timely, discipline-specific support to help them acquire the necessary academic literacy skills within their disciplines.

Notes

1 Sources of the desired graduate attributes:
HKU - https://tl.hku.hk/quality-manual/chapter-1/
CUHK - https://www.cuhk.edu.hk/clear/qm/A2-1.pdf
HKUST - http://cei.ust.hk/files/public/attributes_of_hkust_graduates.pdf
CityU - http://www.cityu.edu.hk/qac/city_university_graduate_outcomes.htm
PolyU - https://www.polyu.edu.hk/ogur/student/4yr
HKBU - http://chtl.hkbu.edu.hk/main/hkbu-ga/
Lingnan - https://www.ln.edu.hk/teaching-and-learning/lingnan-s-liberal-arts-education/graduate-attributes
EduHK - https://lt.eduhk.hk/graduate-attributes/peer-i/
2 Source of Employers' opinion survey: https://www.cspe.edu.hk/en/resources-surveys.html
3 Source of Employers' opinion survey: https://www.cspe.edu.hk/en/resources-surveys.html

References

Alvarado, N. C., Coelho, D., & Dougherty, E. (2016). Mobile apps for ELLs: Supporting language learning with engaging digital tools. *Argentinian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 43–58.

Anson, C. M., & Dannels, D. P. (2018). Handing over the reins: Ownership, support, and the departmentally-focused model of communication across the curriculum. In M. Cox, J. Galin, & D. Melzer (Eds.), *Sustainable WAC: a whole systems approach to launching and developing WAC programs* (pp. 5–7). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Braine, G. (2001). When professors don't cooperate: A critical perspective on EAP research. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 293–303.

Braine, G., & McNaught, C. (2007). Adaptation of the 'Writing Across Curriculum' model to the Hong Kong context. In J. Liu (Ed.), *English language teaching in China: New approaches, perspectives and standards* (pp. 311–328). London: Continuum International.

Census and Statistics Department, Hong Kong SAR Government. (2016a). *Hong Kong as an information society*. Retrieved from http://www.censtatd.gov.hk/hkstat/sub/sp120.jsp?productCode=B1110006

Census and Statistics Department, Hong Kong SAR Government. (2016b). *Thematic household survey report no.* 59. Retrieved from https://www.censtatd.gov.hk/hkstat/sub/sp140.jsp?productCode=B1130201

Chapin, L. (2018). Implementing writing intensive Gen Ed seminars at a small, catholic university. *Composition Forum*, 38. Retrieved from http://compositionforum.com/issue/38/gwynedd-mercy.php

Chen, C. M., Hsu, S. H., Li, Y. L., & Peng, C. J. (2006). Personalized intelligent m-learning system for supporting effective English learning. *2006 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 6, 4898–4903.

Chen, J. (2018). Comprehensive review of university English subjects: Results and reflections. *JACET Journal*, 62, 1–14.

Chen, J., Chau, J., Lim, G., & Li, V. (2016). Improving university students' English reading and listening skills through online language learning. *International Journal for 21st Century Education*, 1, 35–54.

Cheng, W., Chan, M., Chiu, H., Kwok, A., Lam, K. H., Lam, K. M. K., Lim, G., & Wright, R. (2014). *Writing across the curriculum: A critical sourcebook*. Hong Kong: The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

Cox, M. (2011). WAC: Closing doors or opening doors for second language writers? *Across the Disciplines*, 8(4). Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/ell/cox.pdf

Cox, M., Galin, J., & Melzer, D. (2018). Building sustainable WAC programs: A whole systems approach. *The WAC Journal*, 29. Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/journal/vol29/cox.pdf

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davis, D. J. (1987) Eight faculty members talk about student writing. *College Teaching*, 35(1), 31–35.

Dick, J. A. R., & Esch, R. M. (1985). Dialogues among disciplines: A plan for faculty discussions of Writing Across the Curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, 36(2), 178–182.

Eblen, C. (1983). Writing Across the Curriculum: A survey of a university faculty's views and classroom practices. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 17(4), 343–348.

Education Commission. (2000). *Reform proposals for the education system in Hong Kong*. Retrieved from https://www.ec.edu.hk/doc/en/publications_and_related_documents/education_reform/Edu-reform-eng.pdf

Evans, S. (2017). English in Hong Kong higher education. *World Englishes*, 36(4), 591–610.

Ferris, C., & Smith, R. (2000). Writing-intensive courses: Tools for curricular change. In S. H. McLeod, & M. Soven (Eds.), *Writing across the curriculum: A guide to developing programs* (pp. 52–62). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Harvey, A., Russell-Mundine, G., & Hoving, E. (2016). Modelling interdisciplinary collaboration to build cultural competence and academic literacy. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, 10(1), A101–A117.

Holdsworth, A., Watty, K., & Davies, M. (2009). *Developing capstone experiences*. Melbourne: The University of Melbourne: Centre for Study of Higher Education. Retrieved from http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/resources_teach/curriculum_design/docs/Capstone_Guide_09.pdf

Huber, M. T., & Hutchings, P. (2004). *Integrative learning: Mapping the terrain*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Kuriloff, P. C. (1992). The writing consultant: Collaboration and team teaching. In S. H. McLeod, & M. Soven (Eds.), *Writing across the curriculum: A guide to developing programs* (pp. 134–149). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lam, P., Wong, S., Wong, K., & McNaught, C. (2010). Ownership and use of mobile technologies: Planning mobile learning strategies for a Hong Kong university. *Online proceedings of the Enhancing Learning Experiences in Higher Education: International Conference*. Hong Kong: The University of Hong Kong. Retrieved from www.cetl.hku.hk/conference2010/pdf/Lam.pdf

Liaw, S. S., Hatal, M., & Huang, H. M. (2010). Investigating acceptance toward mobile learning to assist individual knowledge management: Based on activity theory approach. *Computers & Education*, 54(2), 446–454.

McLeod, S. H., & Soven, M. (2000). *Writing across the curriculum: A guide to developing programs*. Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse. Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/books/mcleod_soven/

Rademaekers, J. K. (2015, October 27). Is WAC/WID ready for the transdisciplinary research university? *Across the Disciplines*, 12(2). Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/articles/rademaekers2015.pdf

Rowles, C. J., Koch, D. C., Hundley, S. P., & Hamilton, S. J. (2004). Toward a model for capstone experiences: Mountaintops, magnets, and mandates. *Assessment Update*, 16(1), 1–2, 13–15.

Sageev, P., & Romanowski, C. J. (2001). A message from recent engineering graduates in the workplace: Results of a survey on technical communication skills. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 90(4), 685–693.

Thomas, K., Wong, K. C., & Li, Y. C. (2014). The capstone experience: student and academic perspectives. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(3), 580–594.

Townsend, M. (2008). WAC program vulnerability and what to do about it: An update and brief bibliographic essay. *The WAC Journal*, 19, 45–61.

Tudor, J., Penlington, R., & McDowell, L. (2010). Perceptions and their influences on approaches to learning. *Engineering Education*, 5(2), 69–79.

Ware, R., Turnipseed, N., Gallagher, J. R., Elliott, C. M., Popovics, J. S., Prior, P., & Zilles, J. L. (2019). Writing across engineering: A collaborative approach to support STEM faculty's integration of writing instruction in their classes. *American Society for Engineering Education 2019 Annual Conference*, paper ID #26720. Retrieved from https://peer.asee.org/writing-across-engineering-a-collaborative-approach-to-support-stem-faculty-s-integration-of-writing-instruction-in-their-classes.pdf

Wolfe-Quintero, K., & Segade, G. (1999). University support for second-language writers across the curriculum. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 191–209). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Zawacki, T. M., & Cox, M. (2014). *WAC and second-language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices*. Perspectives on Writing. Fort Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press. Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/l2/

Zawacki, T. M., & Rogers, P. M. (2011). *Writing across the curriculum: A critical sourcebook*. Boston: Bedford/St Martin's

7 The 3E (engages, empowers, and emancipates): ESL teacher education curriculum in the development of future teachers

Raja Nor Safinas Raja Harun

Introduction

Advancements in technology in recent years have led to the evolution of different types of learning which mirror educational developments in the 21st century, particularly focusing on the process of learning and teaching. Twenty-first-century learning has moved away from rote learning and memorization of facts to development of creativity, critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and information technological skills (Urbani, Roshandel, Michaels, & Truesdell, 2017). Learning is seen to be ubiquitous in that it can happen anywhere and anytime and not just within the four walls of the classroom. Such learning has impacted different kinds of learning styles, which have emerged from the learners' engagement and participation. Thus, this situation requires different types of learning approaches to be used by teachers to cater to these learners' needs. Learners are no longer seen as recipients of knowledge who wait to receive instruction and to be directed by teachers. To some extent, some learners have even developed a sense of agency which can be defined as the perception of and intention to exert choice and voice, and which can be characterized and studied as engagement (Charteris, 2014; Charteris & Smardon, 2018; Mercer, 2011; Priestley, Biesta, & Robinson, 2016 as cited in Wilcox & Lawson, 2018; Xiao, 2014). Such learners are able to understand what they need to learn, how best they can learn, and to take ownership of and responsibility for their learning. This can be further developed into independent and lifelong learning.

Having realized how learners and learning have changed, there is also a need to examine how teacher preparation programs can change to adapt to the differing and diverse needs of the learners and their learning styles. Teacher education programs have been criticized for not preparing teachers to cope with the challenges in the new world and this results in teachers who are not be able to function effectively in today's classrooms. Pillay (2015), Borg (2011), and Xiong (2016) have also criticized that teacher education programs have done little or nothing to prepare teachers for present-day diverse classrooms (Edge, Reynolds, & O'Toole, 2015; Egeberg, McConney, & Price, 2016; Ladson-Billings, 1995). They also fail to consider the contexts in which teaching takes place, and the ethical and political issues that influence teachers and teaching (Boyles, 2019;

Dawson & Shand, 2019; Oddone, Hughes, & Lupton, 2019; Qi & Vandersall, 2007; Zeichner 2009).

Teacher education programs are expected to develop, model, and assess the current competences needed by teachers so that the process of facilitation during teacher preparation programs can assist student teachers in applying these competences in their classrooms, and these can be further developed throughout their careers (Darling-Hammond, 2006 as cited in Urbani et al., 2017). Besides that, teacher educators themselves need to undergo a paradigm shift related to how they prepare their student teachers in learning how to teach. Informed by cognitive apprenticeship theory, teacher educators should focus on teaching methods that involve modelling, coaching, scaffolding, articulating, reflecting, and exploring (Collins, Brown, & Newman, 1987). Taking all those methods into account, however, there has always been an issue on how best teacher educators can prepare their student teachers in learning how to teach as there are too many variables that need to be considered. The complexities of classroom situations can often be quite alarming for many student teachers. Some studies have concurred that it can be quite difficult for preparatory programs to anticipate specific experiences which student teachers might face upon placements in schools (Mena, Hennisen, & Loughran, 2017). In the Malaysian classroom, for instance, student teachers have to deal with classrooms that are diverse in terms of language background, ethnicities, culture, religion, and target language proficiency. Therefore, Pillay (2015) has evoked the idea that teacher educators should pay attention not merely to knowledge and skills development in teaching and learning but also to the moral and ethical development of teachers (Donahue-Keegan, Villegas-Reimers, & Cressey, 2019; Nenonene, Gallagher, Kelly, & Collopy, 2019; Wise, 2006).

Background of the study

Due to the concerns above on teacher education programs' limitations and constraints in meeting the demands of current times, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI) has taken the initiative to embark on a five-year project, under the Niche Research Grant Scheme (NRGS), funded by the Ministry of Education, Malaysia. The overall aim is to develop a teacher education model for preparing future teachers. This chapter, part of a larger project, focuses only on the 3E (Engages, Emancipates, and Empowers) teacher education curriculum particularly for the Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) program involving three professional education courses: Instruction, Technology, and Assessment 1; Instruction, Technology, and Assessment 2; and, Reflective Seminar. These courses were taught in three consecutive semesters while the student teachers were in semester five, semester six, and semester eight. In semester seven, the student teachers were placed at designated schools based on their choice of teaching practice. The purpose of this chapter is to shed light on how the curriculum was implemented in the three courses mentioned and how the use of transformative pedagogy can engage, empower, and emancipate the student teachers through earning activities and experiences.

The development of the 3E curriculum is guided by eight principles which were formulated through extensive document analysis of best practices in teacher education programs (Darling-Hammond, 2017) in countries such as Finland, Singapore, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. The eight guiding principles stipulate the needs for teachers who:

1 critically examine, appreciate and practice the educational values of the teaching profession in the national and global context,
2 explore and create knowledge about their practice independently and collaboratively, and who have excellent core competencies and skills in the subject matter and are able to apply these competencies and skills in the teaching and learning process,
3 view teaching, learning, assessment, leadership, and clinical experiences as multi-dimensional, integrated, and reflective,
4 create a teaching–learning environment, provide scope and opportunities to foster intellectual excitement that will optimize learners' potential and passion for life-long learning,
5 provide quality learning space, resources, and technologies for learners to engage in active and cooperative learning that promotes positive social interactions and self-fulfillment,
6 competently adapt to changing technology and its application in educational practices,
7 become educational leaders with the attitude and capability to provide ideas and innovations, and manage change through evidence-based practices,
8 foster continual outreach programs and networking with local and global communities.

(Ratnavadivel, Hoon, Salih, Low, Karuppiah, Omar, & Hashim, 2014)

Grounded by the eight guiding principles, the 3E curriculum framework is developed through the episteme of several pertinent documents by the Ministry of Education, Malaysia such as the *National Education Philosophy, National Principles, Teacher Education Philosophy, Malaysian Education Blueprint*, and *Malaysia Teacher Standards*. There are several assumptions made as the basis for the 3E curriculum framework encapsulating current trends in education such as 21st-century skills, the 5 Minds of the Future, Education 4.0, Sustainable Developmental Goals 4 (SDG 4), the Science, Technology, Religion, Engineering, Arts, and Math (STREAM) movement, and the Scholarship of Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (SoTLA). The learning paradigm which informs the curriculum framework is positioned within the social constructivist view. This is aligned to practical and critical forms of knowledge which ensure the engagement, empowerment and emancipation elements of student teachers' learning experiences in the preparatory program.

A curriculum which *engages* means having student-centered mindedness as the core of developing and enriching the student teachers' experiences in becoming scholar teachers. This necessitates active learning experiences which require

participatory actions from student teachers either as individuals or part of a community of practice (Wenger, 1998).

A curriculum which *empowers* provides opportunities for student teachers to be autonomous in their thinking, decision making, and actions based on pedagogical reasoning of situational contexts. This includes the autonomy of being responsible for independent learning and making decisions and pedagogical choices as co-constructors and co-creators of knowledge through high impact practices and purposeful pathways (Raja Harun, Low, Omar, Haniff, & Rahman, 2017).

A curriculum which *emancipates* develops a higher freedom from the regulation of power, interconnectedness, and moral of agency in the view of critical pedagogy proponents. Education aims for social transformation (Hussein, 2009). This enables teachers to cater their professional development based on self-evaluation, reflection, and action-based research in the quest of improving and developing their own practices for self-fulfillment and self-actualization purposes. Emancipation leads to the confidence of sharing knowledge and practices, which are evidence-based in nature, and best practices.

The curriculum is implemented through the use of transformative pedagogy which has the elements of both constructivist and critical pedagogy. Ukpokodu (2009), Liu (2015), and Ovens (2017) opine that the use of transformative pedagogy can empower students to critically examine their beliefs, values, and knowledge; develop reflective knowledge; enhance appreciation of knowledge; and advance critical consciousness and sense of agency.

For transformative pedagogy to be effective, the teacher educator needs to perceive her classrooms in the three courses that were mentioned earlier as a community of practice. This concept is made transparent to her student teachers through shared elements like having mutual understanding, joint negotiations, shared repertoires, and a striving for common goals (Wenger, 1998). In addition, the teacher educator always refers to her student teachers as agents of change. According to Pillay (2015), such a reference enables student teachers to become effective future teachers who are able to assume responsibility for "school reform and renewal" (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Von Esch, 2018; Watson, 2014), and help them grow not only in terms of competence, but concurrently developing empowerment as they are learning to teach (Hammond, 2018; Lane, Pierson, & Givner, 2003; Mardapi & Herawan, 2019).

The outcome of the curriculum framework and the teacher education model is to produce future teachers with the 3CIA—compassionate, collaborative, creative, innovative, and adaptive—scholar teacher attributes. First, a compassionate teacher is someone who cares about the well-being of her students. She is considerate of her students through analysis of situational professional judgement and empathizes with students when there are relevant needs. Second, a collaborative teacher is someone who is open-minded and believes that learning is ubiquitous and that it can occur in multiple ways. Third, a creative and innovative teacher is someone who puts values at the forefront of all her actions. She is able to develop students' potential by knowing their strengths and finding ways to overcome their limitations. Finally, an adaptive teacher is someone who can adjust well to challenging

situations and who is a problem solver who considers challenges in teaching and learning as part of her professional development. Shulman (2011) postulates the idea that it is essential for any teacher education program and teacher to view teaching as scholarly work which often results in innovative acts of teaching. Scholar teachers are teachers who are knowledgeable in pedagogy and build upon their reflective practices to improve teaching and learning.

The TESL student teachers' learning experiences

The study has revealed that there are five components which emerged under the transformative pedagogy used by the teacher educator throughout the three courses that she taught. The components are active learning, peer instruction, negotiated learning environment, reflective practice, and connecting the dots. Each component is illustrated through types of learning activities which are discussed below.

Active learning

Active learning is known to advocate student-oriented, constructivist, and collaborative learning among students and academics (Al-Huneidi & Schreurs, 2013; Niemi, Nevgi & Aksit, 2016; O'Grady, Simmie, & Kennedy, 2014; Slavich & Zimbardo, 2012 as cited in Chan, Cheung, Wan, Brown, & Luk, 2015). Active learning expects students to play an active role in knowledge construction through a collaborative and interactive environment with or without the use of technology. There are at least four types of learning activities which recur throughout the three courses based on different topics of discussion. They are collaborative learning, flipped learning, Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) type of activities, and workshop-based learning.

Many of the learning activities observed were collaborative in nature. The student teachers were assigned to groups and the group members played the role of critical friends in assisting each other in the process of learning to teach. The group dynamics were apparent as student teachers created a sense of belonging to their groups. The prolonged engagement, which they had in the groups for collaborative interactions and discussions, helped them to become active learners. From the perspective of cognitive elaboration, the positive effects of cooperative learning on knowledge acquisition are assumed to be the result of students talking to each other about the learning content (Jurkowski & Hanze, 2015). They can further discuss and process information at a deeper level and arrive at a deeper understanding. By extension, collaborative and cooperative learning provides the opportunity for learners to interthink (Littleton & Mercer, 2013). This means that they can elaborate on the subject matter more collaboratively by engaging with each other's ideas. Interthinking may become apparent when students refer to and build on their group members' ideas and transfer those ideas to more elaborate ones. Therefore, this leads to the co-construction of knowledge among group members (Jurkowski & Hanze, 2015). Collaborative learning becomes the basis for other types of learning, such as flipped learning.

According to O'Flaherty and Phillips (2015), the flipped classroom reverses the traditional way of teaching and learning in that when learning is flipped, recorded materials are made available for students to watch prior to class. Flipped learning has been used by the teacher educator several times to prepare student teachers for in-class activities which are more collaborative and cooperative in nature. The choice of topics to flip according to the teacher educator is based on the demand of the topic itself and the availability of content based on online resources particularly in the form of videos. The intention to flip is to get student teachers prepared for group discussions which lead to a deeper kind of learning, particularly in transforming declarative knowledge into procedural knowledge. In addition, flipping the classroom can save time and the face-to-face classroom can be focused more on hands-on activities which can benefit student teachers.

For example, in one of the lessons, the topics on teaching methods were flipped through a series of videos on teaching methods, such as Total Physical Response and the Audio-Lingual Method, for student teachers to understand the teaching and learning principles of the methods. This led to a group discussion before class. Then, in groups they transferred their understanding of assigned methods in the form of Powtoon presentations. In class, the groups presented their understanding of the assigned methods and shared it with the whole class. Due to a lack of knowledge of all the teaching methods, the student teachers were found to be more attentive and asked for further clarification from groups which presented. The teacher educator helped to scaffold some difficult concepts by providing further explanations and answers. After the concepts had been understood, the teacher educators were assigned groups to discuss how they could combine at least two teaching methods to make their lessons eclectic in nature. This was followed with further discussions in groups and the presentation of ideas which involved whole class participation.

The findings revealed that student teachers tended to engage more in discussion and were active in presenting their ideas and providing constructive feedback to other groups. This is in agreement with some of the studies that have found that flipped learning has several advantages to both teachers and students such as enabling teachers to understand students' learning styles and difficulties, using time effectively and creatively, and meeting the learning needs of diverse students (Fulton, 2012; Roehl, Reddy, & Shannon, 2013). On the other hand, students are said to be more engaged and elicit positive attitudes and emotions towards learning (González-Gómez, Jeong, Rodríguez, & Cañada-Cañada, 2016; Graziano 2017; Heran & Thomson, 2019). In their case study, Tomas, Evans, Doyle, and Skamp (2019) found that the flipped learning continuum provides students with different levels of opportunity to apply and extend knowledge which can be characterized through high levels of student autonomy and a higher order of thinking.

In addition, BYOD has been used in the classes the teacher educator taught. Student teachers uploaded most of their work and feedback through the Padlet application prepared by the teacher educator. During class, they were seen to refer to Padlet either for the purpose of getting into a discussion, providing feedback,

or stating comments. Some students preferred to bring their own laptops to class to access Padlet. However, there is a growing trend observed in which quite a number of student teachers in this context were using their mobile phones to access the online materials and discussions. BYOD, used together with flipped learning, has shown positive results in terms of student teachers' engagement and empowerment which is supported by Kong and Song (2015) who examined a personalized learning hub with students using BYOD and reflective engagement. Their findings have shown that students have sustained the structure and agency domains, which led to a higher degree of emancipation, as opposed to maintaining classroom culture. The findings of this study also correspond with another study which has shown that pre-service teachers have responded positively to the use of BYOD in the classroom in areas such as increased Information Communication Technology (ICT) access, motivation, engagement, creativity, productivity, communication, collaboration, and differentiation of instruction. In contrast, the study also found impediments such as cyber bullying, disruptions, cheating, and accessing inappropriate content (O'Bannon and Thomas, 2015), which were not found in the present study.

Since many of the learning activities were student-centered and hands on in nature, there were many workshops that were facilitated by the teacher educator and some were carried out by invited speakers who were either expert teachers, officers from the Curriculum Development Centre, or former students who graduated and have been teaching in schools. The workshop-based learning was supported with the use of technological and non-technological tools and was carried out and presented to exemplify the realities of classroom situations. Such activities provide a high level of engagement among the student teachers as they have opportunities to transfer their understanding into practice. It empowers them to make decisions on how to design lesson plans, adapt to and adopt appropriate materials, and choose relevant assessment for learning. By having other invited guests in the workshop, the student teachers' thinking was liberated by extending their understanding to other multiple contexts and best practices that were shared with them.

Peer instruction

Peer instruction (PI) has been defined as an instructional strategy which aims to engage students during a lecture through a structured education process (Knight & Braeme, 2018; Mazur, 1997; Stigmar, 2016). Peer instruction was used by the teacher educator as a strategy for engaging, empowering, and emancipating student teachers. Learning activities were frequently carried out through simulations, demonstrations, and modelling, as well as through the sharing of ideas and learning strategies. The demonstrations and modelling which were carried out in class were recorded with the student teachers' agreement and were linked to Padlet and stored in a Google drive which was accessible by everyone in the class. This helped student teachers to learn from each other. Most of the time in class, they were engaged in activities that required them to give feedback on the strengths and

weaknesses of their peers' teaching and simulations as well as to suggest ways their peers could further improve. The teacher educator structured questions and scaffolded the whole discussion to ensure participation and engagement. All these activities were coupled with post-class reflections to ensure learning took place. Other studies have also shown similar results where students are found to: Be more focused and engaged in their discussions (Cortright, Collins & DiCarlo, 2005; Pawan & Fan, 2014); have more increased understanding during discussion (Porter, Bailey-Lee, Simon, & Zingaro, 2011; Sezen-Barrie, Tran, McDonald, & Kelly, 2014); and improve their performance more than through a conventional lecture (Al-Ahdal & Al-Awaid, 2014; Cortright et al., 2005).

In addition, simulations can be integrated into peer instruction in the form of modelling or demonstration. It is an instructional strategy which attempts to recreate a certain aspect of reality for the purpose of gaining information, clarifying values, understanding other cultures, or developing a skill (Christensen, Knezek, & Tyler-Wood, 2011; Cruz & Patterson, 2005, p. 43 as cited in Ferguson, 2017; Fluck & Fox, 2011). Simulations are considered low risk as students can try out different decisions, change their behavior, and see different results (Kaufman & Ireland, 2016) in a safe environment particularly in preparation for teaching practice in schools. For student teachers who modelled or demonstrated certain teaching techniques, such activities have empowered them to make decisions on how best they can demonstrate their ideas to their peers. These activities indirectly built their confidence as they were given platforms to channel their thoughts and ideas with their peers. This is empowering in nature as they become autonomous thinkers who are able to make decisions and provide reasoning for such decisions. These types of learning activities can assist student teachers in emancipating their thinking as they can do self-evaluation through their teacher educator and peer feedback and reflection. In a similar vein, Clapper (2010) has supported the fact that simulations allow students to explore complex tasks and develop critical thinking skills by using active learning and reflection. In addition, Ferguson (2017) has also gathered positive feedback from her student teachers on the use of simulation which subsequently has the potential of enhancing empowerment and self-reflection in the form of formative assessment.

For example, in the reflective course, through their peers' presentation on the findings of their action research, student teachers were able to go through the learning experiences of others which were enriching in understanding multiple contexts and realities of classroom situations. They were also required to innovate their teaching and learning in schools by explaining the teaching activities, strategies, techniques, or materials employed and which of those were found effective with their learners. If student teachers are assisted with looking into their own practices constantly and consciously, they can develop and improve themselves as future teachers. This can be a rewarding and fulfilling experience for student teachers in learning how to teach.

The session of seniors to juniors was one of the favorite activities much anticipated by the student teachers. It gave them a sense of what to expect in the reflective course after the teaching practice. The juniors were looking forward to

listening to the teaching innovations made during teaching practice. On the contrary, senior student teachers used the platform provided to gain constructive feedback on innovations. As an example, there was a session in which the final-year student teachers demonstrated "Green Screen Technology" to their juniors in semester 6. The sharing of ideas session involved explaining principles and the problem to solve, and demonstrating how to use the innovation supported with evidence from real classroom situations. It gave a good sense of emancipation for the seniors as they were able to demonstrate how such innovation could make a change to their classroom situations. This in itself can be a rewarding process for the student teachers.

Negotiated learning environment

Classroom interactions are largely dependent on the teaching and learning activities which occur in the classroom and are quite often negotiated by the members of the classroom community. Through this interaction and negotiation, students' perceptions about knowledge, identity as teachers and their relationships with others are inherently connected (Shim & Kim, 2018). There are four learning activity types which can be discerned through the negotiated learning environment component. They are dialogic interactions, mediated learning, co-constructors of knowledge, and knowledge curators. All these learning types are considered as negotiated learning environments because they involve multiple perspectives which are heavily based on a tripartite negotiated interaction between the teacher educator and student teachers, between student teachers and the teacher educator, and between student teachers and other student teachers. These relations are fluid and dynamic in nature.

Dialogic interaction has been argued to provide social actions and interactions characterized by trust, care, sensitivity, mutual openness, non-manipulation, recognition of uniqueness, and orientation to the other person (Kathard, Pillay, & Pillay, 2015). In classroom situations, dialogic interactions can be observed through a flexible share of turns between teachers and student teachers to co-construct meaning via interactions which are fluid and dynamic. Grounded in the social constructivist view, the teacher educator provided a safe environment for dialogic interactions to happen. Students' engagement and empowerment can be seen through the questions asked. In many instances, multiple answers and responses were welcomed before deriving relevant answers. The teacher educator was as an active agent who provided opportunities for dialogic interactions to happen in class. Many times, these dialogic interactions were extended to the discussion on Padlet which occurred outside of the classroom. Dialogic feedback was also observed in the three courses where meaningful feedback was given both by the teacher educator and student teachers. This dialogic feedback, through a variety of feedback styles, served as an assessment for learning for the benefit of student teachers as well as for the teacher educator. Such activities engaged student teachers in the feedback sessions in which they were actively involved, empowered them to give feedback on what they observed and thought, and

emancipated their thinking. In relation to this, Adie, Van der Kleij, and Cumming (2018) state that dialogic interactions can be closely tied to engagement and self-regulatory skills, particularly in the form of feedback that corresponds to student teachers' identified needs. This can advance learning and facilitate understanding of themselves as learners.

Language plays an important role in the teaching and learning process and serves as a mediator to facilitate learning. Therefore, the notion of mediation in cognitive development extrapolates the idea that language has a mediational role in advancing students to a more competent level (Azadi, Biria, & Nasri, 2018). However, this notion has elaborated upon, revised, and reinforced to represent language as a third party which drives speakers to mediate between their minds and the outside world in the learning process (Guerrero, 2007). Mediated learning can be seen through the student teachers' engagement with the materials and archives uploaded in Padlet for current and future use. These tasks assisted the teacher educator in monitoring the student teachers' engagement and the extent to which those materials and archives empowered them in choosing, adapting to, or adopting those materials and archives as the basis of their work. Azadi et al. (2018) have indicated that mediation should be the backbone to drive change in a teacher education program, particularly in developing a teacher's knowledge and skills so that they can apply these changes productively later in schools. They argue that the principles and theories forming the concept of mediation in the L2 teaching/learning loop tend to facilitate the way pedagogical activities are presented, instructed, and evaluated.

A small number of student teachers emancipated themselves by looking for other resources to clarify their understanding and serve their needs. Most of the time, they shared the resources discovered in the group WhatsApp chat room. This was a common practice to gain immediate attention and feedback from the teacher educator. Although some issues or questions were raised based on the particular resource shared, not many student teachers would respond to the question or issues raised. Only a small number gave responses and quite often it was the same circle of people. This was due to the fact that some student teachers felt they had a choice to respond or not as this type of informal learning is perceived by student teachers as being not compulsory since it was not mentioned in the course outline. The student teachers' minimal engagement to some extent can be a limitation to the concept of community of practice.

The immense engagement and empowerment in learning how to teach allowed student teachers to become co-constructors of knowledge. Knowledge which is not fixed but well thought through, and the process of negotiation and deliberation through learning activities which are based on relevant resources, empowered student teachers to be confident in making decisions based on facts, arguments, and evidence. This indirectly emancipated them from working just within the framework of the mind of their teacher educator. It opens more avenues for student teachers to extend their thinking and be confident of their decisions.

Due to the availability of extensive relevant resources online, student teachers have to learn how they can curate knowledge which is seen to be relevant to their

contexts and practice. Therefore, their engagement with resources is important to empower them to choose, adopt, and create materials as well as resources relevant to them. This can also emancipate them from using only readily available materials which quite often require modification. As knowledge curators, student teachers can develop their technological pedagogical knowledge (TPACK) (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). This is an important competency to be developed among student teachers.

Reflective practice

The third component of transformative pedagogy used was reflective practice. Much research has suggested the use of reflection as part of initial and continuous professional development. Gutierez (2015) has reviewed several studies which indicate the benefits of reflective practice such as: 1) capability building among teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2009; Dumlao & Pinatacan, 2019; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2007; Reeves, 2010); 2) self-knowledge and self-challenges on their professional learning journey (Klein, 2008; Leitch & Day, 2000; Ng & Tan, 2009; Slade, Burnham, Catalana, & Waters, 2019); 3) opportunities for self-reflection within a support group, teacher inquiry groups (Crockett, 2002), peer coaching, collaborative teacher consultation, teacher mentoring (Brownell, Adams, Sindelar, Waldron, & Vanhover, 2006), lesson study (Carlson, 2019; Meyer, Lieberman, & Miller, 2009; Pazhoman, & Sarkhosh, 2019), and collaborative professional learning (Gutierez, 2015) which establishes sustainability and collaboration. There were three types of learning activities involving reflective practice which included video analysis of micro and macro teaching, entries in e-portfolios, and action research.

Reflection is not an easy process, particularly if it requires a change in actions or practice. Descriptive reflection will not guarantee any changes as it becomes merely a process of reporting. To move student teachers from descriptive reflection to critical reflection can be a challenging task as it requires constant practice and sustainable efforts such as providing feedback and showing examples of reflective entries. The process of critical reflection requires student teachers to be able to put their reflection and thoughts into writing which warrants a different type of written discourse and expressions. This, therefore, requires student teachers to have the capacity to express themselves in words and put their actions into words meta-cognitively. To emancipate student teachers from this process, there was constant discussion of their reflective writing, and support was given by providing examples from their peers who were more able. This process was also mediated through the reflective entries which were uploaded by all the student teachers. In agreement with the above, Guiterez (2015) has also highlighted the fact that engaging in reflective practice through constructive utterances and feedback can develop an in-depth understanding of knowledge development. She further explained that the on-going feedback process allows for group members to voice ideas on renewing actual practices (Daniel, Auhl, & Hastings, 2013; Dumlao & Pinatacan, 2019), forms the basis for critical evaluation in the reflection of

existing practices (Han, 1995; Hatton and Smith, 1995; Carlson, 2019; Pazhoman & Sarkhosh, 2019; Slade et al., 2019), and becomes the object of learning from classroom experiences.

E-portfolios were used as both a process and a product of learning. Two types of portfolios were used with two different batches. The earlier portfolio was a free platform from foliofor.me and the later prototype portfolio was developed as part of teacher educator learning innovation. Both the portfolios were used for the purpose of:

1 having an interactive platform for dialogic interactions,
2 encouraging student teachers to make inquiries about how they could learn best through exploring and providing evidence of their own work or from other resources,
3 providing deep engagement through writing reflective entries,
4 allowing students to archive their process of learning to teach by uploading their macro and micro teaching experiences,
5 honing their meta-cognitive skills by putting words to their thinking as well as their beliefs,
6 acting as a learning platform for others within the group to learn from one another by looking at each other's pages and providing constructive comments in the quest of learning to teach,
7 focusing on the process of learning to teach in which the teacher educator and student teachers share best ideas and practices,
8 strengthening the community of practice and students' sense of belonging through engagement in the e-portfolios,
9 archiving all the learning experiences that a student teacher has which have become the product and evidence of learning to teach.

The use of e-portfolios as a platform for reflective practice yielded positive outcomes among the student teachers as they were more able to articulate pedagogical reasoning and were proactive in finding ways to improve their limitations in learning how to teach. In a similar vein, Van Wyk (2017) reports that the use of e-portfolios for reflective practices assisted his student teachers in growing their teaching philosophy and professional identity; engaging in a transformative learning process which entails the use of metacognitive learning strategies, the engagement of diverse approaches, and the evaluation of their own learning process (p. 281); developing reflective capacity and teaching reflective practices; and applying ICT and other technological and pedagogical content knowledge and other technologies. In sum, the use of e-portfolios with reflective practices can empower and emancipate student teachers towards self-directed learning.

Over the decades, action research has been recognized as one of the ways to increase professional development in both pre-service and in-service teacher education programs (James & Augustin, 2018; Kostaris, Sergis, Sampson, Giannakos, & Pelliccione, 2017; Ryan, 2013; Ryan, Young, & Kraglund-Gauthier, 2017). The action research student teachers carried out during teaching practice has also

supported the reflective component in terms of engaging, empowering, and emancipating student teachers in learning how to teach. Ryan et al. (2017, p. 13), have found that students were able to reflect and restudy (restories) experiences, leading to fresh levels of awareness and an ability to articulate what has occurred in practicums and to learning even more from the experiences. In order for action research to take place, student teachers were required to identify a problematic area which they want to improve. This process required them to be engaged and immersed in the teaching context they were in. They were empowered to make decisions about solutions suitable for the contexts that they were in. This was one of the greatest challenges for many student teachers as they had to think independently, although support was given by both their supervisors and mentor teachers. Many student teachers found the problems quite perplexing and did not know which areas they should focus on. Due to the cyclical nature of the action research, student teachers had to keep looking for ways to solve problems and these processes often left student teachers with uncertainty as to whether they were doing things right. The use of action research needs to be strengthened particularly in empowering student teachers in making evidence-based decisions and emancipating student teachers' thinking, beliefs, predispositions, and actions in the process of completing the action research.

Connecting the dots

Developing teacher identity is central in enhancing professional growth among teachers. In fact, the success of a teacher education program is partly determined through the teachers' professional identities which are shaped and reshaped throughout the preparation program (Sardabi, Biria, & Golestan, 2018). In regards to this, the fifth component in transformative pedagogy is termed as "connecting the dots" which helps student teachers to explore their personal and professional identity as future teachers. In all the learning experiences which they go through as future teachers, they need to make sense of who they are as an individual and who they aspire to be as future teachers. Studies have shown that professional identity formation is a "multidimensional, idiosyncratic and context specific nature…which entails an interplay between different, and sometimes conflicting, perspectives, beliefs and practices, which are accompanied by development of the teachers' self" (Flores & Day, 2006, p. 219). This notion is also supported by O'Gallchoir, O'Flaherty, and Hinchion (2018) and Prabjandee (2019). The shaping of self and professional identity reflects a unique combination of culture, context, and experiences (Edwards & Edwards, 2017; Tsang & Jiang, 2018; Zur & Ravid, 2018).

Consciously getting student teachers to think of their identities can help them shape their professional identity by exploring their strengths and weaknesses. Writing an entry on "What teachers would you like to be?" before leaving for teaching practice, as in 1), and revisiting the entry after coming back from teaching practice, as in 2), often made them realize that what they aspired to be and the realities of teaching situations might not be connected or only partially connected.

1) The English teacher I want to be (before teaching practice)

> First of all, I can't really decide what kind of teacher I will be one day. It all depends on the situation of where and whom am I teaching. For now I can… I will be a teacher who can accommodate to the learners' needs. Considering my own personality, I am a person who loves fun and games and does not really like to have rules though I abide in them…as a teacher that students are able to relate with. In terms of teaching and learning, I mostly will use the constructivist way of teaching. I'd rather have them, my students, learn from experience than spoon feed them with all the information. My role in class for the students is just to guide them into discovering the knowledge that they need to learn. I can see myself as a respected teacher, the kind of teacher that nerds would like to be with and gangsters of the school trusts…

In 1), the student teacher wanted to become a fun and loving teacher before leaving for her teaching practice. However, her teaching practice gave her many experiences which in turn gave her a better sense of her professional identity. It is of utmost importance that student teachers realize that the development of their professional identity should begin early, while they are learning to teach, and that the shaping of professional identity is not static. It is best seen as evolving through osmosis which constantly requires affirmation and reaffirmation of their beliefs and predispositions.

2) The English teacher I want to be (after teaching practice)

> Teaching practice woke me up like a splash of cold water. I opened my eyes to reality, and it is a very cruel reality that I have to face. If before I always imagined myself as a teacher that students readily listen to, now I see and I know there was more to teaching than going into the class just to give the students your lecture. It is quite true that I imagined myself as a fun and games teacher. With my carefree personality and serious attitude, I expected to be easily related to. But no. I realize it needs more than just personality and attitude. Teaching goes deeper than that. Before you are able to bring fun and games in class, first thing's first, you need to be able to control the classroom. The first time I brought a game into the class, it ended with the disciplinary teacher rushing to my class to see what happened… Respect is earned, not expected. It is hard to be respected the moment you step into the class. It all lies in the way you walk and communicate with the students. The students were challenging me in every way possible, and there were many times during the 16 weeks I was teaching, I felt like giving up halfway and just running for my life. Though towards the end of the period, my students slowly gained their trust towards me. That feels quite rewarding. Now that I have taken a walk through Jurassic Park, my vision of me as a teacher has become clearer. The more I think about it, the more I know I can make it. I can see myself as a respectable teacher….

Such activities, which deal with student teachers interrogating their beliefs, dispositions, and understanding about teaching, can help student teachers build their own philosophies of teaching that evolve and mature over time based on teaching contexts and experiences. In fact, Van Wyk (2017) has found that the majority of his student teachers believed and experienced that evidence produced over time negates, as well as enhances, their specific philosophy of teaching. Sardabi et al. (2018) indicate that the role of teacher education programs is significant in shaping teachers' professional identity by helping them to voice their concerns, critically reflect, and be conscious of powerful structures and control which may challenge their fundamental assumptions of L2 teaching and learning. Such understanding can empower and emancipate student teachers to take a critical stance as future teachers and to examine their own practices.

Conclusion

This chapter presents the student teachers' learning experiences of the 3E (Engages, Empowers, and Emancipates) curriculum framework through the use of transformative pedagogy. The learning experiences consisted of five components: Active learning, peer instruction, a negotiated learning environment, reflective practice, and connecting the dots. Each of the components was further exemplified with recurring learning activity types throughout the three professional education courses taught by the teacher educator.

From the observations of the three courses, it can be concluded that the elements of engagement, empowerment, and emancipation appeared through the three courses with varying degrees of student teachers' involvement, participation, and outcomes. As many of the learning activities were student-centered, the element of engagement was easily discerned through the student teachers' participation in class or via online platforms such as Padlet and e-Portfolio. The reflective entries, dialogic interactions, collaborative learning, and mediated learning empowered student teachers to make choices and to move themselves towards making informed decisions which can be discerned through their oral interactions in class or through reflective entries. However, it was felt that the element of emancipation through the student teachers' learning experiences needed to be structured and integrated more carefully into the learning how to teach process. This can be done through getting student teachers to self-assess their competencies at different junctures of the teacher education program. Self-assessment can give a better idea of how student teachers have developed and can identify areas which need further improvement. The process of carrying out action research needs to be improved so that this skill can be seamlessly transferred as student teachers become teachers after they graduate. This is an important gateway towards the emancipation of their practice.

Although the outcome of the 3E curriculum framework was to produce beginning scholar teachers who are compassionate, creative, and innovative as well as adaptive, the study did not manage to systematically assess whether these attributes are inherent in the student teachers who were the participants of this study.

Further instruments need to be developed to study the outcome of the student teachers' attributes based on the learning experiences they have gone through, spanning from their first year to the final year.

This study implies that any curriculum change needs to go through a rigorous process of trial and error until it becomes reliable and established. This is a longitudinal process that requires a conscientious effort from all parties involved in the curriculum development and implementation of a teacher education program. Such a process requires teacher educators to embark on the scholarship of teaching and learning which requires them to be adaptive to change, resulting in a more dynamic teaching, learning, and assessing process which will benefit both the student teachers and the teacher education program as a whole.

Acknowledgements

The outcome of this chapter has been made possible with the funding of the Niche Research Grant Scheme (NRGS) awarded to Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI) by the Ministry of Education, Malaysia.

References

Adie, L., Van der Kleij, F., & Cumming, J. (2018). The development and application of coding frameworks to explore dialogic feedback interactions and self-regulated learning. *British Educational Research Journal*, 44(4), 704–723.

Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H., & Al-Awaid, S. A. A. (2014). Reflective teaching and language teacher education programmes; a milestone in Yemen and Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(4), 759–768.

Al-Huneidi, A.M., & Schreurs, J. (2013). Constructivism based blended learning in higher education. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies i-JET*, 7(1), 1–7.

Azadi, G., Biria, R., & Nasri, M. (2018). Operationalising the concept of mediation in L2 teacher education. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 9(1), 132–140.

Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System*, 39, 370–380.

Boyles, D. (2019). Ethics, curriculum, teaching and learning in a hostile learning environment. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*, 21(1–2), 21–44.

Brownell, M. T., Adams, A., Sindelar, P., Waldron, N., & Vanhover, S. (2006). Learning from collaboration: The role of teacher qualities. *Exceptional Children*, 72(2), 169–188.

Carlson, J. R. (2019). "How am I going to handle the situation?" The role(s) of reflective practice and critical friend groups in secondary teacher education. *IJ-SoTL*, 13(1), Article 12.

Chan K., Cheung G., Wan K., Brown I., & Luk G. (2015) Synthesizing technology adoption and learners' approaches towards active learning in higher education. *The Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 13(6), 431–440.

Charteris, J. (2014). Learner agency, dispositionality, and the New Zealand curriculum competencies. *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work*, 11(2), 175–186.

Charteris, J., & Smardon, D. (2018). A typology of agency in new generation learning environments: Emerging relational, ecological and new material considerations. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 26(1), 51–68.

Christensen, R., Knezek, G., & Tyler-Wood, T. (2011). SimSchool: An online dynamic simulator for enhancing teacher preparation. *International Journal of Learning Technology*, 6, 201–221.

Clapper, T. C. (2010). Role-play and simulation: Returning to teaching for understanding. *Education Digest*, 75(8), 39–43.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Reinventing student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42, 104–118. doi:10.1177/002248719104200204

Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Newman, S. E. (1987). *Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the craft of reading, writing and mathematics* (Tech. Rep. No. 403). Cambridge, MA: University of Illinois, Centre for the Study of Reading, BBN Laboratories.

Cortright, R. N., Collins, H. L., & DiCarlo, S. E. (2005). Peer instruction enhanced meaningful learning: Ability to solve novel problems. *Advance Physiology Education*, 29(2), 107–111.

Crockett, M. D. (2002). Inquiry as professional development creating dilemmas through teachers' work. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 609–624.

Daniel, G. R., Auhl, G., & Hastings, W. (2013) Collaborative feedback and reflection for professional growth: Preparing first-year pre-service teachers for participation in the community of practice, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(2), 159–172.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). Teaching and the change wars: The professional hypothesis. In A. Hargreaves & M. Fullan (Eds.), *Change wars* (pp. 45–68). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 291–309.

Dawson, V., & Shand, J. (2019). Impact of support for preservice teachers placed in disadvantaged schools. *Issues in Educational Research*, 29(1), 19–37.

Donahue-Keegan, D., Villegas-Reimers, E., & Cressey, J. M. (2019). Integrating social-emotional learning and culturally responsive teaching in teacher education preparation programs: The Massachusetts experience so far. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 46(4), 150–168.

Dumlao, P. R., & Pinatacan, J. R. (2019). From practice to writing using reflective journal instruction in enhancing pre-service teachers' professional development. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(4), 459–478.

Edge, K., Reynolds, R., & O'Toole, M. (2015). Contextual complexity: The professional learning experiences of seven classroom teachers when engaged in "quality teaching". *Cogent Education*, 2(1), 1120002. doi:10.1080/2331186X.2015.1120002

Edwards, F. C. E., & Edwards, R. J. (2017). A story of culture and teaching: The complexity of teacher identity formation. *The Curriculum Journal*, 28(2), 190–211.

Egeberg, H. M., McConney, A., & Price, A. (2016). Classroom management and national professional standards for teachers: A review of the literature on theory and practice. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(7), 1–18.

Ferguson, K. (2017). Using simulation to teach reading assessment to pre-service teachers. *Reading Teacher*, 70(5), 561–569.

Flores, M. A., & Day, C. (2006). Contexts which shape and reshape new teacher's identities: A multi-perspective study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22, 219–232.

Fluck, A., & Fox, A. (2011). Engaging training simulations for socially demanding roles. In G. Williams, P. Statham, N. Brown, & B. Cleland (Eds.), *Changing demands, changing directions. Proceedings Ascilite* (pp. 398–406). Hobart, Australia: The University of Tasmania.

Fulton, K. (2012). Upside down and inside out: Flip your classroom to improve student learning. *Learning & Leading with Technology*, 39(8), 12–17.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2007). *Supervision and instructional leadership*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

González-Gómez, D., Jeong, J. S., Rodríguez, D. A., & Cañada-Cañada, F. (2016). Performance and perception in the flipped learning model: An initial approach to evaluate the effectiveness of a new teaching methodology in a general science classroom. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 25(3), 450–459.

Guerrero, M. C. M. (2007). Applications of Vygotskyan concept of mediation in SLA. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 9, 213–228.

Gutierez, S. B. (2015). Teachers' reflective practice in lesson study: A tool for improving instructional practice. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 61(3), 314–328.

Graziano, K. J. (2017). Peer teaching in a flipped teacher education classroom. *TechTrends*, 61, 121–129.

Han, E. P. (1995). Issues in education: Reflection is essential in teacher education. *Childhood Education*, 71(4), 228–231.

Hammond, H. G. (2018). Teacher empowerment and teachers' perceptions of the principal's servant leadership. *Luthuan Education*, Spring, 23–33.

Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11(1), 33–49.

Heran, M., & Thompson, H. (2019). How do trainee teachers engage with a flipped learning approach. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 35(2), 92–106.

Hussein, S. (2009) Towards the development of a murabbi. In Rahman, F. A., Shafiee, F. P., & Elias, H. (Eds.), *Teachers' learning, curriculum innovations and knowledge applications* (pp.73–87). Selangor, Malaysia: Universiti Putra Malaysia Press.

James, F., & Augustin, S. D. (2018). Improving teachers' pedagogical and instructional practice. *Educational Action Research*, 26(2), 233–348.

Jurkowski, S., & Hanze, M. (2015). How to increase the benefits of cooperation: Effects of training in transactive communication on cooperative learning. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85, 357–371.

Kathard, H., Pillay, D., & Pillay, M. (2015). A study of teacher–learner interactions: A continuum between monologic and dialogic interactions. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools*, 46, 222–241.

Kaufman, D., & Ireland, A. (2016). Enhancing teacher education with simulations. *TechTrends*, 60(3), 260–267.

Klein, S. R. (2008). Holistic reflection in teacher education: reflection and strategies. *Journal of Reflective Practice*, 9(2), 111–121.

Knight, J. K., & Brame, C. J. (2018). Peer instruction. *CBE-Life Sciences Education*, 17(5), 1–4.

Kong, S. C., & Song, Y. (2015). An experience of personalized learning hub initiative embedding BYOD for reflective engagement in higher education. *Computers & Education*, 88, 227–240.

Kostaris, C., Sergis, S., Sampson, D. G., Giannakos, M. N., & Pelliccione, L. (2017). Investigating the potential of the flipped classroom model in K-12 ICT teaching and learning: An action research study. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 20(1), 261–273.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.

Lane, K. L., Pierson, M. R., & Givner, C. C. (2003). Teacher expectations of students' behaviour: Which skills do elementary and secondary teachers deem necessary for success in the classroom?. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 26(4), 413–430.

Pawan, F., & Fan, W. (2014). Sustaining expertise through collaborative/peer-mediated and individual reflections: The experiences of Chinese English language teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 41(4), 71–88.

Pazhoman, H., & Sarkhosh, M. (2019). The Relationship between Iranian English high school teachers' reflective practices, their self-regulation and teaching experience. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 995–1010.

Porter, L., Bailey-Lee, C., Simon, B., & Zingaro, D. (2011). Peer instruction: Do students really learn from peer discussion in computing? *Proceedings of the seventh international workshop on computing education research* (pp. 45–52). New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery.

Leitch, R., & Day, C. (2000). Action research and reflective practice: Towards a holistic view, *Educational Action Research*, 8(1), 179–193.

Littleton, K., & Mercer, N. (2013). *Interthinking: Putting talk to work*. London, UK: Routledge.

Liu, K. (2015). Critical reflection as a framework for transformative learning in teacher education. *Educational Review*, 67(2), 135–157.

Mardapi, D., & Herawan, T. (2019). Community-based teacher training: Transformation of sustainable teacher empowerment strategy in Indonesia. *Journal of Teacher Education and Sustainability*, 21(1), 48–66.

Mazur, E. (1997). *Peer instruction: A user's manual*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Mena, J., Hennisen, P., & Loughran, J. (2017). Developing pre-service teachers' professional knowledge of teaching: The influence of mentoring. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 66, 47–59.

Mercer, S. (2011). The beliefs of two expert EFL learners. *Language Learning Journal*, 39, 57–74.

Meyer, M. A., Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (2009). Teachers in professional communities: Improving teaching and learning. *Journal of Educational Change*, 10, 79–82.

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017–1054.

Nenonene, R. L., Gallagher, C. E., Kelly, M. K., & Collopy, R. M. B. (2019). Challenges and opportunities of infusing, social, emotional and cultural competencies into teacher preparation: One program's story. *Collopy Teacher Education Quarterly*, 46(4), 92–115.

Ng, P. T., & Tan, C. (2009). Community of practice for teachers: Sense making or critical reflective learning? *Reflective Practice*, 10(1), 37–44.

Niemi, H., Nevgi, A., & Aksit, F. (2016). Active learning and promoting student teachers' competences in Finland and Turkey. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(4), 471–490.

O'Bannon, B. W., & Thomas, K. M. (2015). Mobile phones in the classroom: Preservice teachers answer the call. *Computers & Education*, 85, 110–122.

Oddone, K., Hughes, H., & Lupton, M. (2019). Teachers as connected professionals: A model to support professional learning through personal learning networks. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 20(3), 1–20.

O'Flaherty, J., & Phillips, C. (2015). The use of flipped classrooms in higher education: A scoping review. *Internet and Higher Education*, 25, 85–95.

O'Gallchoir, C., O'Flaherty, J., & Hinchion, C. (2018). Identity development: What I notice myself as a teacher. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(2), 138–156.

O'Grady, A., Simmie, G. M, & Kennedy, T. (2014). Why change to active learning? Preservice and in-service science teachers' perceptions. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1), 35–50.

Ovens, A. (2017). Putting complexity to work to think differently about transformative pedagogies in teacher education. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 26(3), 38–51.

Pawan, F., & Fan, W. (2014). Sustaining expertise through collaborative/peer mediated and individual reflections: The experiences of Chinese English language teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 41, 71–88.

Pazhoman, H., & Sarkhosh, M. (2019). The relationship between Iranian English high school teachers' reflective practices, their self-regulation and teaching experience. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 995–1010.

Pillay, A. (2015). Transformative and critical education praxis in a teacher education lecture room. *Education as Change*, 19(3), 4–23.

Prabjandee, D. (2019). Becoming English teachers in Thailand: Student teacher identity development during teaching practicum. *Issues in Educational Research*, 29(4), 1277–1294.

Qi, J., & Vandersall, K. (2007). Facilitating reflective practice for pre-service teachers through electronic portfolio development. In R. Carlsen, K. McFerrin, J. Price, R. Weber & D. Willis (Eds.), *Proceedings of SITE 2007–Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 2609–2616). San Antonio, TX: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).

Raja Harun, R. N. S. R., Low, J. Omar, A., Haniff, H., & Rahman, A. A. (2017). The development of high impact practices curriculum framework for 21st century teacher education in Malaysia. *Proceedings of London International Conference on Education 2017*, 375–385.

Ratnavadivel, N., Hoon, C. L., Salih, M., Low, J., Karuppiah, N., Omar, A., & Hashim, A. T. M. (2014). Curriculum framework for preparing quality teachers for the future: Developing guiding principles. *Teacher Education*, 4(2), 32–44.

Reeves, D. B. (2010). *Transforming professional development into student results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Roehl, A., Reddy, S. H., & Shannon, G. J. (2013). The flipped classroom: An opportunity to engage millennial students through active learning strategies. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, 105(2), 44–49.

Ryan, T. G. (2013). The communicative elements of action research. *Networks: An Online Journal for Teacher Research*, 15(2), 1–2.

Ryan, T. G., Young, C. D., & Kraglund-Gauthier, W. (2017). Action research within preservice teacher education. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching and Learning Journal*, 10(3), 1–14.

Sardabi, N., Biria, R., & Golestan, A. A. (2018). Reshaping teacher professional identity through critical pedagogy-informed teacher education. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(3), 617–634.

Sezen-Barrie, A., Tran, M., Mc Donald, S. P., & Kelly, G. J. (2014). A cultural historical activity theory perspective to understand preservice science teachers' reflections on and tensions during a macroteaching experience. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 9, 675–697.

Shim, S. Y., & Kim, H. B. (2018). Framing negotiation: Dynamics of epistemological and positional framing in small groups during scientific modelling. *Science Education*, 102, 128–152.

Shulman, L. (2011). Feature essays: The scholarship of teaching and learning: A personal account and reflection, *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 5(1), Article 30.

Slade, M. L., Burnham, T. J., Catalana, S. M., & Waters, T. (2019). The impact of reflective practice on teacher candidates' learning. *IJ-SoTL*, 13(2), Article 15.

Stigmar, M. (2016). Peer-to-peer teaching in higher education: A critical literature review. *Journal of Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 24(2), 124–136.

Tomas, L., Evans, N., Doyle. T., & Skamp, E. (2019). Are first year students ready for a flipped classroom?: A case for a flipped learning continuum. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(5), 1–22.

Tsang, K. K., & Jiang, L. (2018). Positive emotional experiences in teaching, teacher identity, and student behaviours. *Schools: Studies in Education*, 15(2), 228–248.

Ukpokodu, O. N. (2009) Pedagogies that foster transformative learning in a multicultural education course: a reflection. *Journal of Praxis in Multicultural Education*, 4(1), Article 4.

Urbani, J. M., Roshandel, S., Michaels, R., & Truesdell, E. (2017). Developing and modeling 21st century skills with pre-service teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 44(4), 27–50.

Van Wyk, M. M. (2017). An e-portfolio as an empowering tool to enhance student self-directed learning in a teacher education course: A case of a South African university. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 31(3), 274–291.

Von Esch, K. S. (2018). Teacher leaders as agents of change. *The Elementary School Journal*, 119(1), 152–178.

Watson, C. (2014). Effective professional learning communities? The possibilities of teachers as agents of change in schools. *British Educational Research Journal*, 40(1), 18–29.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wilcox, K. C., & Lawson, H. A. (2018). Teachers' agency, efficacy, engagement, and emotional resilience during policy innovation implementation. *Journal of Educational Change*, 19(2), 181–204.

Wise, A. (2006). *Preface*. In H. Sockett (Ed.), *Teacher dispositions: Building a teacher education framework of moral standards* (p. 3). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Xiao, J. (2014). Learner agency in language learning; The story of a distance learner of EFL in China. *Distance Education*, 35(1), 4–17.

Xiong, Z. (2016). The impact of teacher education on in-service English teachers' beliefs about self. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(3), 519–526.

Zeichner, K. M. (2009). *Teacher education and the struggle for social justice*. Oxfordshire, UK: Routledge.

Zur, A., & Ravid, R. (2018). Designing the ideal school as a transformative process: An approach to promoting teacher identity in pre-service teachers. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23(1), 120–136.

8 Literacy sponsorship, language ideologies, and identity construction of EFL learners and users

Yanty Wirza

Introduction

Literacy practice is understood to be ideologically driven and is contextually situated (e.g. Gee, 1990; Street, 2001; Street & Leung, 2010). Unlike the autonomous model of literacy (Street, 1984), which posits that literacy independently affects cognitive and social practices, the ideological model provides culturally sensitive views of literacy that take into account the various elements in society working in a complex, interdependent network of influences. In any given context, educational and policy decisions regarding literacy practice involve judgments, either discreet or explicit, on the kind of literacy that is adopted. To understand this, we need to look at complex literacy practice as it is culturally organized, ideologically grounded, and historically contingent (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994).

It is important to note that literacies are multiple in their kinds and levels and that they are competing in terms of what and how one form is privileged over the others. A major but often overlooked part of literacy practice is literacy sponsorship (Brandt, 2001). Despite its importance, not much research has been conducted to investigate how literacy sponsorship and campaign impact literacy events and practice. In fact, literacy sponsorship significantly influences many levels and aspects of literacy, much of which could be hidden from public discourse. It is literacy sponsors who have interests in educational and policy decisions and judgments regarding which literacy to impart and why (Street, 2001). Thus, many decisions and the processes involved that advance literacies rest on the sponsors of the literacy whose language ideology is worthy of further scrutiny. Wodak (1989) rightly argues that language is only powerful in the hands who have power, and the sponsorship of literacy practices would naturally involve a play of power. In multilingual contexts, the issues of which literacies are promoted can be seen through the language policy and planning of the governing bodies which have the power and the means to set the regulations that influence literacy practices.

English as a global language (Crystal, 2003) and its literacy practice have been one of the contested areas in the contemporary world where the recognition of global status and influence is undeniable; however, at the same time, its relation to other languages used in communities often results in precarious situations. In the

context of English language teaching and learning in periphery regions where English serves as a foreign language (EFL), such as multicultural Indonesia, a deeper investigation to examine how literacy sponsorship influences policies in promoting and advancing EFL literacy practices in schools and in society is needed. In an Indonesian EFL context, one of the discussions to be engaged in concerns the implementation of literacy sponsorship of English in multilingual and multicultural Indonesia. With a strong national language, *Bahasa Indonesia*, and around 600 ethnic languages, the ubiquitous presence of English needs to be looked at in terms of how multiple literacy sponsors perceive English as serving their needs and aspirations. The government, as the most powerful literacy sponsor in the Indonesian EFL context, has the most influential impact on the success of EFL literacy programs in Indonesia. Having political status as a foreign language (Lauder, 2008), English use has already limited function, as it is not the language of the wider community. In this situation, it can be argued that the role of EFL literacy sponsorship is crucial to ensure that English learners have maximum exposure and receive effective instruction in order to become competent English users. However, given that the state has the authoritative means to impose regulations and programs influenced by certain language ideology regarding the values of English in society, the literacy practices in an Indonesian context are heavily shaped by a discourse that tends to perpetuate negative associations, as Western constructs and values are not in harmony with those of Indonesia (Lauder, 2008). This study attempts to look at literacy sponsorship in the Indonesian EFL context. The aforementioned issues have motivated this study to examine how literacy sponsorships shape EFL literacy practices in Indonesia and what their impact is on the EFL literacy experiences of individuals in constructing their EFL identity as learners and users.

Literacy sponsorship

As literacy is acknowledged more than ever before, it has gained a place at the center stage of our civilization. The ability to read (i.e. to decode and extract meaning from texts) and write (i.e. to articulate one's thoughts through some media) has been defined as a basic survival skill in this era. It is not an exaggeration to say that literacy is the cornerstone of our civilization that enables other kinds of learning. In the complex endeavor of literacy learning and practice in society, an inquiry to ponder is what and who is behind literacy practice. This is where Deborah Brandt's work on literacy sponsorship matters. The term "sponsor" is generally associated with business and commercial activities where an entity endorses an event, activity, or a person to represent a brand. In a similar meaning, Brandt's (2001; 2007) literacy sponsorship uses a metaphor to explain what and who is behind certain literacy practice. In a more critical understanding, literacy sponsorship is useful in looking at how sponsors endorse and the extent to which the endorsement is granted or limited. Studying ordinary Americans who recalled their experiences on learning how to read and write, Brandt (2001) argues that literacy development depends on literacy sponsors. She describes literacy sponsors

as "any agents, local or distant, concrete or abstract, who enable, support, teach, and model, as well as recruit, regulate, suppress, or withhold, literacy—and gain advantage by it in some way" (p. 19). With this definition, it can be seen that the sponsors of literacy learning and practice can be any entity, be it an individual, family, organization, state, and so on that can empower or limit access to literacy. The various literacy sponsors working at every level of society suggest the importance of scrutinizing literacy sponsorship within larger sociopolitical and economic contexts. As literacy is now valued as a key commodity that is central to the upward mobility of individuals and societies, it is natural that people feel the need to secure literacy for themselves and their children.

In Brandt's definition of literacy sponsorship, it is clear that she is aware that literacy sponsorship does not only include those who support, teach, and model literacy, but also those who *regulate, suppress,* and *withhold* literacy. As such, according to Brandt's critical notion of literacy sponsorship, we need to evaluate whether literacy sponsors in their roles work to promote and expand literacy or attempt to limit and suppress access and opportunities for literacy learning. As part of the idea of an ideological model of literacy, literacy sponsors also deliver an ideological charge to advance their causes. Sponsors can be explicit or implicit about it; they can be creative, innovative, and progressive, but they can also be limiting, reserved, and secretive. All sponsors have a certain perspective and ideology that dictates what they would do and how much they would invest to harness the literacy manifested in their sponsorship. In the postmodern world we are living in now, it is imperative to acknowledge that, as individuals who pursue enhancement in literacy, literacy sponsors are in need of individuals who pursue and work on it. However, when it comes to the systematic endeavors of the work of literacy sponsorship that limit and impact the larger part of a community's access literacy, the sponsors put up barriers to the participatory culture that fosters the expressions and civic engagement of individuals in the society (Jenkins, H., 2006). Obviously, the consequences of larger entities' acts of literacy sponsorship are more significant than those of individuals.

That said, issues of access in literacy sponsorship can be highly problematic. Through the means available, the sponsors set the terms for access to literacy and employ powerful incentives for compliance and loyalty. It is intriguing when literacy sponsorship is taken as a common place practice, such as in the case of government sponsorship of various literacy programs and activities, as it might be challenging to inspect the sponsor's intentions and ideologies. It is easier to assume that the government works for the best interest of its people in advancing their literacy level and in turn propelling the advancement of the nation. As such, literacy sponsorship mostly portrays positive endeavors which could be propagandistic in nature. In a situation where literacies serve to advance the government agenda, as it has the authority to determine literacy access and resources, the government may have a vested interest in forming discourses about and around literacy and in restricting access and resources that limit individuals' participation. In other words, people can be oblivious to the ideologies behind the literacy sponsorship campaigns of a vast entity such as a government or a large institution. Thus, literacy practice and literacy sponsorship cannot be separated; the focus on literacy sponsorship can "force a more explicit and

substantive link between literacy learning and systems of opportunity and access" (Brandt, 2007, p. 18). This is even more important as opportunity and access to literacy are often unequally distributed.

English and globalization

The unparalleled spread of English to every corner of the globe has created tensional relations between English and the society where it is taught and used. According to Crystal (2003), the reasons why a language becomes a global language have little to do with its intrinsic structural properties, the size of its vocabulary, its association with great culture or religion, or the number of its speakers, as many would assume; rather, it has to do with who the speakers are. English-speaking countries have been in control of many parts of the world during the colonial era and they continued their immense influence as the main player in economic dominance, culture, and the advancement of technology. In other words, although the colonial roots that assisted the spread undeniably left tremendously significant and oftentimes unpleasant traces, these are not the sole factor of English's truly international and global status (Crystal, 2003). The ubiquitous use of English in fields such as commerce, business, education, and technology has significantly boosted its spread. In fact, the hegemonic power of English has shifted from colonial power to soft power through economic and cultural influences. From the perspective of literacy sponsorship, the hegemonic soft power that English has to offer has become its fundamental value.

As such, in places where there was little influence of colonial heritage such as in the Kachruvian outer circle countries like Indonesia, Japan, China, Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia, English has penetrated much of the population's socioeconomic aspects. In this regard, English presents a paradox: It is oppressive but at the same time liberatory (Canagarajah, 2000; Phillipson, 1992; 2009). An understanding English's hegemonic power as linguistic imperialism argues against the extensive spread of English especially at the expense of losing local vernacular languages. On the other hand, as proposed by Crystal (2003), English presents us with unprecedented ideas for mutual global understanding. As an international language, and as the ownership of English has become de-nationalized from English speaking countries, learners and users of English have the opportunity to promote their local cultures and learn from other cultures (McKay, 2002; 2010). Moreover, as a construct which has challenged the ultimate target of learning English, and in a framework known as lingua franca English, nativespeakerism has influenced local languages in interactions involving those whose first language is not English (e.g. Canagarajah, 2007; Firth, 1996; Kirkpatrick, 2006; 2010; 2011; Jenkins, J., 2006; 2009; Seidlhofer, 2001; 2004)

EFL in Indonesia: Language planning and policy

English in Indonesia serves a foreign language where it is taught and learned as a mandatory subject (Alwasilah, 2013; Lauder, 2008) from the 7th to 12th grades

for four to six instructional hours. English curricula are centralized and have gone through several changes (Alwasilah, 2013; Lie, 2007). In 2013, the government campaigned against the teaching of English in elementary school and reduced the instructional hours (Lie, 2017). In Lie's review, she argues that the reduction has triggered complaints from teachers who felt that the limited teaching hours were insufficient for teaching and learning activities. English's status as a foreign language bears in mind the fact that the main contact and exposure students have is in the classroom.

However, ELT in Indonesia has been facing fundamental problems. One of the main problems is the low proficiency of English teachers. Hamied (2003) reported that only about half of English teachers are qualified to teach English and that they use mainly Indonesian in English lessons (Pasaribu, 2001). Another major problem is that the lessons are typically teacher-centered with a banking-style approach (Larson, 2014). Bire (2010) was concerned that there is a mismatch between the objectives of English lessons, the contents taught, the methodology employed, and the evaluation in ELT in Indonesia. Moreover, the vast geographical context of Indonesia, and its socioeconomic status disparities, also propose tremendous challenges in terms of setting ELT standards. Take for example the use of ELT textbooks. Public schools typically use government-published textbooks whose quality for instruction has been reported to be unsatisfactory (Alwasilah 2013; Collins, 2006). Studies by Musthafa (2001) and Suherdi (2012) reported on the rituals of English lessons commonly found in Indonesia; teachers would only use English to greet students at the beginning of a lesson, to say goodbye at the end of it, and to read instructions, passages, or dialogues, and to give recall-type questions from a textbook. As such, Renandya (2018) recently called for an urgent re-evaluation of teacher standards in teaching English.

In the political realm, English sits rather uncomfortably among the national and some 600 hundred vernacular languages. The success story of the Indonesian government abiding by the national language, *Bahasa Indonesia,* has been applauded. Goebel (2010) maintained that Indonesians with diverse linguistic backgrounds find a sense of "togetherness in difference" (p. 197) in the shared ability in communication using *Bahasa Indonesia*. The Youth Pledge, "one nation, one language, one people", is widely invoked like a mantra (Emmerson, 2005) when it comes to using *Bahasa Indonesia* as a unifying force. In this context, the Indonesian government is aware that English is necessary for global participation, but it does not let the penetration go too deeply without state control (Alwasilah, 1997 as cited in Lauder, 2008). Thus, according to Sadtono (1997 as cited in Musthafa, 2001) English's status would never be elevated to the language of wider communication as a national or second language.

Research methodology

This study employed narrative inquiry as a methodology for studying lived experiences (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007). Narrative inquiry serves as a mode of knowing and learning about human experiences with a

high level of complexity: Temporality, generic particularity, interpretability, implied canonicity, negotiability, ambiguous reference, and historical extension (Bruner, 1986). This is part of a larger study and three participants' narratives are reported here. They were doctoral candidates from three reputable universities in Indonesia. Two of the participants majored in English Language Education and one in Sports Education.

The study used in-depth interviews to capture the participants' experience in past and present times in relation to English. The study also examined documents pertaining to ELT as a literacy practice in an Indonesian context such as policy documents and textbooks. Thematic analysis (Riessman, 2003; Squire, 2008) which focused on the content of the text was used in the data analysis.

Findings and discussion

The study's focus on ELT sponsorship in an Indonesian context found that there are multiple sponsors, sponsorships, and campaigns working in dynamic interaction that involve power, language ideology, access to opportunities, and resources. The most prominent are the force of English as a global language, the Indonesian government, and the self. Other sponsors, like families and society, tend to be inconsistent and secondary.

The hegemony of English as a global language, as the most significant sponsor in the lives of the participants, should not come as a surprise. The power and influence of English has undoubtedly continued to spread and has maintained its influence through various means of sponsorships and campaigns. It is worth mentioning the status of English as a global and international language that is certified and validated by global institutions such as the United Nations and in the regional context, by organizations such as ASEAN (Association of South East Asian Nations), in which all of the members are multilingual countries. ASEAN's Charter was ratified in 2008 and signed by all the heads of state of its members. It is stated in Article 34 of the ASEAN Charter that "The working language of ASEAN shall be English" (Association of Southeast Asian Nations, 2008, p. 29). This indicates that the organization perceives English as being instrumental to achieving its purposes and principles, which are: To maintain and enhance peace; to enhance regional resilience by promoting political security, economic, and sociocultural cooperation; to alleviate poverty and narrow the development gap; to strengthen democracy; to develop human resources and lifelong learning in education and science and technology; and to promote ASEAN identity through the fostering of a greater awareness of the diverse culture and heritage of the region.

This further shows the privileged position of English in organizations where English is not the dominant language of the nation's people. However, it is undeniable that English has been playing significant roles in the region. Status-wise, English bears the status of a second language in Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines, but for other nations (Brunei, Indonesia, Myanmar, Laos, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand) English is classified as a foreign language. In his review, Kirkpatrick (2012) discussed how the previously Francophone-language nations of

Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam moved toward major changes and investment in adopting English as the primary foreign language. The arguments for adopting English as the ASEAN working language, Kirkpatrick notes, have been centered around English's status as a global language, its association with modernity, and its use in technology and knowledge dissemination. Through the lens of literacy sponsorship, it can be seen that the regional and international forces of English are powerful since the majority, if not all, of the affairs are conducted in English.

Another reason for the powerful sponsorship of and campaigning for English is the industry support for the teaching of English as a second and foreign language in ASEAN countries and, by extension, the world. English has become a commodity for many industries and for-profit institutions that provide curriculum consultation, training, textbooks, and evaluation. Big industries, such as British Council and the English Testing Service (ETS) as well as many others, have relied on earnings from English-related services. According to their website (British Council, 2019), about 85 percent of the British Council's turnover is earned from teaching, examinations, tendered contracts, and partnerships. Similarly, ETS obtains about half of its revenues from higher education testing services (Strauss, 2015) These giant industries and many others continue to sponsor and campaign for English use and perpetuate the privilege of English in many parts of the world.

Looking at how English is promoted by sponsorships and campaigns around the world, it is hard to dismiss its impact on societies, institutions, and individuals. Largely due to the massive sponsorships and campaigns, English has obtained even greater access in order to maintain its global status. English is now introduced at an early age and included in the formal curriculum for primary education. Taking ASEAN countries as an example, all except Indonesia (which introduces English at the secondary level), officially introduce English in primary education (Kirkpatrick, 2012). Regarding this, the Indonesian government has persistently tried to diminish the influence of English in the nation. Arguing for strengthening and maintaining national unity, English has been discouraged from being taught at the primary level of education. It is important to note that while English is not included in the primary school curriculum in Indonesia, many schools, especially private schools and those located in cities, have been teaching English for many years. Apparently, this has caused concerns that English could erode national and local languages, and it has been cited as a threat to Indonesian identity (Alwasilah, 2013; Lauder, 2008). Around 2012, there was an intense discourse regarding the abolishment of English from primary education. As reported by Lotbiniere (2012) in the *Guardian*, citing official personnel from the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture, primary schools should not teach English to young Indonesian students in order to reverse the falling standards in *Bahasa Indonesia*. Official personnel also mentioned the arguments against the teaching of English in primary education, the inclusion of religion as a subject, and preservation of Indonesian cultures. This government campaign against the teaching of English at the primary level in Indonesia was met with backlash from parents who wished to promote early literacy in English for their children and who demanded that

English should be maintained in schools (Zein, 2017). Another problem was the fate of many English teachers who were concerned with their employment status.

At the secondary level, in 2013, the Indonesian government also reduced instructional hours (Lie, 2017). Similar arguments were put on the table: Indonesian children need to have strong values and a sense of identity and English is perceived to pose a threat to national cultural values and identity (Alwasilah, 2013; Lauder, 2008). Whereas it is plausible that a great nation tries to preserve and maintain its national cultures, it is a misplaced argument that English is entirely responsible for these problems. A government should analyze the problems and challenges facing the nation with more critical and informed arguments and assessment. The ELT literacy sponsorship and campaign in Indonesia have demonstrated the love–hate relationship with English (Lauder, 2008) whereby it is admitted that English is needed for the advancement of the nation but there is suspicion of English's influence on people and society. That said, Indonesia can be seen as one of the countries where "nationalism or 'national state ideology' has become more prominent in which language policy and planning can impose exclusionary practices on schools" (Wright, 2016 p. 247). However, as Lie (2007; 2017) and Renandya (2018) have argued, Indonesian education could benefit from having stronger English teachers, learners, and users spearheading its development and global participation.

The present study found another prominent literary sponsor: The participants themselves. Through their narratives, the participants shared how English has shaped their lives after many years of studying English. Their testimonies are presented below.

"I feel that when we speak English, people would think that we are smart. I have been fortunate to go abroad 15 times. …. All of these were possible because of English" (Tina). Tina had been an English learner and user for more than 30 years. She experienced the first ELT curriculum in Indonesia in 1975. She is a language learning enthusiast, and in learning English, she focused on grammar and pronunciation. She spoke several local languages at a considerably functional level, such as the Minang language, Javanese, Bataknese, and Sundanese. Her Indonesian sounded Betawian because she had lived in Jakarta for many years. On some occasions spent with her, I heard her speaking a little Arabic and Japanese. Her testimony above demonstrates her perspective on the values of English. The perception that English is associated with intelligence and a high level of education was widely held in Indonesia and by extension many areas in the world where English is not the society's dominant language. This indicates the privilege of English and motivates many English learners and users like Tina to learn English.

Apart for being a lecturer at one private university in Jakarta, Tina was also an active member in a women's organization that advocated for women's rights to better education and careers and that promoted a healthy life balance for working women. She had assumed several important positions within this organization. With these roles, Tina was afforded opportunities to travel abroad for conferences and short courses. She felt that her English significantly contributed to providing the opportunities to go and interact with people of other nations.

Anto was a doctoral candidate from one district in Central Java. In his early years of learning English, Anto faced many challenges due to lack of exposure and support. However, he persisted in learning English and majored in English language education in one of the universities in the capital of the province where he lived. His family members initially frowned upon his decision to pursue a doctoral degree in English education because English was considered to be the language of the West, whose values are not compatible with their local and religious values. However, Anto continued to pursue his doctorate, which is highly regarded in the community. About this he said: "When I finish my doctoral program, I would be the first in my village to hold this degree. There is actually another guy, but he moved and teaches somewhere else, so that didn't count (laugh)" (Anto).

In many Indonesian communities, having a post-graduate degree is an immensely prestigious achievement. As a nation working toward improving its higher education, Indonesia is struggling to produce more lecturers with doctoral qualifications to teach in universities. In Anto's case (coming from a small village in Central Java), having the chance to pursue a doctoral degree in English language education shows a great recognition of his achievement.

Rina was a lecturer and trainer in a sports education study program at one university in Central Java. In her middle school years, Rina did not have any interest in learning English at all because she felt that the lessons failed to motivate and engage her. Her interest in sports developed during her high school education, where her sport teacher spotted her ability and potential in sports. Currently she is focused on being a lecturer and a referee in Wushu. She also held a position in the Wushu organization under the Ministry of Youth and Sports in Indonesia which holds regular tournaments and competitions at the local and national levels.

Despite having no initial interest and minimum exposure to learning English, Rina had come to the realization that she needed English to advance her career on the regional and national stage. Recently, in her career as a Wushu referee, Rina travelled to many countries in Asia for conferences and tournaments. She claimed that she had limited English, but she was determined that this would not stop her participating in international events. Moreover, she had to pay for her papers to be translated to English to be presented at international conferences.

> For me, my increase in knowledge and experience would also benefit my students. Last year I went to a conference in Thailand and it was in English. The keynote speaker was [an expert's name] whose theories and works were quoted heavily in the sports textbooks. I read his books ten years ago in Indonesian translation, and it was really a privilege to see and talk to him. I took pictures with him and showed them to my students. That's so cool (laugh).
>
> (Rina)

The excerpt above talks about Rina's then recent conference on sports education held in Thailand for which English was the language of the conference. For Rina, it is important to attend international conferences regularly to stay updated

about current research, teaching, and new perspectives in sports education. Like she mentioned above, the conferences had great positive impacts on her and her students, as she shared what she had learned with them. Rina's students' admiration of her having an opportunity to hear an expert talk and take pictures with them shows how such an experience is highly regarded and cherished in periphery countries like Indonesia. In Rina's many years of experience as a lecturer in sports education, it is uncommon to have lecturers who are fluent in English and who have published their work in English. Therefore, she realized that she needed to keep learning English as a means to penetrate regional and international networks and audiences for her work.

The glimpses of participants' experiences with English seen above have demonstrated that they themselves are EFL literacy sponsors. As individuals, they have struggled, persisted, and strived to find access to English for their education, career, and personal fulfilment in contexts where society and government institutions lack a supporting system and mechanisms to ensure a better learning environment. Nonetheless, these participants have shown great agency and investment (Darvin & Norton, 2015a; 2015b; Norton, P., 1995; Norton, B., 2000; 2013) by taking initiative and action despite the odds of learning and using English in a periphery context (Kachru, 1992; Lauder, 2008) like Indonesia. As experts have reckoned, learning and using English as a foreign language presents immense challenges and not many are able to penetrate the imagined community (Anderson, 2006) of English networks in larger contexts. Pennycook (1998) observed that English has produced "images of the Self and Other,…from the native speaker/non-native speaker dichotomy to the images constructed around English as a global language and the assumptions about learners' cultures" (p. 19). Nonetheless, Norton, B. (2000) stated that learners are often conscious that through their efforts and investment they "will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources which will, in turn, increase the value of the cultural capital" (p. 8). Furthermore, Alwasilah (2000) argued that Indonesians who master English tend to be more respected than those who do not and that the latter group does not obtain as many privileges.

The participants' experiences being the literacy sponsor for their English learning had a tremendous impact on their EFL identity construction. Through many years of learning in the educational system, which is a less than ideal environment in which to learn English and where the participants generally held negative associations with English, a shift to a positive identity as EFL learners and users happened (Wirza, 2018). In this light, though we understand identity to be multiple, fluid, and fragile (Norton, B., 2000; 2013; Darvin & Norton, 2015a; 2015b), the participants often found themselves in a constant struggle for legitimate peripheral participation (Wenger, 1998; 2010). Nonetheless, enacting and negotiating multiple identities in an increasingly globalized and digitized world is inevitable (Darvin & Norton, 2016). Moreover, since we are breaking away from English nativespeakerism, the ownership of English has been relocated (McKay, 2012) to periphery contexts where more varieties of English are utilized. English now belongs to whoever speaks it. Therefore, more learners should become

empowered to be competent English users to promote local cultures (Canagarajah, 2000; 2007).

Conclusions and recommendations

This study looked at the multiple sponsorships that occurred in dialectic tensions between the powerful force of English as a global language, the inconsistent policies of the Indonesian government driven by language ideology that perceived English as a threat to the national identity of its citizens, and the limited access and means available to the participants who aspired to have fuller access and opportunities with a positive and solid EFL identity. According to Wright (2016), Indonesia is also a country where tensions are "rising within multi ethnic states between the centripetal efforts of the nation building center and the centrifugal pressure of globalization" (p. 98). In its language policy and planning, the country has consciously positioned Indonesian and local languages over English, in the spirit of maintaining "national and cultural identity and appeals to the authentic spirit and character of a people" (Block, 2008, p. 34). However, in the globalized world that we find ourselves in, where people and ideas are even more connected and blended, Indonesia cannot afford to miss the train because they lack means such as English, which is needed to work and participate in the global society. Today, it is a fact that English in Asia is a lingua franca, and in ASEAN, of which Indonesia is one of the founding nations, English assumes the official status as the sole working language with the signing of the ASEAN Charter (Kirkpatrick, 2010). In addition, at the recently held Asia TEFL conference in Bangkok in June 2019, in his keynote speech, Andy Kirkpatrick reiterated that English is not a language in Asia, it is an Asian language.

The study proposes some recommendations. Given that, as a great country, Indonesia needs to increase its involvement and participation in global affairs, it is advised that the Indonesian government improves access to English and rethinks the discourse that English is a threat to our national values. The study calls for improvements in ELT in Indonesia on "…many variables. Mixed in are the teachers, student motivation, textbooks, bureaucrats' attitudes, and government policy" (Alwasilah, 2001). As argued by Lie (2007), we need to counterbalance the power of policymakers in ensuring up-to-date, balanced, pedagogically sound education policies and an EFL curriculum. And more recently, as identities are in nature multiple and hybrid, Lie (2017) argued that English could be a part of Indonesian multicultural identities and should be seen as an opportunity for greater global participation. Therefore, it is time that we embrace English as a part of Indonesian identities and make it a part of nation building efforts.

References

Alwasilah, A. C. (2000). *Perspektif pendidikan bahasa inggris di Indonesia: Dalam konteks persaingan global*. Bandung, Indonesia: Andira.

Alwasilah, A. C. (2001). *Language, culture, and education: A portrait of contemporary Indonesia*. Bandung, Indonesia: Andira.

Alwasilah, C. (2013). Policy on foreign language education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Education*, 7(1), 1–19.

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). (2019). *The ASEAN charter*. Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat. Retrieved from https://asean.org/storage/2012/05/The-ASEAN-Charter-26th-Reprint.pdf

Bire, J. (2010). Mismatch English education in Indonesia. *Linguistika*, 17, 271–290.

Block, D. (2008). Language education and globalization. In N. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 31–43). New York, NY: Springer.

Brandt, D. (2001). *Literacy in American lives*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Brandt, D. (2007). Narrating literacy. In S. Carter (Ed.), *Literacy in context* (p. 11–37). Southlake, TX: Fountainhead Press.

British Council. (2019, August 13). Finance. *British Council*. Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.org/about-us/how-we-work/finance

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2000). Negotiating ideologies through English: Strategies from the periphery. In T. Ricento (Ed.), Ideologies, politics and language policies: Focus on English (pp. 121–132). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2007). Lingua Franca English: Multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 923–939.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Clandinin, D. J., & Rosiek, J. (2007). Mapping the landscape of narrative inquiry: Borderlands spaces and tensions. In D. J. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp. 35–76). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Collins, P. (2006). Grammar in TEFL: A critique of Indonesian high school textbooks. *TEFLIN Journal*, 17, 1–10.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015a). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 36–56.

Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015b). Language, identity, and investment in the twenty-first century. In T. L. McCarty & S. May (Eds.), *Language policy and political issues in education* (pp. 1–15). Berlin: Springer.

Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2016). Investment and language learning in the 21st century. *Langage et société*, 3, 19–38.

Emmerson, D. (2005). What is Indonesia? In J. Bresnan (Ed.), *Indonesia: The great tradition* (pp. 7–74). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publisher.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 237–259.

Gee, J. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.

Goebel, Z. (2010). *Language, migration and identity: Neighbourhood talk in Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hamied, F. A. (2003). Kebijakan pengajaran bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing di Indonesia. In A. C. Alwasilah & H. Abdullah (Eds.), *Revitalisasi Pendidikan Bahasa* (pp. 11–30). Bandung, Indonesia: Andira.

Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 157–181.

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28, 200–207.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching*, 25, 1–14.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2006). Which model of English: Native-speaker, nativized or lingua franca? In R. Rubdy & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 71–83). London: Continuum.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). Researching English as a lingua franca in Asia: The Asian corpus of English (ACE) project. *Asian Englishes*, 13, 4–18.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). English as an Asian lingua franca and the multilingual model of ELT. *Language Teaching*, 44(2), 212–224.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English as an Asian lingua franca: The 'lingua franca approach' and implications for language education policy. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1, 121–139.

Larson, K. R. (2014). Critical pedagogy(ies) for ELT in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal*, 25(1), 122–138.

Lauder, A. (2008). The status and function of English in Indonesia: A review of key factors. *Makara, Sosial Humaniora*, 12, 9–20.

Lie, A. (2007). Education policy and EFL curriculum in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal*, 18(1), 1–14.

Lie, A. (2017). English and identity in multicultural contexts: Issues, challenges, and opportunities. *Journal TEFLIN*, 25, 71–92.

Lotbiniere, M. (2012, November 13). Indonesia to end teaching of English in primary school. *The Guardian*, Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/education/2012/nov/13/elt-diary-november-indonesia-english

McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McKay, S. L (2010). English as an international language: Where we are and where we need to go. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 5, 27–54.

McKay, S. L. (2012). Principles of teaching English as an international language. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay, G. Hu, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 28–46). New York, NY: Routledge.

Musthafa, B. (2001). Communicative language leaching in Indonesia: Issues of theoretical assumptions and challenges in the classroom practice. *TEFLIN Journal*, 12, 184–193.

Norton, P. B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 9–31.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change*. London: Pearson.

Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Pasaribu, B. (2001). The use of Bahasa Indonesia in the ELT classroom. *TEFLIN Journal*, 12, 142–148.

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

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

Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Renandya, W. A. (2018). *What kind of English proficiency is needed for effective teaching?* Indonesian TESOL Summit, Century Park Hotel, Jakarta.

Riessman, C. K. (2003). Narrative analysis. In M. S. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman, & T. Futing Liao (Eds.), *The Sage encyclopedia of social science research methods* (pp. 1–8). London: Sage.

Sadtono, E. (1997). *The development of TEFL in Indonesia*. Malang, Indonesia: The English Department of IKIP Malang.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 1, 133–158.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209–239.

Squire, C. (2008). Experience-centered and culturally oriented approaches to narrative. In M. Andrews, C. Squire, & M. Tamboukou (Eds.), *Doing narrative research* (pp. 41–63). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, V. (2015, September 30). How much do education non-profits pay their bosses? Quite a bit, it turns out. *The Washington Post*, Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2015/09/30/how-much-do-big-education-nonprofits-pay-their-bosses-quite-a-bit-it-turns-out/?noredirect=on

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. (2001). Introduction. In B. V. Street (Ed.), *Literacy and development: Ethnographic perspectives* (pp. 1–18). London: Routledge.

Street, B., & Leung, C. (2010). Sociolinguistics, language teaching and new literacy studies. In N. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 290–316). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Suherdi, D. (2012). The use of quality pedagogic language in the teaching of English in Indonesian setting. *International Journal for Educational Studies*, 4, 111–124.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E. (2010). Communities of practice and social learning systems: The career of a concept. In C. Blackmore (Ed.), *Social learning systems and communities of practice* (pp. 179–198). London: Springer.

Wirza, Y. (2018). A narrative case study of Indonesian EFL learners' identities. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8, 473–481.

Wodak, R. (Ed.). (1989). *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23(1), 55–82.

Wright, S. (2016). *Language policy and language planning: From nationalism to globalisation*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Zein, M. S. (2017). Elementary English education in Indonesia: Policy developments, current practices, and future prospects: How has Indonesia coped with the demand for teaching English in schools? *English Today*, 33(1), 53–59.

9 The role of mediation in classroom interaction

Le Pham Hoai Huong

Development of the mediation concept

Vygotsky (1896–1934) and his collaborators in Russia are considered to have developed sociocultural theory in the 1920s and 1930s. The theory has been used in interdisciplinary subjects including psychology, Second Language Acquisition (SLA), and English Language Teaching (ELT). Earlier works by Vygotsky (e.g. Vygotsky, 1978) indicate that he followed Karl Marx's historical materialism by focusing on human societies and their development through history, which are the result of material conditions rather than ideas. More specifically, Vygotsky borrowed the concept of tools from Hegel and Marx to refer to the development of human society:

> Marx cites that definition when speaking of working tools, to show that man uses the mechanical, physical, and chemical properties of objects so as to make them act as forces that affect other objects in order to fulfill his personal goals. (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 54)

Vygotsky conceptualized cognitive development as the transformation of socially shared activities into internalized processes. Central to sociocultural theory is the concept of mediation, which Fernyhough (2008, p. 230) describes as "a situation where one entity plays an intermediary causal role in the relation between two other entities". In the more limited context of sociocultural theories of development, it can refer to the process whereby individuals' understanding is refracted through the experience of others.

Mediation in this sense indicates that the individual does not establish a direct relationship with society, but mediates through the use of tools (Nieto, 2007). "Mediation is the instrument of cognitive processes and cognitive change, both requisites for learning" (Tocalli-Beller, 2003, p. 146). Mediation acts as the facilitation of learning using semiotic tools (or cultural artifacts) (Martin-Beltrán, Guzman, & Chen, 2017).

To classify mediation, Kozulin (1998) proposed three kinds of mediators: Material tools, psychological tools, and other human beings. First, the material tools such as a tool, a book or, in this modern age, computers, have been made to

help humans master nature. Kozulin (1998, p. 62) claims, "They [material tools] presuppose collective use, interpersonal communication, and symbolic representation". In other words, the invention and use of material tools have transformed our way of thinking, which has different consequences for each individual.

The role of psychological tools is to mediate the psychological processes of humans. These tools are known as "symbolic tools" and some examples are numbers, arithmetic systems, music, art, and language (Lantolf, 2000). Symbolic tools can be called "higher intellectual processes" (Vygostsky, 1978) and are strictly human. Kozulin (1998) pointed out that these tools have been transformed along with the history of human beings. One example is primitive humans use of such psychological tools as casting lots, tying knots, and counting fingers to mediate between their mind and the abstract world, and modern societies have transformed and updated these tools through language, art, music, etc.

The third type of mediation is through another individual (Kozulin, 1998) and it can take different forms. Originally, Vygoskty (1978) provided an example to illustrate the concept of mediation via another. For example, a child wants to grasp an object which is beyond his reach. In trying to do so, he points at it in an attempt to establish a direct relationship with the object. His/her mother comes to aid him/her interpreting the pointing as indexing the desire to reach the object. In this moment, pointing becomes a sign for others. When the child realizes the change in the function of pointing, its orientation changes, too. From this moment on, the child will use the pointing to establish a relationship with others and not with the object. In this case, the mother has become the mediator who helps the child reach his/her goal through another mediation tool: Pointing. Mediation then is the way in which humans establish a relationship between their mental representations and the world. It is the mechanism through which external, sociocultural activities are transformed into internal, mental functioning. According to Kozulin (1990), mediation is the instrument of cognitive change.

The concept of mediation has been interpreted and applied in different fields such as psychology, education, and ELT. In the scope of this paper, the role of mediation in ELT in general, and in classroom interaction in particular, is discussed. According to the sociocultural theory of education, learning is social. When first theorizing the concept, Vygotsky placed much emphasis on children's development and learning. He emphasized the roles of adults and more capable peers in assisting the child to move in his/her Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) which he defined as follows: "The distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). In this sense, this premise of Vygotsky's theory has challenged the behaviorist approach that claimed that learning was a passive and individual activity (Lantolf & Appel, 1994). Instead, sociocultural theory emphasizes the role of interaction, or learning from interacting with others, through a meaningful exchange of ideas, concepts, and actions. This new dimension of sociocultural theory highlights the importance of classroom interactions between teachers and students and between students and

students. In relation to classroom learning, Tharp and Gallimore (1988) elaborated that initially unfocused learning actions may become adjusted and modified based on how the learning of the language is mediated. This mediation can occur through a textbook, visual material, classroom discourse, opportunities for second language interaction, types of direct instruction, or various kinds of teacher assistance.

Viewing language mediation as a "tool for collective thinking", Swain (2009) has offered the term "languaging". It is through languaging that teachers and students "articulate and transform their thinking into an artifactual form, which becomes a source of further reflection" (Swain & Deters, 2007, p. 821) for focus attention, problem solving, and creating social relationships. Recently, Martin-Beltrán (2014) and Wei (2011) have connected the concept of languaging with translanguaging. Translanguaging recognizes the "process of using language to gain knowledge, to make sense, to articulate one's thoughts and to communicate about using language" (Wei, 2011, p. 1224) given the fact that nowadays, classrooms usually have multiple linguistic resources available for bilingual and multilingual speakers. Martin-Beltrán, Guzman, and Chen (2017) define translanguaging as the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages. The notion evolves from the concept of languaging and focuses more on examining the relationship between the participants' language practices and multidirectional and multilingual language learning.

In short, in sociocultural theory, individuals are mediated by cultural artifacts, social practices, and activities (Poehner, 2007). They are mediated when interacting with others in society. Even when they are working alone, their cognitive functioning is mediated by their history of interactions with the world (Vygotsky, 1986).

Interpretations of the mediation concept

As mentioned earlier, mediation is the central concept in sociocultural theory and it puts emphasis on interaction. To illustrate the transformative role of mediation, this section will discuss how interaction mediates the learning process in the classroom.

Language as a meditational tool

In sociocultural theory, language is a means by which one comes to know what one does not know, and the process of this is called mediation. In this sense, language serves as a mediating tool for thought. External social speech was internalized through mediation and language in this sense is a tool for mediated learning. Swain and Lapkin (2013, p. 105) suggest that language is not merely a means of communicating what is in one person's head to another person. Rather, language serves to construct the very idea that one is hoping to convey. In learning another/other language(s), learners are mediated not only by L1 but also L2 and even translanguaged.

Vygotsky's original study (1978) focused on the use of language in general and mainly referred to the use of the first language. The research by and large has expanded to both L1 and L2. In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes, it is admitted that L1 contributed linguistic meaning which leads to further ideas expressed in English. Findings from the study by Huong and McDonald (2004) indicate that L1 was able to mediate the process of speaking English in group work and that it facilitated cognitive processing. Furthermore, the process of working with English-speaking task procedure and planning was cognitively challenging and the use of L1 overcame cognitive difficulties.

The study by Dobao (2014, p. 508) reveals that, while working on the collaborative writing task, a group of students of same intermediate proficiency of Spanish, encountered a lexical problem and could only use their L1, English, to scaffold entry into Spanish:

1 PAT: um … cómo se dice take the train? (how do you say take the train?)
2 ALICE: andar en tren? (to walk by train?)
3 CHRIS: Toma (he takes)
4 PAT: Toma (he takes)
5 PAT: to:maron un … un tren (they took a train)The excerpt first started with Pat's use of L1. Alice's answer was modelled on the English phrase "take the train" with the noun correct. Chris changed the verb, but its form was not appropriate for describing the past event. Through interaction, the three students scaffolded each other by building on the noun and verb provided by their peers. Finally, Pat was able to generate the correct phrase, conjugate the verb, and demonstrate her understanding of the grammatical rules behind it.

The study by Huong and McDonald (2004) pointed out L1 h EFL university students in Vietnam in planning a task given in an English textbook. The students in the following excerpt had to decide where to take a vacation and what to do while on it. They were asked to talk about three cities, or countries, three restaurants, and three leisure activities. Each group was given a travel brochure to help with the task.

01 S1: What will we do?
02 S2: Tới Hà Lan được không? [How about visiting Holland?] Which country would you like to go on your vacation?
03 S1: On your holidays.
04 S3: Hỏi như vậy? [Should we ask like that?]. Hỏi cô thử! [Can we ask the teacher?] Mình không hiểu. [I don't understand.] Quyết định cùng nhau đi đâu và làm gì. [We have to decide together where we want to go and what activities to do] (Inaudible)
05 S2: Which country would you like to go?
06 S1: Đi Hà Lan. Chọn một thành phố. [Holland, choose a city.](5 seconds pause)

07 S4: Hỏi cô giải thích thêm. [Let's ask the teacher]. Mình nói chưa được đâu. [I don't think we can talk now] three cities, three countries, three activities and restaurants, three activities.

08 S3: Hỏi cô mình chọn được ba nước hay sao? [Ask the teacher if we can discuss three countries] Mình có thể chọn three đất nước được không? [Three countries ok?](10 seconds pause)

09 S2: Đi Trung Quốc [go to China.] 10 All China.

11 S2: Excuse me, should I choose three countries?

12 T: I want you to choose three and decide on one. For example, if you want to go to Ho Chi Minh city. You can have three cities if you want, but one is ok. You have to see things when you are there. You have one city if you want but three will be better. You do things together.

13 S4: Thảo luận ba nước để chọn một. [We have to choose one out of three.]

14 S2: Mình sẽ có ba cái nhưng mình sẽ chọn một để đi [We have three but we have to choose one.]

15 S4: Ba nơi mình thích nơi nào thì mình đi [Three places but we choose a place which we want to visit.] Mình sẽ nói mình thích đi một nơi nào đó [We will say that we like to go to a certain place.]

16 S3: Nói đi [Let's talk.]

17 S2: I think China is an interesting place to visit.In the above excerpt, the students used mainly Vietnamese as a chain of verbal interaction (S4-S2-S4-S3). However, the use of L1 helped them to work out together what they were supposed to do. It might be that the use of L1 made the conversation easier for the students; however, as indicated by the lines, it was to mediate the thinking process to start and carry out the task.

Mediation also takes place thanks to the use of the target language. The study by Hynninen (2011) on the practice of mediation in English as a lingua franca interaction found that mediation has three main functions. First, it facilitates understanding between participants because in the process of interaction, they seek alternative ways to convey the meaning of the same thing. In other words, intermediaries help participants to take part in the discussion. Second, mediation is a way to organize discourse, and thanks to it, teachers are able to manage interaction. Third, mediation plays the role of socializing to include evaluation of students' contributions.

Below is an example of mediation in the target language (Hynninen, 2011) In this excerpt, S7 has just given a presentation and S2 asks him a question.

1 S2: mister chairman one more question

2 T1: er to the topic

3 S2: yes

4 T1: yes please yeah [quickly]

5 S2: [er] i would like the sp- the speaker to er

6: (in) his own er suggestion how to deal with the constraints

7: (of these worms and er maize diseases)

8 T1: er
9 S7: excuse me [(xx)]
10 T1: [in what] sense
11 T2: (he asked) how to control the pests
12 S2: pest an
13 S7: how to control
14 T2: [yeah]
15 S2: [and] diseases
16 S7: mhm (e- w- with) (xx) mhm erm mono- monogrowth is very difficult to control the (the) (xx) and the insects because the growth of the insects increase exponentially but in if I think if there are a mixed er crops i- is better and the biological control is i think i- is possible
20 T2: and it's correctly er emphasized that this is a serious problem think of locusts if you locusts land on your maize field so nothing can be done actually there is absolutely nothing you can do(ne) millions billions of locusts land an on your field and then the striga the witch weed that you mention here is so bad in sub-saharan Africa (it) destroys crops or decreases the yields and it's almost impossible to get rid of it witch weed striga para- parasitic plant in maize field.It can be seen from the extract above that the questions and other ideas from S2 in the excerpt above provided S7 with hints and helped him to generate ideas to the discussion as shown in lines 16–19.

The study by DeNicolo (2010) focused on the role of mediation in Spanish and English and how they impacted students' participation in literature discussion groups. The study proved that there were forms of linguistic mediation in the discussion which triggered the students to take risks in using their language of lesser proficiency. When bilingual students negotiate in multiple languages and language forms, they demonstrate the depth of their communicative and linguistic knowledge. Besides, such group discussions promote participation of all students, and challenges the hegemony of English.

Mediational role of teachers

Regarding the role of teachers, Vygotsky (1962, p. 83) describes the process of teaching children scientific concepts:

> Direct teaching of concepts is impossible and fruitless. A teacher who tries to do this usually accomplishes nothing but empty verbalism, a parrot like repetition of words by the child, simulating a knowledge of the corresponding concepts but actually covering up a vacuum.

The role of a teacher is therefore not enough to generate learning; teachers need to implement strategies that help learners mediate between what they know (their actual zone of development) and what they would like to achieve (the ZPD) (Nieto, 2007). The process of teaching via mediation is stated as follows:

> The teacher is responsible for introducing the learner to new concepts and helping him/her walk through this new knowledge until the learners appropriates it. This is not new because teachers have been doing this for centuries. The contribution of the sociocultural theory to the field of education is making the role of the teacher much more interactive, dialogic, and visible.
>
> (Nieto, 2007, p. 219)

In regards to teacher talk, there can be seen some interchangeable perceptions between SLA and sociocultural theory. In SLA, the discourse used by teachers in classroom interaction includes questions (McCormick & Donato, 2000), functional recasts (Mohan & Beckett, 2003), negotiation of meaning requests (Gibbons, 2003), repetition, demonstrations, translation, and metalinguistic comments, and it emphasizes a solution that learners must complete (Guk & Kellog, 2007). However, the way to use these linguistic expressions is to facilitate the thinking process in learners and to promote linguistic development in learners. In sociocultural theory, such a process is a form of semiotic mediation.

Similarly, Cheng and Kia (2011) point out that mediation takes place when students learn to use language and make sense of the world through interaction with the teacher as a mediator. Therefore, the role of the teacher should not only provide students with knowledge about the language. Teachers should talk to students in a way that uses language as a tool for thought provocation, transforming the thinking process in learners as well as creating social relations among students by working in pairs/groups. Cheng and Kia (2011) propose mediating stimuli which include questions, instructions, models, artifacts, and affordances such as hints and vocabulary explanations.

The mediational role of the language teacher does not mean that there is additional work required of the teacher, but that the teacher takes on qualitatively different role. The teacher in the mediational role engages in a joint effort with learners, mainly through interaction, to advance the learners' development (Huong, 2003). In other words, the role of the teacher as a mediator in language teaching "is concerned with helping learners to become autonomous, to take control of their own learning, with the fundamental aim of enabling them to become independent thinkers and problem-solvers" (Williams & Burden, 1997).

In language classrooms, teacher mediation is believed to enable learners to appropriate language forms for communication and to transform communicative capacities and mental functioning as a result of a process of obtaining control over psychological tools such as language forms, patterns of language use, and meanings (Dao & Iwashita, 2018; Lantolf, 2012). Dao and Iwashita (2017) considered mediation to be various forms of assistance provided to help learners appropriate psychological tools such as language forms, patterns of language use, and meanings that are then used independently to regulate their mental activity during task performance (Lantolf, Thorne, & Poehner, 2015; van Compernolle, 2015). Teacher mediation is perceived to help learners develop a better understanding on the way to appropriation of language forms (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Additionally, teacher mediation not only supports learners to work towards task completion but

also scaffolds and responds to their needs in the interaction of "working collaboratively through tasks" (Poehner & van Compernolle, 2011, p. 191).

Focusing on the meditational roles of teacher, Bird (2018) studied how teacher talk impacts access to and support for learning academic genres for elementary writers. The study found that by using different pedagogical approaches, the teachers framed what it meant to write and showed students how to participate in the writing conference. The teacher created different norms for engagement in the classroom community. More specifically, one of the teachers in the study mediated students' learning through his explicit teacher discourse, the creation of a shared language, attunement to students' social and emotional development, and positioning students as writers. The other teacher, however, applied a more dialogic teacher discourse by the use of questioning. She elicited student understanding and used student responses as a guide for her instruction. By doing so, this teacher decentered her authority and positioned writing as a collaborative endeavor and students as authors. In other words, the mediation provides affordances for student learning. The results show that, thanks to their mediating engagement, teachers were able to position students as writers capable of engaging in complex writing tasks, and build relationships and create support among students who take up academic writing practices and identities.

In another study, Dao and Iwashita (2018) transcribed classroom talk to illustrate the task-related assistance from the teacher which mediated students' learning.

1 T: Here what more information could you get?
2 S1: When did you take a bath?
3 T: Yes well maybe with whom did you take a bath? Where did you take a bath?
4 S1: What time?
5 S2: What time?
6 T: Ok what time did you take a bath?
7 S3: How long did you [laughs]?
8 S2: How many times?

In this excerpt, the teacher elicited ideas (line 1), which led to the learner's initiation of a question (line 2). Then, the teacher modeled with example questions (line 3). According to Dao and Iwashita (2018), this task-related assistance facilitated learners to continue in the task because, as can be seen from the transcript, learners were able to generate many different questions subsequently (lines 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8).

In general, mediation by teachers takes the form of questions, stimuli, and hints to create joint efforts to advance students' learning.

Mediational role of peers

The concept of peer in Vygotsky's work initially appears in the ZPD, which is presented earlier in this chapter. It generally refers to "more capable peers"

(Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). Huong (2007) however argues that Vygotsky (1978) proposed the concept of ZPD but did not elaborate the concept of "peer". The author argues that the question how capable a peer should be needs addressing because in its original context, the notion of "peer" referred to schoolchildren. By and large, the concept of peer has been interpreted according to different contexts including peers as learners (van Lier, 2000); peers as more and less proficient learners (Ohta, 1995) and more and less informed junior students (McDonald, Kidman, & Clarke, 1991); and peers as native and non-native speakers in the classroom (Barnard, 2002; Olmedo, 2003). In recent years, the concept of peers continues to evolve, for examples, peers as children in of symmetrical learning mathematics (Fernández, Wegerif, Mercer, & Rojas-Drummond, 2015); peers as students (Haider & Yasmin, 2015); and peers as multilingual children (Martin-Beltrán, Daniel, Peercy, & Silverman, 2017) and students at different learning levels (Li & Gao, 2016).

Peer interaction is considered to be the mechanism by which novice learners become experts. For example, Cheon (2008) reviewed the effects of peers learning and pointed out that scaffolding in L2 learning or learners working together were able to reach a higher level of performance by providing assistance to one another (Donato, 1994; Swain & Lapkin, 1998; Ohta, 2000). Lantolf (2009) reported findings from a study with mediation in the talk of French speakers. An episode from the study as follows shows the value of effectively deployed mediation and that verbalization of the thinking process, such as self-reflection, is a powerful form of mediation because it helped learners to be able to decide themselves.

In the following episode, Donna (D) was not at first able to decide the appropriate verbal aspect to use ("passé composé or imparfait") to relate the fact that Sam is shocked at hearing the news of Rebecca's pregnancy. The students were talking about a movie, *Nine Months*.

1 D: … en traîn de compter dans un livre tout à coup elle a dit à Samuel ahin the process of counting in a book all of a sudden she said to Samuel
2: bon je suis enceinte et Samuel était très choqué a été choqué était choquéwell I am pregnant and Samuel was very shocked was shocked was shocked
3 M: which one?
4 D: (laughs) okay
5 M: était, a été?was, has been?
6 D: c'était un choque à lui cette nouvelle donc il était choqué et ça justeit was a shock to him this news so he was shocked and that just after
7 D: après ça—that
8 M: il était choqué—he was shocked
9 D: il était choqué à cause de cette nouvellehe was shocked because of this news
10 M: okay, using imparfait
11 D: using imparfait
12 M: because?
13 D: parce que il était choqué he was shocked he started to be shocked and because he was shocked continued to be shocked by this news but I think I

first chose passé composé to note that at a very distinct point he started to become shocked

14 M: so emphasizing that?

15 D: right so maybe what I want to say is il a il a été choquéhe was he was shocked

The transcript shows that initially Donna (D) was unable to decide whether to use the simple past or the present perfect tense. She received hints and prompts from the mediator (M) and then she was able to reach her conclusion.

In general, peers use explanations and examples, provide vocabulary, question or verbalize to mediate other peers in the learning process and to help other peers complete the task.

Mediational role of artifacts

Regarding artifacts, Vygotsky (1978, p. 127) wrote, "Like words, tools and non-verbal signs provide learners with ways to become more efficient in their adaptive and problem-solving efforts". It can be said that Vygotsky was interested mainly in language, but his category of signs and sign systems has been expanded and discussed as artifacts. Artifacts appear in different times and forms; however, nowadays, networks and technology extrapolate Vygotsky's concept of mediation and apply it to other types of tools created and upgraded constantly by human beings to suit their needs. Wertsch (1998, pp. 30–31) defines artifacts as:

> Physical objects that can be touched and manipulated. Furthermore, they can continue to exist across time and space, and they can continue to exist as physical objects even when not incorporated into the flow of action. These aspects of materiality are often associated with the term "artifacts" in the sense of historical artifacts that continue to exist after humans who used them have disappeared.

The concept of artifacts has been further interpreted. For example, McDonald, Huong, Higgins, and Podmore (2005) refer to artifacts as material texts, and artifacts are "physical objects which can be touched and manipulated" (Wertsch, 1998, p. 30). In other words, artifacts become tools and instruments with a purpose. In the classroom, they exist in the forms of textbooks, flip charts, or jigsaw puzzles. According to Dang and Marginson (2013), there is a change in the kind of artifacts in use. Recently, a study adopting sociocultural theory dwells on the use of technology in learning. The network is a mediating artifact with a symbolic face that shapes global social relations, creating new potentials for identity (Castells, 2000). When using social networks, people regulate their thoughts and interactions in the form of messages and digital contents, to software. Artifacts in this digital age therefore exist in the form of materials, books, and email, and computers, blogs, and websites can serve as mediating tools for interaction. However, according to Thorne (2003, p. 38), artifacts and tools are the same

because their utilization implies cultural mediation and the routinized use of an artifact exhibits its temporal location as well as its historical constitution.

With the expanding use of computers, CMC (Computer-mediated communication) (Warschauer, 1997; 2006) has been applied and studied. This author argued that mediated computer learning increased the opportunities for social interaction beyond the classroom. With computers, artifact mediation is taking a new form via emails, chat, threaded discussions, and video conferencing. Beauvois (1997) supported CMC as it is a way of fostering language learners' social interaction for second/foreign language classrooms where learners have limited or minimal interaction with their instructor or peers. Besides, this form of communication can result in a joint construction of knowledge.

Another concept of artifact in the high tech era is Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL). CALL is considered to lead to artefact mediation because it proved conducive to learners' cognitive development (Chapelle, 2001; Warschauer & Healey, 1998). Shabani (2014) more specifically explained how CALL can be applied in ELT by providing the evidence that explicit instruction through hypertexts and glosses could significantly affect the learners' vocabulary knowledge. Besides, the computerized instruction of vocabulary through electronic scaffolding is suggested as a valid procedure to mediate L2 learners' vocabulary growth. The study by Shabani (2014) confirmed that, with the use of CALL, implicit and explicit modalities could lead to enhanced reading comprehension, and the author concluded that CALL is a reliable means of teaching vocabulary in both familiar and unfamiliar contexts and tasks, and thus a worthwhile tool to foster the learners' growing agency.

In general, artifacts have evolved from original tools and signs into concrete items such as textbooks, charts, and computers used in the classroom. CMC and CALL put into practice the use of computers as mediated artifacts in the current time to generate interaction and to enhance learning.

Affective mediation

Emotion was mentioned by Vygotsky and indicates the relation between the children and their surroundings.

> One way to increase the production of egocentric speech is to complicate a task in such a way that the child cannot make direct use of tools for its solution. When faced with such a challenge, the children's emotional use of language increases as well as their efforts to achieve a less automatic, more intelligent solution. They search verbally for a new plan, and their [emotional] utterances reveal the close connection between egocentric and socialized speech.
>
> (Vygotsky, 1980, p. 27)

Levykh (2008) elaborated on the concept of the ZPD by Vygotsky and emphasized that an emotionally positive collaboration between teachers and

students in a supportive environment must be created from the outset, because in that environment positive emotions are developed, which is vital to human learning and development.

The scrutinization of the topic of affective mediation has been of more concern recently. For example, White (2018) points out that affective factors may mediate development in students' writing practices, particularly when social interaction becomes part of such practices. In a longitudinal study on corrective feedback through dialogic writing conference, Mazzotta (2017) found that the interaction process not only helps learners to develop cognitively but affectively thanks to the mediation of positive emotions. Abdul, Hood, and Coyle (2009, p. 15) pointed out that approval gestures such as smiling and nodding or praise can provide affective mediation to learners because they increase confidence and self-efficacy in learners. With such mediation, learners may move from being a legitimate peripheral member to one who was more active in participation within his group and was even able to offer mediation to peers in his group.

Besides all the aspects mentioned earlier in this article that include language as a meditational tool, peers as mediation, and artifacts to assist learners in the learning process, it should be noted that L1 can serve as an affective and interactional mediator in target language learning. Wu (2018) argues that the use of L1 is connected with emotions and performs scaffolding in the face of cognitively/emotionally challenging tasks, complex academic languages, and abstract concepts" (Wu, 2018, p. 14). The author also argues that if L1 is a cognitive mediator, it must also be an affective mediator based on the Vygotskian (1980, p. 50) notion of "a unity of affective and intellectual processes". Emotions inform one's decision about what to think and how to behave afterwards. The behavior then generates new emotions and thoughts (e.g. anxiety/motivation).

An excerpt from Lin and Lo (2017, p. 36) illustrates how affective factors contribute to the learning of a concept in English:

1 MR. B: Muscles, exactly, muscles. So people who want to build their body, they actually have to take in extra protein, like kind of, er, like milk powder. 有無見過 呀? (Have you seen that?) 嗰啲, 嗰啲, 食嗰啲補充劑. (Those, those, eat those supplements.) 有無呀? (Have you?) (…) (a student's name), you have the potential. [Ss laugh] Can you show us your muscles?

2 S6: 我無呀(I don't (have any muscles)) (…)It can be seen from the excerpt that Mr. B used L1 to involve students in developing scientific knowledge and in creating rapport. In this case, rapport is a form of attending to emotions that can build confidence (Mahn & John-Steiner, 2002, p. 49). Before these verbal exchanges, students were still puzzled with the concept of proteins, as evidenced by their pauses and hesitations when being asked questions by Mr. B. When Mr. B shifted to the L1 and created a humorous atmosphere, as in this example, students laughed and gave responses in a laughing way. Their laughter implied that they now had a clearer idea of the actual daily use of proteins.

Some challenges with sociocultural theory

With much emphasis on the mediation of language and interaction, the concept itself may cause some inappropriate understanding as it might be compared or associated with other terminology. For example, Ohta (2017) pointed out that the ZPD has inappropriately been said to be the same as "i + 1", from Krashen's monitor model. The difference is ZPD implies the transformative process in thinking as well as psychological tool use, or language use, whereas the input model of SLA emphasizes the importance of language input. Villamil and Guerrero (2019, p. 26) pointed out: "Sociocultural theory [SCT] stands in sharp contrast to interactionist theories of learning in which interaction is seen merely as an exchange of information between partners or as a means of modifying 'input' for the learners". In addition, the concept of the ZPD may be understood as an instructional strategy or process by which assistance promotes learning. In some cases, the ZPD and scaffolding may be considered to be interchangeable and to imply one learner helps another (Chaiklin, 2003). However, mediation is not just mutual assistance, it must be a transformative and developmental process.

Another problem was pointed out by Huong (2007) who argued that Vygotsky proposed the concept of the ZPD but did not elaborate the concept of "peer", leaving open the question of how capable a peer should be and how a peer's level of capability can contribute to mediation as well as the outcome of mediation. Besides, according to Ohta (2017), research that reflects SCT understandings of the mediated mind and developmental processes have used different terms to address the divergent concepts. For example, Swain (2009) provided such terms as languaging and grammaring to embody SCT understandings of human development and cognition.

Conclusion

Originally, Vygotsky proposed that the use of psychological tools or languages and material tools or physical objects was to transform the human thinking process as well as human activities to achieve certain goals. By and large, the process has been referred to as mediation, which now indicates individuals' understanding and development refracted through the use language in interaction with others and the material world which is being used. Nowadays, the mediation concept has been elaborated on and the focus of much of the process is associated with the use of computers, the Internet, and social media for interaction in learning and teaching.

In general, mediation can be facilitated by teachers who use hints, questions, and prompts to generate thoughts and language use in learners. This does not mean mediation can come naturally in the teaching process. Techniques to stimulate and provoke thoughts in learners must be trained. Teachers therefore must be aware of how to use their prompts to keep students on task and promote their thinking in order to be able to solve the problem or complete the task given. The assistance or scaffolding in the ZPD should be withdrawn when students show signs of being ready to solve problems independently so that learners can develop their independence in thinking and in task performance. For example, in an

English class in which students have to carry out a project of presenting the history of a place, students might find it hard to decide what to include in the report. Such questions as "what are some unique features of the place ?" or "what should local people remember the place for in terms of history?", will challenge students and simultaneously support them in stepping in the direction of thinking more to complete the project. While students are doing the project, teachers can provide guidance if needed. However, gradually, they should step back and let students work out the project themselves. Feedback, and evaluation with constructive comments from the teachers and project peers, not only contributes to enhance the quality of the learning and the process of collaboration, but it also improves cognition and the thinking process in completing a project.

Another key feature of sociocultural theory is the emphasis on peer interaction. When working with peers, learners are also mediated by peers' assistance, explanations, or modeling. This indicates that mediation can take place naturally or through training. It might be that peers in the process of working with other peers use language to assist others or they may be taught the techniques of facilitating others' learning. As most studies show, when working in pairs or groups, learners need help with task planning and understanding meanings of words, phrases, or concepts related to the task. In this case, having more knowledgeable peers work with less competent ones means more mediation will take place. This does not mean the more knowledgeable would not benefit from such working conditions. They will sharpen their skills in assisting, instructing, modeling, explaining, exemplifying, and communicating. Besides, less competent peers might be good at certain aspects that might provoke thinking in more knowledgeable peers during the process.

In language classrooms, the mediation process also takes place when learners use both L1 and the target language. When the tasks pose cognitive challenges to learners, they may refer to L1 for understanding the procedure of task implementation. Translanguaging is also claimed to happen when learners learn several languages. This is not to mean that L1 should be promoted in L2 or foreign language classrooms, but rather it should be seen as an inevitable thinking tool that can be made use of in assisting learners to work on tasks in L2. Besides, in a language class, the process of using language to create rapport and a fun atmosphere is claimed to facilitate the thinking process when students learn another language. Affective mediation may indirectly lead to the use of more language to share ideas and create cooperation among peers or between teachers and students. Through the process of establishing bonds with others, learners might feel more inspired and eager to talk, and the process in turn generates more ideas among peers.

Today, students have access to multiple forms of classroom materials. When being used, such artifacts can mediate for learners by providing them with questions, texts, or images to reflect on or to contemplate. The use of social media, and CALL for educational purposes thus needs to be fostered. If artifacts are given without instructions on how to make use of them, learners may misuse them for other purposes. We cannot ignore the roles of traditional classroom materials such as textbooks and audio-visual aids. However, modern classrooms with access to

the Internet and forms of social media have more tools for mediation and more choices for teaching and learning and facilitating interaction in new modes with computers, threaded discussions, and other online teachers and learners.

Given the fact that mediation exists in multimodal forms from teachers' language use, peers' assistance, interaction with artifacts in use, and with affective factors, the concept needs embracing and promoting to bring about positive effects in classroom interaction, leading to language learning. Teachers and students thus ought to know techniques to mediate students or other peers. Through this process, they will use language(s) more effectively and develop their thinking.

Future research will probably focus on the meditational role of online interaction due to the fact that today, face-to-face interaction is becoming less common and online learning has boomed. Due to the scope of the paper, mediation through non-verbal expressions is not discussed; however, it is worth studying this topic as it is an integral part of classroom interaction.

References

Abdul, R. F., Hood, P., & Coyle, D. (2009). "Becoming experts": Learning through mediation. *Malaysian Journal of Learning & Instruction*, 6, 1–21.

Barnard, R. (2002). Peer tutoring in the primary classroom: A sociocultural interpretation of classroom interaction. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 37(1), 57–72.

Beauvois, M. H. (1997). Computer-mediated communication (CMC): Technology for improving speaking and writing. In M. D. Bush & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Technology-enhanced language learning* (pp. 165–184). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Bird, E. M. (2018). *The mediational role of teacher discourse in students' opportunities to learn and become academic writers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Washington, Seattle.

Castells, M. (2000). Materials for an exploratory theory of the network society. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 51(1), 5–24.

Chapelle, C. A. (2001). *Computer applications in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cheng, X., & Kia, L. (2011). Mediative functions among China's EFL teachers in interactive classrooms. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 1(1), 187–192.

Chaiklin, S. (2003). The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction. *Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Context*, 1, 39–64.

Cheon, H. (2008). Sociocultural theory and computer-mediated communication-based language learning. *Studies in Applied Linguistics and TESOL*, 8(1), 1–3.

Dao, P., & Iwashita, N. (2018). Teacher mediation in L2 classroom task-based interaction. *System*, 74, 183–193.

Dang, T. K. A., & Marginson, S. (2013). Global learning through the lens of Vygotskian sociocultural theory. *Critical Studies in Education*, 54(2), 143–159.

DeNicolo, C. P. (2010). What language counts in literature discussion? Exploring linguistic mediation in an English language arts classroom. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 33(2), 220–240.

Dobao, A. F. (2014). Vocabulary learning in collaborative tasks: A comparison of pair and small group work. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(4), 497–520.

Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 33–54). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Press.

Fernández, M., Wegerif, R., Mercer, N., & Rojas-Drummond, S. (2015). Re-conceptualizing "scaffolding" and the zone of proximal development in the context of symmetrical collaborative learning. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 54–72.

Fernyhough, C. (2008). Getting Vygotskian about theory of mind: Mediation, dialogue, and the development of social understanding. *Developmental Review*, 28(2), 225–262.

Gibbons, P. (2003). Mediating language learning: Teacher interactions with ESL students in a content-based classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(2), 247–273.

Guk, I., & Kellog, D. (2007). The ZPD and whole class teaching: Teacher-led and student-led interactional mediation of tasks. *Language Teaching Research*, 11(3), 281–299.

Haider, M., & Yasmin, A. (2015). Significance of scaffolding and peer tutoring in the light of Vygotsky's theory of zone of proximal development. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, 1(3), 2015.

Huong, L. P. H. (2003, July). The mediational role of language teachers in sociocultural theory. *English Teaching Forum*, 41(3), 31–35.

Huong, L. P. H. (2007). The more knowledgeable peer, target language use, and group participation. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 64(2), 329–350.

Huong, L. P. H., & McDonald, G. (2004). Mediation through the first language: A sociocultural study of group work in Vietnam. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 31–49.

Hynninen, N. (2011). The practice of "mediation" in English as a lingua franca interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(4), 965–977.

Kozulin, A. (1990). The concept of regression and Vygotskian developmental theory. *Developmental Review*, 10(2), 218–238.

Kozulin, A. (1998). *Psychological tools: A sociocultural approach to education*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P. (2009). Knowledge of language in foreign language teacher education. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(2), 270–274.

Lantolf, J. P. (2012). Sociocultural theory and the pedagogical imperative. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, (2nd ed.) (pp. 1–19). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P., & Appel, G. (Eds.). (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P., Thorne, S. L., & Poehner, M. E. (2015). Sociocultural theory and L2 development. In B. VanPatten, G. D. Keating, & S. Wulff (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 207–226). New York: Routledge. Levykh, M. G. (2008). The affective establishment and maintenance of Vygotsky's zone of proximal development. *Educational Theory*, 58(1), 83–101.

Li, L., & Gao, F. (2016). The effect of peer assessment on project performance of students at different learning levels. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(6), 885–900.

Lin, A. M., & Lo, Y. Y. (2017). Translanguaging and the triadic dialogue in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms. *Language and Education*, 31(1), 26–45.

Mahn, H., & John-Steiner, V. (2002). The gift of confidence: A Vygotskian view of emotions. In G. Wells & G. Claxton (Eds.), *Learning for life in the 21st century*, (pp. 46–58). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Martin-Beltrán, M. (2014). "What do you want to say?" How adolescents use translanguaging to expand learning opportunities. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8(3), 208–230.

Martin-Beltrán, M., Guzman, N. L., & Chen, P. J. J. (2017). "Let's think about it together": How teachers differentiate discourse to mediate collaboration among linguistically diverse students. *Language Awareness*, 26(1), 41–58.

Martin-Beltrán, M., Daniel, S., Peercy, M., & Silverman, R. (2017). Developing a zone of relevance: Emergent bilinguals' use of social, linguistic, and cognitive support in peer-led literacy discussions. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 11(3), 152–166.

Mazzotta, M. (2017). *The impact of dialogic CF on L2 Japanese writers' linguistic and affective outcomes* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Georgia State University, Atlanta.

McCormick, D. E., & Donato, R. (2000). Teacher questions as scaffolded assistance in an ESL classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 183–202). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McDonald, G., Kidman, J., & Clarke, V. (1991). *Junior school study: A study of classrooms containing five-year-olds*. Wellington: New Zealand Council of Educational Research.

McDonald, G., Huong, L. P. H., Higgins, J., & Podmore, V. (2005). Artifacts, tools, and classrooms. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 12(2), 113–127.

Mohan, B., & Beckett, G. H. (2003). A functional approach to research on content-based language learning: Recasts in causal explanations. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(3), 421–432.

Nieto, C. H. (2007). Applications of Vygotskyan concept of mediation in SLA. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 9, 213–228.

Ohta, A. S. (1995). Applying sociocultural theory to an analysis of learner discourse: Learner-learner collaborative interaction in the zone of proximal development. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 93–121. Ohta, A. S. (2000). Rethinking interaction in SLA: Developmentally appropriate assistance in the zone of proximal development and the acquisition of L2 grammar. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 51–78). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ohta, A. S. (2017). Sociocultural theory and second/foreign language education. In N. Van Deusen-Scholl & S. May (Eds.), *Second and Foreign Language Education*, (pp. 57–68). New York: Springer International Publishing.

Olmedo, I. (2003). Language mediation among emergent bilingual children. *Linguistics and Education*, 14(2), 143–162.

Poehner, M. E. (2007). Beyond the test: L2 dynamic assessment and the transcendence of mediated learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(3), 323–340.

Poehner, M. E., & van Compernolle, R. A. (2011). Frames of interaction in dynamic assessment: Developmental diagnoses of second language learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 18(2), 183–198.

Shabani, K. (2014). The effects of computerized instruction of vocabulary through hypertexts on L2 learners' cognitive functioning. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 149, 868–873.

Swain, M. (2009). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95–108). London: Continuum.

Swain, M., & Deters, P. (2007). "New" mainstream SLA theory: Expanded and enriched. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 820–836.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(2), 320–337.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2013). A Vygotskian sociocultural perspective on immersion education: The L1/L2 debate. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1(1), 101–129.

Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thorne, K. (2003). *Blended learning: How to integrate online & traditional learning*. London: Kogan Page Publishers.

Tocalli-Beller, A. (2003). Cognitive conflict, disagreement and repetition in collaborative groups: Affective and social dimensions from an insider's perspective. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 60(2), 143–172.

Van Compernolle, R. A. (2015). *Interaction and second language development: A Vygotskian perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

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.

Villamil, O. S., & Guerrero, M. C. (2019). Sociocultural Theory: A framework for understanding the socio-cognitive dimensions of peer feedback (pp. 25–44). In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language* (E. Hanfmann & G. Vakar, Trans.). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1980). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language* (A. Kozulin, Trans.). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Warschauer, M. (1997). Computer-mediated collaborative learning: theory and practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(4), 470–481.

Warschauer, M., & Healey, D. (1998). Computers and language learning: An overview. *Language Teaching*, 31(2), 57–71.

Warschauer, M. (2006). *Laptops and literacy: Learning in the wireless classroom*. Columbia: Teachers College Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222–1235.

White, C. (2018). Agency and emotion in narrative accounts of emergent conflict in an L2 classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(4), 579–598.

Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wu, W. (2018). A Vygotskyan sociocultural perspective on the role of L1 in target language learning. *Cambridge Open-Review Educational Research e-Journal*, 5, 87–103.