

The Pedagogy of English as an International Language (EIL): More Reflections and Dialogues

Roby Marlina

Abstract This chapter introduces the conceptual frameworks we adopt in this book project: English as an International Language (EIL) and what it means by the pedagogy of English as an International Language. Then it discusses why it is important to have further discussions and reflections on the pedagogy of EIL. This will be followed by a review of recent literature on teaching EIL and a highlight of what have been over-discussed and/or under-researched – which are the ‘gaps’ that this edited volume aims to address. Thereafter, it explains how the edited volume is structured and how each chapter addresses the gaps.

Keywords English as an International Language • Pedagogy • TESOL • World Englishes • Pluricentric • Kachruvian circles

1 English ‘Going to Strange Shores’ and Its Outcomes

Thanks to the colonial and postcolonial expansion of English as well as the help of globalisation, it is widely agreed that the sociolinguistic reality of this language has become far more complex than those of other languages in the world today. This changing reality – envisioned by 1599 minor poet, Samuel Daniel, who fantasised about English going to the ‘strange shores’ – has led English to acquire the status of an international language, and, thus, prompted a paradigm shift in the field of Applied Linguistics and ELT (Saraceni 2009; Sharifian 2009).

Firstly, as a result of “new technologies bringing new linguistic opportunities, English emerged as a first-rank language in industries which in turn affected all aspects of society – the press, advertising, broadcasting, motion pictures, sound

R. Marlina (✉)

English as an International Language, School of Languages, Literatures, Cultures, and Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, Monash University, Clayton, VIC, Australia
e-mail: Roby.Marlina@monash.edu

recording, transport and communication” (Crystal 1997, p. 111). It became the dominant language in a variety of economic and cultural arenas such as the language of international organisations, of the motion picture industry and popular music, of international travel, of publications, and of education (McKay 2002, 2010, 2012a; Crystal 1997; Graddol 1997). In fact, Fishman (1982) observes that it is the ‘non-English-mother-tongue’ countries that have been significantly active in using English, and that have enhanced its value in each of the arenas. And, taken together, it is these international roles or functions of English that have given the language the status of an international language.

Secondly, the status of an international language ascribed to English is also a result of the increasing numbers of countries in the world bestowing a special role or priority upon English, either by making it an official language of the country or by requiring its study as a second or foreign language (Crystal 1997; McKay 2002). Statistically, there are over 70 countries in the world that give special status to English. Thus, based on the types of spread, the patterns of acquisition, and the roles of English, Kachru (1986) categorised them into three circles: Inner Circle countries (where English is formally recognised as a national language), Outer Circle countries (former British and American colonies where English is used as an additional institutionalised language and in conjunction with other official local languages), and Expanding Circle countries (where English does not have any official status and yet is often mandated for study as a foreign language). These concentric circles, however, are no longer applicable in today’s postmodern globalisation era. For example, the increased human mobility across globe such as mass migration has allowed speakers of different varieties of English to travel across the circles and to settle permanently in other circles (Clyne and Sharifian 2008). Additionally, due to awareness of being competent and proficient in the English language is like “possessing the fabled Aladdin’s lamp” (Kachru 1986, p. 1), some Expanding Circle countries have shifted its status and role of English, and are gradually becoming almost similar to the Outer Circle countries (Graddol 1997; Jenkins 2009).

The changing role and status of English in those countries have also suggested changes to the backgrounds of the users of English. This is another increasingly recognised feature that gives English the status of an international language. The ‘strange shores’ in which English enters are not ‘languageless’; the inhabitants of those shores already speak another language or languages, which makes English an additional language to their linguistic repertoire. Today’s users of English are predominantly bi-/multilingual users of English. They are fluent in English and in other languages, and they develop and use English in plurilingual contexts (Crystal 1997; McKay 2012a; McKay and Bokhorst-Heng 2008; Graddol 1999). Thirteen years ago, basing his figures on expected population changes, Graddol (1999) envisaged that “the number of people using English as their second/additional language will grow from 235 million to around 462 million during the next 50 years” (p. 62). Although it is difficult to determine the exact numbers of users/speakers of English today, it is clear that “the number of individuals who have some familiarity with the language today is vast and growing” (McKay 2003, p. 11).

What is also clear is that nearly 80 % of today’s communication in English takes place between bi-/multilingual speakers of English (Graddol 2006), meaning

that the so-called monolingual ‘native-speakers’¹ of English have more than likely become ‘the minority’ (Bloch and Starks 1999; Graddol 1999; Jenkins 2009; McKay 2003). The forces of globalisation such as the explosion of advanced information technologies and human mobility across the globe have further led to uncertainty of the lingua-cultural backgrounds of the interlocutors with whom people communicate in English. What is definitely certain is that today’s communicative exchanges are plurilingual in nature, characterised by “variation in linguistic and cultural behaviour” (Xu 2002, p. 231), and take place between speakers whose lingua-cultural backgrounds are often diverse and complex.

This global expansion of English and the increase in the numbers of bi-/multilingual speakers of English in the world have further led to emergence of different varieties of world Englishes (Graddol 2001; Kachru 1986). Journals such as *World Englishes*, *English Today*, and *English World Wide*, have been publishing for decade research studies that use a wide range of methodological approaches to document explicitly the newly emerged and emergent Englishes in different parts of the world. These publications collectively and unanimously illustrate and argue that when English is brought into a particular society, the language and its culture are ‘appropriated’ (Canagarajah 1999a) and ‘re-nationalised’ (McKay 2002) to ‘suit the local tastebud’ (Marlina 2010) and to project their own cultural and linguistic identities. Therefore, with its pluralised forms, English is a vehicle for users of English to project their cultural identities and to express their cultural conceptualisations (Sharifian 2011) to those outside their local milieu. In today’s communicative settings, speakers of English are likely to use the varieties of English they know and other languages they speak (depending on their interlocutors’ linguistic backgrounds); and to employ various pragmatic strategies to negotiate with other speakers of English in order to achieve mutual intelligibility.

2 EIL, WE, ELF: A Variety of English? A Perspective? A Function of English?

The above changing contemporary sociolinguistic reality of English language has led a growing number of linguists and/or applied linguists (e.g., Bolton 2005; Brutt-Griffler 2002; Jenkins 2009; Kachru 1986; Kirkpatrick 2010a, 2011; Seidlhofer 2005; Smith 1976, 1978, 1981; Sharifian 2009, to name a few) to develop different frameworks or academic approaches to conceptualising, researching, and

¹In this volume, the term ‘native-speaker’ is used to refer to speakers of the so-called ‘Standard’ American or British English whose English is often ‘glorified’ as well as used as the model for teaching, learning, and assessment. We acknowledge the complexity of this label thanks to the global expansion of English, and the political construct behind the dichotomy of ‘native’ and ‘non-native’. By writing the term with ‘inverted commas’, we indicate our attempt to challenge it, and our awareness that it is a problematic classification.

learning/teaching English – English as an International Language (EIL), World Englishes (WE), English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). In sometimes similar and sometimes different ways, these frameworks have challenged the taken-for-granted or unquestioned superiority of the notions such as ‘the Queen’s English’, ‘Received Pronunciation’, or ‘General American’, and they have put forward a more liberal and democratic view, which has led Kubota (2012) to call it as the “anti-normative paradigm”. Despite being collectively categorised as the anti-normative paradigm, there have been terminological debates about WE, EIL, and ELF in the literature (Matsuda and Friedrich 2010; Prodromou 2007) and therefore the ways in which they are conceptualised and interpreted have not been consistent. Since it is beyond the scope of this book to highlight these debates and unpack each of these frameworks, I shall explain why I have chosen EIL as the main philosophical approach adopted for this edited volume.

EIL tends to be conceptualised differently by different scholars: ‘paradigms or perspectives’ (McKay 2002; Sharifian 2009); ‘the functions or uses of English in international contexts’ (Matsuda and Friedrich 2010); and ‘a variety of English’ (Tomlinson 2003; Widdowson 1997). For this volume, EIL is conceptualised as a perspective (McKay 2002) or “a paradigm for thinking, research, and practice” (Sharifian 2009, p. 2). In other words, EIL is regarded as a linguistic and epistemological lens for researchers, scholars, and educators to ‘put on’ in order to critically:

- revisit and reconsider their ways of conceptualising English,
- re-assess their analytical tools and the approaches they adopt in the sociolinguistics of English and TESOL disciplines, and
- revise their pedagogical strategies for English language education in the light of the tremendous changes that English has undergone as a result of its global expansion in recent decades.

EIL, as a paradigm, recognises the international functions of English and its use in a variety of cultural and economic arenas by speakers of English from diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds who do not speak each other’s mother tongues. However, this does not mean that there is a particular single variety of English called ‘EIL’, like ESP – English for Specific Purposes (Widdowson 1997) – that is shared by those speakers and is used specifically for international purposes such as English for International Aviation or International Business English. There are in fact cases in which EIL is confused with or mistakenly referred to as ‘International English’. As Sharifian (2009) argues, “the use of an adjective plus ‘English’ often suggests a particular variety (e.g. Australian English or Singaporean English) and ‘International English’ can suggest a particular variety of English . . . being selected as a lingua franca for international communication” (p. 2). Agreeing with Sharifian (2009), the EIL paradigm “rejects the notion of a single variety of English which serves as the medium for international communication. English, with its pluralised forms, is a language of international and intercultural communication” (p. 2). In international communicative encounters, for example in a putatively English communicative exchange between a Chinese Indonesian, a Maldivian, a Chinese Mauritian, and an Italian New Zealander at a train-station in Singapore, they are

likely bring to their use of English a variety or varieties they are most familiar with; and are likely to employ various strategies from their multilingual and perhaps multidialectal repertoire to negotiate linguistic and other differences to ensure and achieve successful communication and mutual intelligibility.

In conceptualising and discussing EIL as a paradigm, it does not mean that WE and ELF are entirely irrelevant. In fact, I believe and would like to argue that the EIL paradigm cannot be separated from WE and ELF. Because the EIL paradigm acknowledges the diversification of English as a result of the global spread of the language, EIL recognises Kachruvian World Englishes, and emphasises the relevance of world Englishes in the teaching, learning, and thinking about English today (Matsuda 2002, 2009; Matsuda and Friedrich 2010; Sharifian 2009). However, the notion of ‘world Englishes’ is also diversely interpreted and inconsistently used by researchers and scholars who have studied various aspects of different varieties of English in the world. Bolton (2005) has found different ways in which this notion is used. On one hand, Kachruvian school of thought conceptualises World Englishes (with capital letters) as a paradigm that “captures the dynamic nature of world-wide spread of the language” (Matsuda and Friedrich 2010, p. 3). They call for the equal recognition of the varieties of English from Outer and Expanding circle countries, and argue for “the importance of inclusivity and pluricentricity in approaches to the linguistics of English worldwide” (Bolton 2005, p. 204). On the other hand, World Englishes, as varieties of English, are often referred to either *all* varieties of English in the world or only the ‘new Englishes’ in the Outer Circle countries where English arrived as a colonial language and later became established as an additional language (Bolton 2005). One of the criticisms that Saraceni (2009) offers about the WE paradigm is that it overlooks the diversity of English spoken within a single nation, i.e. regional varieties of English, sociolects, and idiolects. He argues that “the evolution of English is progressing in a complex manner which cuts across borders . . . it evolves in ways that escape academic description . . . and young users of English mix global and local norms freely” (Saraceni 2009, p. 183). Canagarajah (1999a) adds that Kachruvian WE tends to:

ignore the ideological implications of the legitimating periphery Englishes. In his attempt to systematise the periphery variants, he has to standardise the language [which then valorises] the educated versions of local English and leaving out many eccentric, hybrid forms of local English as unsystematic (p. 180)

As a paradigm that promotes a pluricentric view of English, I advocate that the EIL paradigm embraces/recognises all varieties of English at national, regional, social, and idiolectal levels in all circles as equal.

Since EIL gives legitimate recognition of varieties of English spoken by the so-called ‘non-native’ speakers, the EIL paradigm also views the need to take into consideration a new branch of research, English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), and the works of its proponents (such as Jenkins 2000, 2006a, 2007; Kirkpatrick 2010b, 2011, 2012; Seidlhofer 2006). ELF scholars explore and describe the use of English used by the so-called ‘non-native’ speakers from countries where English does not have an historically-established presence and where the so-called ‘native-speakers’ are absent or excluded. This can be observed in their newly-discovered

varieties of English such as the Lingua Franca Core (Jenkins 2000), ASEAN English (Kirkpatrick 2010b), Euro-English (Seidlhofer 2006), ELFA or English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings (Mauranen 2006; Mauranen and Ranta 2008). Although I, as an EIL paradigm advocate, believe and recognise the relevance and importance of these works, the underlying ontological assumptions that “ELF and EIL are one and the same phenomenon, and that both refer to lingua franca uses of English primarily along its non-mother-tongue-speakers” (Jenkins 2007, p. xi) runs counter to those of the EIL paradigm. Firstly, although the EIL paradigm acknowledges the fact that 80 % of communication in English takes place between ‘non-native’ speakers, it does not claim that communication in English or varieties of English encountered in international contexts excludes ‘native-speakers’. Second, as mentioned before, the EIL paradigm rejects the idea of having a single variety of English as the chosen form of English for global communication. Although the view of English promoted by ELF scholars is somewhat liberating, to a large extent, it still promotes a particular variety of English or a predetermined set of several varieties (ASEAN English or Euro-English) as ‘the core’ and gives other varieties less equal recognition. As Matsuda and Friedrich (2012) strongly assert,

Proposing and teaching a ‘standard’ or ‘core’ variety of English in international contexts would create an additional layer in the English language hierarchy to which different people would have different degrees of access, and that, as a result would generate inequity among speakers of different Englishes (p. 19)

If there needs to be a ‘core’ or a ‘base’ to a variety of English, then one should look toward the diversity and complexity of the form, user, and culture of the language as some sort of dynamic and mutable core of the EIL paradigm.

I acknowledge and am aware of the fact that it is virtually impossible to expect all scholars and, specifically, the contributors of this volume to share and adopt the same perspective because all of us have our own ideological standpoint and therefore have our own preferred paradigm and its ontological assumptions. Despite the different perspectives some of our contributors adopt, there is one view that we all unanimously advocate for and that ties the whole volume together. We believe in and emphasise the importance of recognising the pluricentricity of English and the equal treatment given to all varieties of English and its speakers. Differences in English are neither viewed as fossil-ridden examples of interlanguages nor inferior examples of incorrect speech or ‘half-baked quackery’ (Quirk 1990). However, they are recognised as “sociolinguistically normal, necessary, and intrinsic to language varieties” (Tollefson 2007, p. 30).

3 The Pedagogy of EIL

The changing sociolinguistic reality of English and the paradigm shift in the field discussed above have led many prolific scholars in the field (to name a few, Alsagoff et al. 2012; Matsuda 2012a; McKay 2002; Smith 1983; Sharifian 2009) to rigorously

promote the significance of teaching English as a heterogeneous language with multiple grammars, vocabulary, accents, and pragmatic discourse conventions. English language practitioners and teacher-educators have been urged to challenge the view of adopting a ‘monomodel’ (Kachru 1992) or ‘a native-speaker’ model (Kirkpatrick 2006) to teaching English. Since “no one can avoid being part of the current of linguistic change or variation, and avoid bathing in the sea of linguistic variety” (Crystal 1999, p. 19), English language educators have been encouraged to re-visit and re-examine their *teaching methodology* (Brown 2006; Kumaravadivelu 2003), *instructional variety and model* (Kirkpatrick 2006; Matsuda and Friedrich 2012), *curriculum and syllabus materials* (Brown 2012; Gray 2002; Marlina and Giri 2013; Matsuda 2005, 2012b; McKay 2003, 2012b), *language testing* (Canagarajah 2006; Hu 2012; Jenkins 2006b; Lowenberg 2012), and *TESOL teacher-education program* (Dogancay-Aktuna 2006; Dogancay-Aktuna and Hardman 2012; Manara 2012; Sifakis 2007) in the light of the changing nature of English. Informed by the EIL paradigm, teaching EIL or EIL pedagogy means the act of professionally guiding students from all Kachruvian circles to (1) gain knowledge and awareness of the pluricentricity of English and the plurilingual nature of today’s communication; (2) inspire students to give equal and legitimate recognition of all varieties of English; and (3) develop the ability to negotiate and communicate respectfully across cultures and Englishes in today’s communicative settings that are international, intercultural, and multilingual in nature. The following table provides a summary of what specific knowledge, attitudes, and skills that are crucial attributes expected in today’s employment (Briguglio 2005), and that EIL scholars advise language teachers to inspire their students to develop (Table 1).

4 Another Book on Teaching EIL – Still Not Enough?

The editors’ response to that question is ‘yes, another book! And no, it’s still not enough!’ because of the following reasons.

It is, without doubt, that (teaching) EIL is no longer an unfamiliar concept or term in the current discourses on English Language Teaching (ELT). As Matsuda (2012a) observes in her recently edited book, there have been a large number of TESOL journals and conferences that include works that discuss issues in teaching and learning of EIL. Sharing a similar observation with her, we have also observed that there has been a growth in a number of books dedicated specifically to the topic on teaching EIL (Alsagoff et al. 2012; McKay 2002; McKay and Bokhorst-Heng 2008; Matsuda 2012a; Sharifian 2009; Smith 1983). Jenkins (2006a), however, brings to our attention that these works are still “the exception rather than the rule” (p. 158). My experience in presenting at a number of national and international TESOL conferences in the Asia-Pacific region and the responses that I have received

Table 1 EIL-inspired knowledge, attitudes, and skills

Knowledge and awareness	<p>Knowledge of the spread of English and its implications</p> <p>Knowledge of other varieties of English</p> <p>Knowledge of the nature of language diversification and changes</p> <p>Awareness of the values of cultural and linguistic diversity</p> <p>Awareness of the sociopolitical awareness of the spread of English and its impact on other languages</p>	<p>Briguglio (2006), Crystal (1999), Kubota (2001a, b, 2012), Matsuda (2002, 2005, 2009, 2012b), and McKay (2002, 2003)</p>
Attitudes	<p>Having a view of English as a heterogeneous language with multiple norms</p> <p>Sensitivity toward the unprecedented spread and diversification of English</p> <p>Recognising the legitimacy of other varieties of English</p> <p>International understanding</p> <p>Acceptance towards different cultures</p> <p>Confidence in facing up to linguistically intransigent elements in the world</p> <p>Attitudinal resources: i.e., patience and humility to negotiate differences</p> <p>Negotiation skills – such as speech accommodation – for shuttling between English varieties and speech communities</p> <p>Interpersonal strategies: i.e., repair, rephrase, clarification, gestures, topic change, consensus-orientation, mutual support</p> <p>Multidialectal competence – involving passive competence to understand new varieties of English and the capacity to negotiate diverse varieties of English</p> <p>Listening skills</p> <p>Analytical and reflective skills</p>	<p>Baumgardner (2006), Briguglio (2006), Canagarajah (2006), Crystal (1999), Higgins (2003), Li (2007), Shim (2002), Shin (2004), and Matsuda (2002, 2005, 2009)</p> <p>Briguglio (2006), Canagarajah (2006), Crystal (1999), Firth (1996), and Matsuda (2009)</p>

from the attendees about my presentations that predominantly advocate for the importance of teaching English as a pluricentric language echo Jenkins' (2006a) view:

EIL again! heard and read about it! It's very confusing. I still don't know what it is. And I think it's not really practical to teach different types of English

Yeah, I know what you guys are saying! Our non-native English students speak their own English, but that's just not Standard English. We just have to be parochial! They need to speak the correct English which is our Standard native English

I'm not sure if my students like to be confused. When I want to learn, for example, Arabic, I don't want to know Arabic spoken in different countries. That's just a waste of time! I would expect my teacher to keep things simple for me.

I think it's enough for us to hear about scholars like yourself telling us to teach EIL, but has anyone really implemented what you have just presented? And how do they feel?

I've taught one lesson using EIL as a framework and I just can't see how it could work²

Even though those conferences had EIL as either a main theme or sub-theme, the above comments indicate that there is still a hunger for, what I prefer to call, 'PESTS', which stands for 'Practicality' (*not practical to teach different types of English*), 'Efficiency' (*just a waste of time*), 'Standards' (*need to learn standard native English*), and 'Simplicity' (*don't like to be confused, keep things simple*). Some of the above comments are also often heard from the students from the undergraduate EIL program, as well as in the postgraduate TESOL teacher-education program in which I have taught. Therefore, what messages have my co-editor and I received from here?

Though the above comments reflect a minimal understanding of the dynamic nature of language using/learning/teaching, they also indicate that the discourses on teaching EIL are still not solid and convincing enough. We are aware that there is a wealth of writing that offers theoretical principles of how to teach EIL. However, the responses from the conference attendees and our 6-year-experience of inspiring our very own students to learn about the principles offered by those writings have prompted us to realise that some of them seem to be relatively vague and are not representative of the voices of the stakeholders such as educators, students, and so on. This vagueness has prompted our students to feel confused and to describe this perspective as 'utopian'. Occasionally, we even struggled to respond to our students when they asked us how to implement these theoretical principles into an actual learning context. In the light of this, we argue that it is important to have more writings on the theoretical principles of teaching English as a pluricentric language, which are based on and developed from thorough observations of the sociolinguistic reality of English within an actual socio-cultural context. Using several countries in the Asia-Pacific region as illustrative exemplars, a number of contributors in this

²All of these quotes were not necessarily the exact words of the conference attendees, but a recreation based on the notes that I wrote (after the conference) in my reflective journals. There are some other comments which I deliberately excluded as they were largely xenophobic.

volume offer a number of principles of teaching EIL or food-for-thought that educators can consider implementing into their own lessons, curricula, or study programs. This is not to suggest that these principles serve as a ‘blanket’ for other socio-cultural contexts, but it can help motivate EIL researchers, educators, or students to reflect on or to conduct further research on the extent to which these principles can be applied to other contexts, and to propose further principles of teaching EIL.

In addition, we believe and argue that the discourses of teaching EIL may also need to move forward. There still need to be more writings and critical reflections that focus specifically on the pragmatic dimension of teaching EIL, which is still lacking in the current discourses on teaching EIL. Though it is important for scholars to propose theoretical principles of teaching EIL, we also need to be realistic about the application of these principles. In other words, we need to move from the phase of *‘let’s consider change’* to *‘let’s see if change is already taking place’*. As Wee (2013) argues in his review on one of the recently published edited book on teaching EIL, a set of proposals about teaching EIL would be more effective if they include or “trigger debates about just how realistic it might be to try to implement particular suggestions” (p. 203) as opposed to just informing teachers what/how to teach EIL. Therefore, in this volume, we include writings that include voices of teachers who have already implemented change or incorporated the principles underpinning the EIL paradigm into existing course, program, policy, or educational system, and their reflections on their experiences of doing so. Not only do these writings solely aim to showcase ‘how-to-do-it’, but they also aim to demonstrate that there is already a change in orientation and attitudes towards the teaching of English in reality.

Hence, to further address how realistic it might be to translate the EIL paradigm into practice, we also need to include voices or critical reflections from teachers and students about their views on the implementability of EIL paradigm; and from teachers who are teaching/have already taught EIL, as well as students who are studying/have already studied EIL. As suggested by Li (2009), it is high time that researchers in the field to include voices, views, or reactions of both ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ speakers on a range of delicate and contentious issues that the fields of study have raised, promoted, and advocated. Therefore, after reading about or seeing *‘if change is already taking place or can take place’*, it is also important to *‘see how people react to this change’* and *‘critically reflect on this change’*, which are sorely missing in the literature. Through projects that adopt a wide range of methodological approaches, from a quantitative study to a narrative-based study, a number of contributors of this edited volume explore how the principles or mindsets advocated by the EIL paradigm are received by English language teachers, teacher-educators, and/or students. These writings aim to highlight the fact that incorporating EIL into classrooms and changing students and/or teachers’ (or perhaps a community/society) beliefs are not a simple journey – what the tensions, conflicts, struggle, and challenges EIL teachers and/or students may experience in becoming advocates of or advocating for the EIL paradigm. The use of narratives, by some of our contributors to present their experiences, is powerful in a sense that it allows people to understand experience and the impact of the experience itself; to develop a different way of understanding teaching (Bell 2002; Carter 1993; Doecke

and Parr 2009) EIL; and to bring forward some deeply hidden assumptions to surface, such as any assumptions about the goals, purposes, and methods of teaching that are taken for granted (Bell 2002; Holliday 2007; Simons 2009). The aim of these discussions is not to argue that teaching EIL is impossible. Rather, it may serve as a springboard for further discussions on what else EIL-inspired educators can do more in order to enhance the teaching and learning of EIL or to further develop solid EIL-oriented programs, curriculum, or lessons.

This edited book attempts to address the gap outlined above, which contributes to the current discourses on teaching EIL. Specifically, it also attempts to showcase and/or trigger debates about how realistic it is to teach English as a pluricentric language.

5 Overview of the Book

This book is divided into two sections, which I will elaborate in the following. In the first section, scholars draw readers' attention to the changing sociolinguistic reality of English, and encourage them to consider a change in the way they teach English or conceptualise English language teaching based on the suggested principles. The second section addresses the experiences and dimensions of change. In order to inspire readers to consider change, some scholars in this section inform their readers that there is already a change taking place in an actual teaching and learning context; and that attempts have already been made to translate the principles or beliefs advocated by the EIL paradigm into practice. However, other scholars also in the second section would like to acknowledge and address that sometimes when change is demanded, there are occasions where we may overlook the fact that changing one's thinking and practice is (1) not a simple task; (2) a time-consuming process; and (3) often filled with tensions and conflicts. Therefore, voices, views, experiences, and critical reflections from teachers and students in relation to the change or specifically about the change need to be included and made audible.

The three chapters in the first section act as calls for change by offering theoretical principles for teaching English as an International Language which are developed on the basis of thorough observations of the sociolinguistic and sociocultural reality of English in a particular region, country, or city in which the communicative exchanges are often international and intercultural in nature. Based on the contemporary sociolinguistic reality of English in ASEAN region and on the Asian Corpus English (ACE) corpora, Kirkpatrick, in Chapter "Teaching English in Asia in Non-Anglo Cultural Contexts: Principles of the 'Lingua Franca Approach'", outlines six principles of the Lingua Franca Approach that collectively aim at developing intercultural ASEAN communicative competence, which can be realistically used to inform the teaching and learning of English in the ASEAN contexts. Focussing on a multilingual and multicultural inner circle country (Australia) in which communication in English continues to become more intercultural and multi-varietal in nature, Sharifian in Chapter "Teaching English as an

[International Language in Multicultural Contexts: Focus on Australia](#)” advocates for the development of two important competencies – multi-varietal and metacultural competence – that Australian English language educators are encouraged to view as the teaching/learning goals in order to realise teaching EIL in Australia. Witnessing the interest in fostering intercultural speakers of English in the South Korean national curriculum as a result of globalisation and the internationalisation of English, Park and Kim in Chapter [“Teaching and Learning of EIL in Korean Culture and Context”](#) discuss ways in which English language educators in South Korea can realistically implement an EIL paradigm in order to achieve the national curriculum objective, and at the same time to problematise the view of ‘native-speaker-supremacy’ embedded within the current characteristics of ELT in South Korea.

Now that there are already calls for change, the following six chapters serve to show how English language educators in different parts of Asia respond to Wee’s (2013) concern by demonstrating and arguing that change is already taking place. In Chapter [“English as an International Language and Three Challenging Issues in English Language Teaching in Japan”](#), Honna and Takeshita showcase (1) how the American English Speaker Model (that has been practised for a long time) is now being challenged and is beginning to lose its ‘prestige’ in Japan; and that (2) ELT specialists in Japan are now heading towards the adoption and the implementation of Japanese English Speaker Model. Doan in Chapter [“Teaching the Target Culture in English Teacher Education Programs: Issues of EIL in Vietnam”](#) also reports similar observations. The results of the interviews that he conducted with a number of English language educators from different universities in different parts of Vietnam reveal that there is a sign that English language teacher-education in Vietnam is shifting its paradigm from the teaching of culture based on a monocentric to a pluricentric approach to teaching that places an emphasis on the pluricentricity of English, its user, and therefore its culture. This sign is also felt and observed in the neighbouring country, Malaysia in Chapter [“Implementing EIL Paradigm in ELT Classrooms: Voices of Experienced and Pre-Service English Language Educators in Malaysia”](#). Ali’s interview results with experienced English language educators and initial TESL teacher-educators have also demonstrated a positive attitude towards the beliefs advocated by the EIL paradigm, and a belief in the bright prospect for the teaching of English based on the EIL paradigm in Malaysia. Even though some participants in her study are aware of the challenges in the implementation, they are aware of and even propose ways to initiate change. In an attempt to show that change is also already taking place and being implemented, van den Hoven, in Chapter [“Teaching Teachers to Teach English as an International Language: A Korean Case”](#), reflects on the way she uses the principles of teaching EIL to re-design culture course for in-service teachers in a Korean TESOL certificate program. Similarly, Xu, in Chapter [“Teaching and Assessing EIL Vocabulary in Hong Kong”](#), also presents his reflections on the way he uses the principles of teaching EIL to develop his teaching approaches and assessment strategies in teaching a ‘Vocabulary Studies’ course to English language and English language teaching majored students at a university in Hong Kong. While Chapters [“Teaching Teachers to Teach English as an International Language: A Korean Case”](#) and [“The Relocation of Culture](#)

in the Teaching of English as an International Language” showcase attempts by university educators to ‘EIL-ise’ their courses, Chapter “Teaching and Assessing EIL Vocabulary in Hong Kong” presents an attempt by initial English teacher-education students to integrate the principles advocated by the EIL paradigm into their mini-lessons on ‘teaching culture’ in a Micro-teaching course at a university in Indonesia. Based on her analyses of their reflective journals, lesson plans, and teaching materials, Zacharias have found out that Inner-Circle cultures are used in their mini-lessons, but are taught (not predominantly) in conjunction with global cultures as well as local Indonesian cultures which the students feel more enthusiastic and comfortable to use.

However, in response to the numerous pedagogical implications of EIL offered in the literature of teaching EIL, Tupas in Chapter “The Unequal Production of Knowledge in the Sociolinguistics of Englishes”, argues that those implications seem to have overlooked the need to recognise and treat teachers as co-constructors of knowledge as opposed to passive recipients; and classrooms as sites for intellectual inquiry as opposed to premises for implementing a theoretical proposition. Based on the narratives of three English language teachers from Indonesia, Vietnam, and the Philippine, he argues that the pedagogical implications need to be products of dialogues between scholars and teachers, and need to consider a myriad of issues or challenges that English language teachers face in language teaching. Therefore, Chapters “The Cosmetics of Teaching English as an International Language in Japan: A Critical Reflection” and ““So What Do You Want Us to Do?”: A Critical Reflection of Teaching English as an International Language in an Australian Context” provide readers with voices of EIL-inspired educators who share their critical reflections on and inquiry into the pedagogical implications of the plurality of English. Based on his observations of ELT in Japan and critical reflections on his experiences as an EIL-inspired educator, Toh in Chapter “The Cosmetics of Teaching English as an International Language in Japan: A Critical Reflection” uncovers the prevailing native-speaker-supremacy ideology embedded within the discourse and practice of ELT in Japan, and the contradicting views of English as a language for the nation’s internationalisation initiatives and as a threat to local culture. These factors have prompted EIL-inspired educators to experience uncertainty about or challenges in applying the pedagogical implications that encourage language teachers in Japan to teach Japanese English. In Chapter ““So What Do You Want Us to Do?”: A Critical Reflection of Teaching English as an International Language in an Australian Context”, Manara takes the readers into an actual scenario of teaching in an EIL-oriented program in an Australian university. A critical inquiry into her practice of implementing the EIL paradigm has prompted her to become aware and critical of a utopian view of diversity embedded in her practice of teaching EIL, and also to claim the need to recognise the struggles and tensions that both EIL-inspired educators and students are likely to experience in teaching and learning EIL. There needs to be a space for students to voice and inquire into the tensions and struggles they experience as a result of a clash between anti-normative discourses promoted by an EIL-curriculum, lesson, or program; and the native-speaker-supremacy ideology embedded within the discursive practices outside classrooms.

In order to further explore responses to change and how realistic it might be to implement the pedagogical implications of EIL, there also needs to be an inclusion of voices from “the treasure in our very own backyards: our students” (Soo Hoo 1993, p. 390) who I argue, are also co-constructors of knowledge as opposed to passive recipients. Educators can lose a powerful opportunity to learn about their own pedagogical practices if students’ perceptions and experiences are not involved in their critical reflections on their teaching (Nieto 1999). Therefore, the following scholars critically discuss the pedagogical implications of EIL from students’ perspectives. Based on his in-depth interviews with Korean learners of English in Australia, Pollard, in Chapter “[The Realities of Real English: Voices from Those Exposed](#)”, claims that the ideology of native-speakerism is still very much alive in the mind of these learners. He argues that this mindset tends to have been prompted by the reality of English communication in Australia: (1) the view of communication in English as a one-way-street which is reflected in the assimilationist discursive practices in Australia; and (2) linguistic discrimination or divide. In addition to teaching different varieties of English, ELT community may need to be critical of the above reality in order to contribute to the appreciation of EIL in Australia. While students in Pollard’s chapter have not had any exposure to an EIL-oriented curriculum, students in Chapter “[The WEs/EIL Paradigm and Japan’s NS Propensity: Going Beyond the ‘Friendly Face’ of West-Based TESOL](#)” have already engaged in learning about the diversity of English in a department of World Englishes at a university in Japan. Despite of the exposure, D’Angelo’s quantitative analysis of the students’ attitudes towards their ELT experience still indicates (1) a predilection for a native-speaker model; (2) minimal understanding of World Englishes; and (3) a potential challenge in developing metacultural competence and a competence in Japanese English. Though D’Angelo mentions the reasons underlying those attitudes in a brief manner, a discussion on the narrative of an EIL graduate from Australia who taught English in Japan in the following chapter extends those reasons. Also confirming the experiences of Toh in Chapter [The Cosmetics of Teaching English as an International Language in Japan: A Critical Reflection](#), Giri and Foo, in Chapter “[On Teaching EIL in a Japanese Context: The Power Within and Power Without](#)”, have presented the struggles and challenges that Foo experienced when teaching English in Japan with a perspective offered by his EIL lecturer (Giri). While Foo enthusiastically intended to advocate the works of EIL scholars and his lecturer in his own teaching, he was met with resistance, powerful discourses, and practices from his surroundings that were indicative of a support for the ideology of native-speakerism. Not only has this narrative imply that some theoretical propositions offered by EIL scholars may sound far-fetched, but it has also prompted Giri, as an EIL lecturer, to re-think his pedagogical practices.

Although the last few chapters in this edited volume may sound ‘negative’, they are not aimed to suggest that the teaching of EIL is infeasible and has no prospect. Instead, it is feasible and has a bright future if EIL-inspired educators are ready to employ a different way of conceptualising these struggles, tensions, and conflicts. Inspired by Bakhtinian perspective, I would not regard or view struggles, tensions, and conflicts in learning EIL as negative or signs of rebellion against the paradigm,

but as *natural* reactions or responses to a different way of seeing the world, especially one that encourages its followers to ‘swim against the current’ that has been flowing in one direction for a very long time. When people engage in learning or understanding a particular subject matter, they are, at the same time, cognitively engaging in dialogues with many other voices or discourses on that particular subject matter to which they have previously been exposed, and into which they have previously been socialised. As Canagarajah (1993) concurs, students/teachers do not leave behind them at the classroom door voices and discourses that they have heard and developed from their social relations, their rural upbringings, or their relationships to their parents; instead, they bring them in with them. As they encounter different words/discourses or different ways of understanding the world, “words from the past that echo in our minds as we converse with one another, the routines that we follow in order to participate in institutional settings, the communities or social networks to which we belong” (Doecke and Kostogriz 2008, p. 82) are used as referential frameworks to evaluate the extent to which these new discourses make sense. In social environments where individuals encounter interactions of competing and clashing multiple discourses or voices, “humans inherently experience [tension and] struggle to assimilate discourses that they feel make sense” (Assaf and Dooley 2006, p. 5). These struggles and tensions that learners experience in understanding their own and other’s ideological beliefs are the stepping stone for individuals to develop their own ideological standpoint. Therefore, in a context of teaching and learning, “the social interactions that are most effective in promoting learning are those that are filled with tension and conflict” (Freedman and Ball 2004, p. 6). Specifically, language teaching in general or programs that specialise in teaching linguistic and cultural pluralism should not isolate themselves from sociopolitical questions (Pennycook 1990, 1999, 2000) or “buries our eyes ostrich-like to the political evils and ideological temptations outside” (Canagarajah 1999b, p. 201), but to provide a space for students and teachers to problematise or inquire into those questions, political evils, and temptations; and to envisage versions of a world that is ‘not yet’, or alternative possibilities for organising social life. By suggesting this, I am not intending to provide solution, but to further trigger debates or open up further conversations on how realistic it might be to teach EIL. It is because, as Bakhtin (1981, cited in Manara, in this volume) states, dialogues and learning about the pedagogy of EIL are dynamic, ongoing, and ‘unfinalised’.

References

- Alsagoff, L., McKay, S. L., Hu, G. W., & Renandya, W. A. (2012). *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language*. New York: Routledge.
- Assaf, L. C., & Dooley, C. M. M. (2006). “Everything they were giving us created tension”: Creating and managing tension in a graduate-level multicultural education course. *Multicultural Education*, 14(2), 42–49.
- Baumgardner, R. J. (2006). Teaching world Englishes. In B. B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, & C. L. Nelson (Eds.), *The handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 661–679). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

- Bell, J. S. (2002). Narrative inquiry: More than just telling stories. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(2), 207–213.
- Bloch, B., & Starks, D. (1999). The many faces of English: Intra-language variation and its implications for international business. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 4(2), 80–88.
- Bolton, K. (2005). Where WE stands: Approaches, issues and debate in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 24(1), 69–83.
- Briguglio, C. (2005). *The use of English as a global language in multinational settings and the implications for business education*. Unpublished PhD thesis, The University of Western Australia, Western Australia, Australia.
- Briguglio, C. (2006). Empowering students by developing their intercultural communication competence: A two-way process. In ISANA (Ed.), *Educate, advocate, empower* (pp. 661–679). Queensland: ISANA International Education Association Inc.
- Brown, K. (2006). Models, methods, and curriculum for ELT preparation. In B. B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, & C. L. Nelson (Eds.), *The handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 680–693). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Brown, J. D. (2012). EIL curriculum development. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay, G. Hu, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 147–167). New York: Routledge.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002). *World English: A study of its development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Canagarajah, S. (1993). Critical ethnography of a Sri Lankan classroom: Ambiguities in student opposition to reproduction through ESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4), 601–626.
- Canagarajah, S. (1999a). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (1999b). On EFL teachers, awareness, and agency. *ELT Journal*, 53(3), 207–214.
- Canagarajah, S. (2006). Changing communicative needs, revised assessment objectives: Testing English as an international language. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 3(3), 229–242.
- Carter, K. (1993). The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 22(1), 5–12.
- Clyne, M., & Sharifian, F. (2008). English as an international language: Challenges and possibilities. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 1–16.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1999). From out in the left field? That's not cricket: Finding a focus for the language curriculum. In R. S. Wheeler (Ed.), *The workings of language: From prescriptions to perspectives* (pp. 91–105). Westport: Praeger.
- Doecke, B., & Kostogriz, A. (2008). Becoming a professional (and other dissident acts): Language and literacy teaching in an age of neoliberal reform. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 8(4), 63–84.
- Doecke, B., & Parr, G. (2009). 'Crude thinking' or reclaiming our 'story-telling rights': Harold Rosen's essays on narrative. *Changing English (An International Journal of English Teaching)*, 16(1), 63–76.
- Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (2006). Expanding the socio-cultural knowledge base of TESOL teacher-education. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 19(3), 278–295.
- Dogancay-Aktuna, S., & Hardman, J. (2012). Teacher education for EIL: Working toward a situated meta-praxis. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language* (pp. 103–118). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of 'normality': On conversation analysis and 'lingua franca'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26(2), 237–259.
- Fishman, J. (1982). Sociology of English as an additional language. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 15–22). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- Freedman, S. W., & Ball, A. F. (2004). Ideological becoming: Bakhtinian concepts to guide the study of language, literacy, and learning. In A. F. Ball & S. W. Freedman (Eds.), *Bakhtinian perspectives on language, literacy, and learning* (pp. 3–33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English*. London: British Council.
- Graddol, D. (1999). The decline of the native speaker. *AILA Review*, 13, 57–68.
- Graddol, D. (2001). English in the future. In A. Burns & C. Coffin (Eds.), *Analysing English in a global context* (pp. 26–37). New York: Routledge.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next*. London: British Council.
- Gray, J. (2002). The global coursebook in English language teaching. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 151–167). London: Routledge.
- Higgins, C. (2003). “Ownership” of English in the outer circle: An alternative to the NS-NNS dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37, 615–644.
- Holliday, A. (2007). *Doing and writing qualitative research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Hu, G. (2012). Assessing 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. 123–143). New York: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language: New models, new norms, new goals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2006a). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 157–181.
- Jenkins, J. (2006b). The spread of English as an international language: A testing time for testers. *ELT Journal*, 60, 51–60.
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). *World Englishes: A resource book for students* (2nd ed.). London/New York: Routledge.
- Kachru, B. B. (1986). *The alchemy of English*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). Models for non-native Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: Englishes across cultures* (2nd ed., pp. 48–75). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2006). Which model of English: Native-speaker, nativised or lingua franca? In R. Rubdy & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 71–83). London: Continuum.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010a). *The Routledge handbook of world Englishes*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010b). Researching English as a lingua franca in Asia: The Asian Corpus of English (ACE) project. *Asian Englishes*, 31(1), 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(1), 121–140.
- Kubota, R. (2001a). Learning diversity from world Englishes. *The Social Studies*, 92(2), 69–72.
- Kubota, R. (2001b). Teaching world Englishes to native speakers of English in the USA. *World Englishes*, 20(1), 47–64.
- Kubota, R. (2012). The politics of EIL: Toward border-crossing communication in and beyond English. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language* (pp. 55–69). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Li, D. C. S. (2007). Researching and teaching China and Hong Kong English: Issues, problems and prospects. *English Today*, 23(3&4), 11–17.

- Li, D. C. S. (2009). Attitudes towards English as an international language: The pervasiveness of native models among L2 users and teachers. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 81–118). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Lowenberg, P. (2012). Assessing proficiency in EIL. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language* (pp. 84–102). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Manara, C. (2012). *Intercultural dialogue and English language teaching: Indonesian teacher educators' narratives of professional learning*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia.
- Marlina, R. (2010). Teachers of Englishes. *English Teaching Professional*, 66, 47–49, Keyways Publishing: Chichester.
- Marlina, R., & Giri, R. (2013). “We provide the best international education and use international-oriented learning materials”: Questioning the ‘international’ from the perspective of English as an international language. In N. Zacharias & C. Manara (Eds.), *Contextualising the pedagogy of English as an international language: Issues and tensions* (pp. 75–98). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Publishing Scholars.
- Matsuda, A. (2002). “International understanding” through teaching world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 21(3), 436–440.
- Matsuda, A. (2005). Preparing future users of English as an international language. In A. Burns (Ed.), *Teaching English from a global perspective: Case studies in TESOL series* (pp. 62–72). Alexandria: TESOL.
- Matsuda, A. (2009). Desirable but not necessary? The place of world Englishes and English as an international language in English teacher preparation program in Japan. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 169–189). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Matsuda, A. (2012a). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Matsuda, A. (2012b). Teaching materials in EIL. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay, G. Hu, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 168–185). New York: Routledge.
- Matsuda, A., & Friedrich, P. (2010). When five words are not enough: A conceptual and terminological discussion of English as a lingua franca. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 4, 20–30.
- Matsuda, A., & Friedrich, P. (2012). Selecting an instructional variety for an EIL curriculum. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language* (pp. 17–27). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Mauranen, A. (2006). A rich domain of ELF: The ELFA corpus of academic discourse. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5(2), 145–159.
- Mauranen, A., & Ranta, E. (2008). English as an academic lingua franca – The ELFA project. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 7(3), 199–202.
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, S. L. (2003). EIL curriculum development. *RELC Journal*, 34(1), 31–47.
- McKay, S. L. (2010). English as an international language. In N. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 89–115). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- McKay, S. L. (2012a). 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: Routledge.
- McKay, S. L. (2012b). Teaching materials for 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. 70–83). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- McKay, S. L., & Bokhorst-Heng, W. (2008). *International English in its sociolinguistic contexts: Towards a socially sensitive EIL pedagogy*. London: Routledge.

- Nieto, S. (1999). Critical multicultural education and students' perspectives. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (pp. 191–215). London: Falmer Press.
- Pennycook, A. (1990). Critical pedagogy and second language acquisition. *System*, 18(3), 303–314.
- Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction: Critical approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 329–348.
- Pennycook, A. (2000). The social politics and the cultural politics of language classrooms. In J. K. Hall & W. G. Eggington (Eds.), *The sociopolitics of English language teaching* (pp. 89–103). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Prodromou, L. (2007). Is ELF a variety of English? *English Today*, 23(2), 47–53.
- Quirk, R. (1990). Language varieties and standard language. *English Today*, 21, 3–10.
- Saraceni, M. (2009). Relocating English: Towards a new paradigm for English in the world. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 9(3), 175–186.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELF Journal*, 59(4), 339–340.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2006). Towards making 'Euro-English' a linguistic reality. In K. Bolton & B. B. Kachru (Eds.), *World Englishes: Critical concepts in linguistics* (pp. 47–50). London: Routledge.
- Sharifian, F. (2009). *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Sharifian, F. (2011). *Cultural conceptualisations and language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins & Co.
- Shim, R. J. Y. (2002). Changing attitudes toward TEWOL in Korea. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 12(1), 143–158.
- Shin, J. K. (2004). The use of Freirean pedagogy in teaching English as an international language: Raising the critical consciousness of EFL teachers in Korea. *LLC Review*, 4(1), 64–84.
- 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.
- Simons, H. (2009). *Case study research in practice*. London: Sage.
- Smith, L. E. (1976, December). English as an international auxiliary language. *RELJ Journal*, 7(2), 38–53.
- Smith, L. E. (1978, June). Some distinctive features of EIL vs ESOL in ELE. In *Culture learning institute report*.
- Smith, L. E. (1981). English as an international language: No room for linguistic chauvinism. Nagoya Gakuin University *Gaikokugo, Kyoikukiyo*, 3, 27–32.
- Smith, L. E. (1983). *Readings in English as an international language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Soo Hoo, S. (1993). Students as partners in research and restructuring schools. *Educational Forum*, 57, 386–393.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2007). Ideology, language varieties, and ELT. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 25–36). New York: Springer.
- Tomlinson, B. (2003). A multidimensional approach to teaching English for the world. In R. Rubdy & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 130–150). London: Continuum.
- Wee, L. (2013). Book review: Lubna Alsagoff, Sandra Lee McKay, Guangwei Hu, Willy A. Renandya, eds. 2012. Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(1), 202–204.
- Widdowson, H. (1997). EIL, ESL, EFL: Global issues and local interests. *World Englishes*, 16(1), 135–146.
- Xu, Z. (2002). From TEFL to TEIL: Changes in perceptions and practices: Teaching English as an international language (EIL) in Chinese universities in P.R. China. In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *Englishes in Asia: Communication, identity, power, and education* (pp. 225–240). Melbourne: Language Australia.

The Pedagogy of English as an International Language
Perspectives from Scholars, Teachers, and Students

Marlina, R.; Giri, R.A. (Eds.)

2014, X, 265 p. 10 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-06126-9