Going Global

Going Global:
Transnational Perspectives
on Globalization, Language, and Education

Edited by

Leslie Seawright

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS
PUBLISHING

Going Global:
Transnational Perspectives on Globalization, Language, and Education,
Edited by Leslie Seawright

This book first published 2014

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

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

ISBN (10): 1-4438-6333-5, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-6333-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many of the works contained in this volume grew out of presentations given in Doha, Qatar at the Texas A&M University of Qatar Liberal Arts International Conference in 2013 and 2014. Therefore, I must give credit to my fellow conference committee members that made possible such diverse and significant panels and presentations: Hassan Bashir (Chair 2013), Troy Bickham, and Phillip Gray. In addition, I must thank the graduate student assistants, postdoctoral research assistants, and student employees who worked tirelessly on the organization and creation of the conferences: Hamza Jenhangir, Amy Hodges, Colby Seay, and Alia AlHarthy. A special thank you to Hanaa Loutfy, an undergraduate student, who spent many hours and much effort in making this edited collection possible. I owe a debt of gratitude to the Liberal Arts Program administrative assistants, Khadija ElCadi and Amal Hassan, for their constant oversight of our program, the conference, and all of the details that make the difference between success and failure in our collective endeavors.

The conferences and this book would not have been possible without multiple funding sources. I would like to thank Qatar Petroleum, the sole industry sponsor of the conference, and the Texas A&M University of Qatar special initiatives TIPE (The Initiative in Professional Ethics) and ICTS (Initiative in Culture, Technology, and Society). In addition special thanks to Dean Mark Weichold, Eyad Masad and Hamid Parsaei, all of Texas A&M University at Qatar, for their continuous support of the Liberal Arts Program and the international conferences with special funds and their attendance. The Qatar Foundation and Hamad bin Khalifa University have also played critical roles in the support and success of not only both conferences but the Liberal Arts Program and Texas A&M University at Qatar as well. The State of Qatar's focus on higher education through the creation of Education City in Doha, Qatar is a testament to its people, future, and ambitions. I am delighted and grateful to be a part of the grand design.

Finally, I must thank all of the conference speakers and participants who traveled across town and across continents to discuss globalization, multiculturalism, and education. More conversations, research, and discoveries are imperative if we are to positively impact our students, our institutions, and our nations. While our directions and opinions may vary

widely, the discussions that are born of such complex issues as globalization will continue to shape and frame future generations' notions of language, nationality and identity.

INTRODUCTION

The new forms of communication, technology, and travel suppress space/time differences and intensify inter-community contact, impressing upon us the fact that our fates are intertwined.
—Suresh Canagarajah, Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations

Globalization is not a new phenomenon. For as long as communities have reached out to other communities for trade, marriage, and allies, globalization has been a force shaping the people of such societies. What perhaps is new in the process of globalization is the pace and impact of change given new technologies in communication and travel. The availability of information from and access to the most remote portions of our globe is now largely available within seconds on an inexpensive mobile phone. New technologies have changed the way in which we see each other and ourselves. World news, other languages, religions, beliefs, customs, values, systems of government, and cultures are now easily and immediately accessible. The impact of globalization on the global and local scale is undeniable.

As educational systems have been impacted by globalization, tensions between the languages in use, local culture atrophy, and student identity concerns have plagued educators. Communities are trying to balance local perspectives with global realities in order to acknowledge the forces going on inside their communities. Joel Spring affirms, "There is a constant dynamic of interaction: global ideas about school practices interact with local school systems while, through mutual interaction, both the locals and the global are changed" (1). These ideas manifest from differences in cultural practices, values, education, religion, and other interactions. It is easy to see this dynamic play out in our own communities. From the United States where students continue to fall behind other countries in math and reading scores (OECD), to Qatar where the language of instruction in public schools has changed three times in 10 years (Khatri), school administrators and teachers are grappling with the effects of globalization on local cultures.

This volume of critical essays explores questions surrounding language and culture in our globalized world. Honoring students' cultures while

trying to prepare them for an uncertain and constantly changing future is the resounding theme of this book. In addition, what to teach and how to teach it are the fundamental questions the authors examine. The contributors to this volume are as multicultural and multi-faceted as such a volume would demand. The essays include authors and studies from Algeria, India, Iran, Ghana, Germany, Poland, Tunisia, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Yemen.

Part One of this book, Critical Perspectives on Language, Culture, and Identity, addresses global concerns related to language, specifically English as the lingua franca, and identity. School systems and universities around the world are scrambling to adapt, change, include, and revise curriculum and other educational resources to reflect the multicultural and interdisciplinary nature of our present time. As administrators, teachers, and professors we look for ways to incorporate the themes of globalization and multiculturalism. While doing so, we must also reflect and determine the ways in which we use and teach English in our classrooms. While English has become the lingua franca in Science, Business, and other fields, scholars still grapple with the implications of its adoption in many settings. To what extent should English be introduced and taught in schools around the world? Who "owns" the English language and can therefore shape its structure and aims? What are world Englishes and how can we demonstrate them to our students? Is English the language of the oppressor, an imperialist tool, or does global English offer an opportunity for greater understanding and cooperation amongst peoples and cultures?

Chapter One, Globalized English: Power, Ethics, and Ideology, provides an introduction to the controversy over English as lingua franca. The essay explores the economic, sociopolitical, and educational issues that occur as a result of the adoption of English in various countries and communities. Specifically focused on ethical issues related to the teaching of English, the authors offer a framework for examining assumptions related to who is deemed worthy of teaching language. The marginalization of non-native speakers as teachers of English is critiqued.

Vivek Dwivedi in Chapter Two, Globalization and Multiculturalism: A Linguistic Perspective, extends the dialogue related to English as lingua franca. His essay describes the dual nature of language; its ability to lend identity to groups on the one hand, while enforcing ideological oppression on the other. Local cultures feel threatened, and less privileged cultures feel forced to adapt to new ideologies and new languages in order to compete economically and develop politically. It is imperative to recognize the linguistic role English plays, both ethically and socio-politically in a globalized world.

In Chapter Three Fella Benabed, in Cross-Cultural Implications for the Use of New Englishes in Postcolonial Literatures, offers one way that non-native speakers may respond to the English language imperatives in their own societies. Recognizing the oppressive and unethical demand for English as lingua franca, especially in developing nations, Benabed details how postcolonial authors respond to such requirements. The resistance to English language conformity and hegemony has resulted in "New Englishes" being created, adopted, and adapted to better serve and represent cultural identity and needs. New non-mainstream authors of postcolonial literature have led to an expansion of the literary canon and have created opportunities for cross-cultural understanding.

Millicent Adjei in Internationalizing a Private Liberal Arts College in Ghana, Chapter Four, presents the case study of Ashesi University College, a small liberal arts college. The college wished to increase its internationalization efforts and reputation; however, the college discovered that the concept of internationalization holds different meanings between and within academic institutions, and by extension presents different contextual interpretations to various academic settings. Adjei's essay raises several questions including: What does internationalization really mean to institutions operating in an environment unique from the West, which has largely been responsible for defining the concept? How does the interpretation of the phenomenon affect what academic institutions deem as "necessary" in the training of its graduates? Can graduates really be trained to "fit into" today's multicultural global work environment? This study includes semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with the college's administration and students, naturalistic observations of the campus, and content analysis of documents.

Gamil Alamrani closes Part One with his essay, Arab ESL Students at American Universities and their Identity Formation Process. In it, he describes how Arab students at the University of Arkansas navigate their cultural and religious identities in a Western environment. Literacy studies, specifically the ideological model of literacy which emphasizes the social and cultural nature of literacy acquisition, offers a framework to study ESL students and the complicated issues related to identity construction. Alamrani presents a case study of several Arab ESL students as their cultural identities are conflicted and questioned by the larger social context and classroom performance.

In Part Two of this book, In the Classroom: Globalization and Education, issues directly related globalization, pedagogy, and classroom practices are discussed. The themes explored in this section are complex and troubling for educators. Should multiculturalism be taught? If so, who

should teach it? How do students learn about culture? What is a framework for teaching globalization, gender, religion, and other complicated issues? The essays in this section offer case studies, interviews, lesson plans, and approaches to understanding and teaching in various contexts and places.

Jeannie Waller in Chapter Six, African American English and Code-Switching in School, examines one specific English in the context of a rural community in Arkansas, USA. African American English remains controversial as a variation, even though several scholars have declared it as an authentic version of English. For teachers in the community's schools, nothing but Standard American English (SAE) is allowed. This pits teachers versus students and, ultimately, hurts student identity formation for the children who speak AAE in this community. Waller explores the environment of these children and their lives in school while holding up a critical lens on similar practices around the world.

Chapter Seven, Integrating Applied Anthropology to Teach Gender Roles in the Age of Globalization, presents a practical approach to teaching students about gender in a multicultural context. Residents from over 190 countries currently live and work in Germany. In such a diverse and multicultural space, identity formation and gender roles are complicated and important topics. Ursula Bertels and Noémie Waldhubel offer insight into a project currently taking place in the city of Münster, Germany meant to contribute to the identity formation of girls and boys. Called Wann ist ein Mann ein Mann (When is a man a man, WIEMEM), this project is in its third year of being implemented in the city. The project's approach is described and lessons plans presented in this chapter.

Salah Ayari in Studying Arabic Abroad: A Transformative Experience, Chapter Eight, looks at students' intercultural competencies by examining the study abroad experiences of native English speakers learning Arabic. He follows several students on their 10-week intensive cultural and language immersion program to Tunisia. His findings suggest that not only do students' language abilities increase when given study abroad opportunities, but so too do their intercultural competencies and communication practices.

Chapter Nine, The Globalization of the Teaching of Poetry in the 21st Century, explores how the teaching of a specific subject, in this case poetry, can positively affect students impacted by globalization. Andy Trevathan argues that poetry can aid in writing instruction, identity formation, and critical thinking skills. Despite a general decline in poetry publication and instruction, students stand to benefit from the practice of studying, reading, analyzing, and writing poetry, especially in the current

context of multiculturalism and globalization. In addition, poetry leads to the negotiation of meaning making, which develops voice and a sense of audience in a specific community. These skills are invaluable for students at various levels of secondary and university training.

In Chapter Ten, Why do Designers Have to Take Writing Classes?, Mohanalakshmi Rajakumar explores the context of design students studying English, specifically composition, at an American branch campus in the Middle East. Students are often resistant to taking courses they deem unnecessary or unrelated to their major, and this is a frequent source of contention for students required to take English writing courses. Combine this resistance with the fact that the students in this study are all native Arabic speakers first and ESL students, and a complicated picture arises for faculty and students. While many instructors expect students at the branch campus to perform like their American counterparts, Rajakumar notes the ethical and pedagogical faults of such an approach. Using student writing examples and assignments, the branch campus context and expectations are explored.

Eve Baldwin in Chapter Eleven, Looking Back, Looking Forward: Bringing Home Culture to Play in the College Classroom, argues that cultural groups draw strength from their most essential characteristics. Research suggests that the first year of college is a traumatic time in students' lives and educators must understand the unfamiliar territory students enter when arriving at campus. As students navigate new identities and roles, allowing them to connect with their home culture in writing assignments can help them bridge the familiar to the unfamiliar. Students who feel a sense of pride in their home identities will have confidence in writing about these and will produce more quality written products which, in turn, may alleviate some of their apprehension about the overall college experience.

The final chapter, Isn't Everyone a Plagiarist?: Teaching Plagiarism IS Teaching Culture, asks instructors and university administers to rethink current plagiarism penalties and violations, especially at institutions with majority ESL populations. LeAnn Rudd and Amy Hodges present the case study of student who habitually plagiarizes writing assignments. Through intensive discussion and interviews with this student, a new perspective on culture, American branch campus pedagogy, ESL education, and plagiarism definitions is gained. The authors contend that institutions and instructors need to re-examine issues of culture, cultural markers, ESL writing, plagiarism, and student identity and engage in dialogue with students on the interplay between ethos and competing academic notions of learning, sharing, and writing.

References

Canagarajah, Suresh.(2013) *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. New York: Routledge.

Khatari, Shabina S. (2013). "Qatar's education system grapples with language challenges." *Doha News Online*.

OECD. (2012) Programme "For International Student Assessment (PISA) Results from 2012/ United States." http://www.oecd.org/unitedstates/PISA-2012-results-US.pdf

Spring, Joel. (2009). *Globalization of Education.* New York: Routledge.

PART I:

CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES ON LANGUAGE, CULTURE, AND IDENTITY

CHAPTER ONE

GLOBALIZED ENGLISH: POWER, ETHICS, AND IDEOLOGY

ZOHREH R. ESLAMI, KATHERINE L. WRIGHT, AND SUNNI SONNENBURG

Society today is more global than ever before, and people need a linguistic medium for interactions. Businesses conduct international transactions on a daily basis and must be able to communicate with customers. American engineers order South Korean parts for their machines being assembled in Mexico and then shipped to the United States. Students from all over the world come to English speaking countries to attend college. The internet provides access to almost anywhere in the world with absolutely no travel involved, and countries come together for military invasions, humanitarian aid and natural disaster relief. English is now at the forefront of international relations, business, tourism, education, science, computer technology and even media.

English is often viewed as an essential tool in developing and changing nations' economic systems. In some countries, in order to assist the spread of English, improve the society's English proficiency, and meet the needs of developing situations, various kinds of English programs have been established. English courses are offered in elementary and high schools, adult education programs in English are present, and various media, such as radio and television, have also made great contributions to the improvement of English proficiency of people from all walks of life.

Governments play a central role in this local hegemony through dictating policies and systems to be implemented to facilitate English teaching and learning countrywide. A predominant emphasis on the teaching, learning, and testing of English in order to advance political and economic goals is prevalent in many countries. Performance in compulsory English study from early secondary school on and scores on national examinations, including compulsory English, continue to be critical factors for entrance into post-secondary education positions.

Meanwhile, scientists, technicians, teachers, and many other professionals are required to master English in order to read literature about advanced technology and management from developed countries.

However, the worldwide use of English introduces a whole set of issues. Will English replace other languages or accompany them? Will countries create equitable opportunities for their citizens to learn English? What language policies will countries enact and how will these affect the native languages and culture? To address these and other questions, this chapter includes a summary of sociopolitical issues related to the spread of English; a description of language policies; the debate over English as an international language (EIL), including its relevance to English language teachers and their native/non-native status; and insight into specific critical issues related to the spread of English.

Different Views Related to the Global Spread of English

Is English a neutral or innocent instrument? Critical linguist (e.g., Mahboob, 2011; Kandiah, 2001; Robinson, 2009) believe English, which, in some "standard" form, is the staple of the global medium of communication is hardly a neutral or innocent instrument. It defines a discourse whose conventions of grammar and use are heavily vested ideologically, affirming and legitimizing particular ways of seeing the world, particular forms of knowledge, and particular relations of power. All these factors work decidedly against the best interests of disadvantaged countries (Phillipson, 2008a).

While much of English's dissemination has evolved naturally, there has been some "forced" spread of English. Edge (2003) asserts that the United States has spread English through military invasions and "covert Christianity". Especially in Iraq and Afghanistan, but also in Israel and Palestine, American military presence has increased the importance of English. Since Americans have influential power in these countries, it is to the citizen's advantage to learn and speak English. It should be noted that, while Edge appreciates the informed decision of people to learn and use English to open lines of communication, he criticizes those that use outright deception to do so (Edge, 2003). This phenomenon is relevant to teachers as "the extent that the dominance of English-speaking nations is to be imposed by force, English language teachers may now explicitly be perceived as a second wave of imperial troopers" (Edge, 2003, 703).

According to Pennycook (2000), the dominant academic line on the spread of English in applied linguistics espouses a liberal attitude. Based on a mixture of general political liberalism and a more specific academic

apoliticism, a view that academic work should somehow remain objective, this approach either denies ideological implications of the global spread of English, or suggests that they are not the concern of applied linguistic scholars. An example of this line of thinking is Crystal (1997) who claims to offer "a detached account" of global English (vii –viii). He argues for support for the benefits of English as a global means of communication, and does not deny the importance of multilingualism either.

However, such a view of celebrating universalism while sustaining difference tends to downplay the ideological implications of the global expansion of English and thus is problematic. As Pennycook (2000) suggests, such a view, while appearing to maintain a stance of "scientific objectivity," is in fact associated with a liberal ideology that favors a capitalist market-driven "freedom-of-choice" approach in interpreting human behavior – "everyone is free to do what they like with English, to use English in beneficial ways and to use other languages for other purposes" (111). As submitted by Phillipson (2008a):

> Is there a choice then between the panacea of English supposedly guaranteeing economic success, and the pandemic we are experiencing of corporate and military globalisation, environmental degradation, energy and food crises, and an intensifying gap between global Haves and Never-to-haves, mediated and constituted by the key international language, English? (3).

Phillipson is critical of the unquestioning assumption that learning or speaking English better prepares a society to participate in the global marketplace or that it gives individuals a better economic advantage. English is never neutral. The whole world does not have equal access to choice English education and state-of-the-art language learning facilities. Often this instruction is only available to financial and intellectual elites, not a country's masses. Thus English proficiency becomes a gate keeping measure that maintains the status quo and keeps a society's privileged in power.

The Philippines exemplifies the asymmetry of English; "since independence in 1946, the Philippines has been dominated by a relatively small group of wealthy families who control the political system through a variety of means" including the belief that English language proficiency will garner one a successful and lucrative career (Tollefson, 2000, 14). Similar to the American ideal of meritocracy, the Filipino ideology is founded to serve the interest of those privileged in society, since not all have equal access to the linguistic capital. The acceptance that learning English improves one's lot in life is not maintained with force but

primarily through consensual social practices which only benefit the haut monde. There is nothing 'normal' about the way English has become established – it is a survival strategy dictated by economic and political pressures, which dovetail with linguistic imperialism. Causal factors and particular interests are behind the expansion of English in the neoimperial world (Phillipson, 2008b).

Linguistic hegemony perpetuates the spread of English because "alternatives to the current linguistic hierarchies are seldom considered and tend to be regarded as counterintuitive and in conflict with a commonsensical, 'natural' order of things" (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996, 433). American culture has infiltrated the global consciousness through business and media, therefore English language is essential to participate in the world marketplace. This blind acceptance of English neglects the fact that certain people are benefitting. On a macro and micro level, certain entities are constructed to profit with English's prevalence and power. Underscoring the supremacy and authority of English, Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1996) note:

> As English is the dominant language of the U.S., the UN, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, many other world policy organizations, and most of the world's big businesses and elites in many countries worldwide, it is the language in which the fate of most of the world's citizens is decided, directly, or indirectly (440-1).

Thus, as English language teachers, we are suddenly put in a precarious position of supporting linguistic hegemony and neocolonialism by entering foreign countries and promoting English language attainment. Edge (2003) even likens TESOL professionals to imperial troopers that "move in, following 'pacification,' with the unspoken role ... of facilitating the consent that hegemony requires" (703). Therefore English language educators need to be cognizant of *linguicism.* Skutnabb-Kangas define this construct as the "ideologies, structures and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (material and immaterial) between groups which are defined on the basis of language" (cited in Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996, 437). More recently, Ammon (2000) contributed to the definition of *linguicism*, identifying "the valuing of NS [native speaker] English language forms above those of NNSs [non-native speakers] even though the former do not lead to greater communicative efficiency for the majority in international contexts of use" (cited in Jenkins, 2006, 44).

English Hegemony

Hegemony, and its associated concepts of consent and acceptance, suggests that many forms of dominance appear to be jointly produced through complicated forms of social interaction, socio-cultural assumptions, and discursive practices. It is critical to investigate how we are responding to "global English" and how our responses are related to the operation of the hegemony of "global English."

Edge (2003) defines hegemony as "a relationship based not on explicit coercion, but on established power and the consent of the majority to go along with the arrangements that flow from that power because of the rewards that the majority receives" (702). Gramsci (1971) suggests hegemony works when the dominated accept dominance as natural, and act in the interest of the powerful out of free will. In another words, inequities are internalized or taken for granted by both the dominant and dominated groups as being natural and legitimate. Consensus and acceptance contribute to the global hegemony of English in the form of uncritical support for its dissemination and our participation in the process. Thus, the global dominance of English should be considered partly as a product of the local hegemonies of English. Teachers need to be informed and instructed that they may be implicitly supporting a diffusion-of-English paradigm, reflexively indoctrinating learners and reinforcing the society's linguistic hegemonic attitudes.

Role of Government

The extent that English has led to social inequities is related to how English is used by the government. For example, in Japan, English is primarily associated with international government and access to popular culture, minimizing its effects of inequality. However, in the Philippines, English is used for internal purposes and is a central basis for determining who has access to economic resources and political power (Tollefson, 2000). This distinction leads to a discussion of language policy, a "broad, overarching term for decisions on rights and access to languages and on the roles and functions of particular languages and varieties of language in a given polity" (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996, 434). Presented here are the policies most representational of the research field. While many similar theories exist, these are the most common and widely accepted.

Monolingualism is one language policy "in which national unity and security are associated with a single dominant language and the politically

dominant group holds power in part by excluding other languages from public use" (Tollefson, 2000, 14). In a country that has adopted this policy, the ability to speak English is a primary determination of access to wealth and power. Usually, access to high-quality English education is limited to the elite, helping to maintain the hierarchy.

By contrast, assimilation encourages minority groups to adopt the language of the majority (English) as their own. This is the educational policy in the United States. Speakers of other languages are placed in ESL (English as a Second Language) classes and taught that English is the language of education and success.

A third policy, pluralism, encourages cultural and linguistic diversity. In a pluralistic society, English may be common but does not hold a special power. Pluralistic governmental policies encourage and promote the use of a wide range of languages and government services are accessible in languages other than English (Tollefson, 2000).

The Japanese communication scholar Tsuda described language policy as a continuum, with diffusion-of English and ecology-of-language as the endpoints. The diffusion-of-English paradigm is characterized by monolingualism, Americanization, homogenization of world culture, and linguistic, cultural, and media imperialism. At the opposite end, ecology-of-language is characterized by multilingualism, maintenance of languages and cultures and protection of national sovereignties (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996). Language initiatives can be seen as shifts toward one end or the other. The English-only movement in the U.S. sits on the diffusion-of-English end while the pluralistic policy and minority language rights sit on the ecology end (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996).

Local vs. Global Tensions

As asserted by Modiano (2004), "Retaining our indigenous cultures and language(s) while reaping the benefits of large-scale integration via a language of wider communication is the challenge many of us will no doubt have to come to terms with in the years to come" (225). Within the English as an International Language (EIL) approach, there is no relationship between using English as a global language and assimilating the culture of native English speakers. English becomes localized as well as denationalized, is learned by all levels of society, and is established alongside local languages in multilingual contexts (Teodorescu, 2010). The emerging local standards need not and should not align with American or British standards (Teodorescu, 2010). As submitted by Jenkins (2009);

> Younger English speakers in Expanding Circle countries, particularly in East Asia, are beginning to realize that native-like English is no longer relevant to their international communication needs. Instead, they seem increasingly to wish to make their own decisions about the kind of English they speak, and to protect – by means of the influence of their L1 on their English accent – a sense of their own local identity, as well as to develop some kind of hybrid global identity in their English, instead of being told to take on the identity of an NS of English in the US or UK (54).

EIL users thus liberate themselves from the imposition of native speaker norms as well as the cultural baggage associated with it. English is not simply an object used in different places, but rather something that emerges from local discursive practices. As Canagarajah (2007) argues, "LFE [lingua franca English] is not a product located in the mind of the speaker; it is a social process constantly reconstructed in sensitivity to environmental factors" (94). According to Pennycook (2010);

> We do not need to know the *what, but the how and the why. We need to* understand how people position themselves towards it, how they locate it within their linguistic repertoire, how it contributes to shaping their identities and how they use it to participate in, or resist, aspects of globalisation (123).

Despite the fact that English language use and its promotion is intended by some to further their political, economic and religious agendas, English users worldwide have realized that native-like English is no longer required for international communication. Speakers increasingly seem to wish to make their own decisions about the kind of English they speak, and to protect a sense of their local identity (by means of their accent). Many speakers are also working to develop some kind of hybrid global identity in their English, instead of being told to take on the identity of an NS of English (Jenkins, 2009). Many have resisted and, in fact, changed the language to reflect their own religious and cultural values (Mahboob, 2011). In the indigenization process regional cultural concepts influence the English language and give it a local flavor. Furthermore, this process signifies that EIL users are not passive recipients of native speaker norms of language use and culture; they resist by adapting and changing the language to suit their own purposes.

Othering and the Dichotomy of Native vs. Non-native English Speakers

Research estimates show that about 80 per cent of English language teaching professionals worldwide are bilingual users of English (McKay, 2002). However the English Language Teaching (ELT) field continues to subscribe to the dualistic labels of 'native speaker' (NS) and 'non-native speaker' (NNS) when discussing educators in the profession. The seemingly simplistic categorization of ELT teachers into either classification of NS or NNS inherently ranks the NS characterization as superior. Non-native English language teachers, learners, and administrators have been conditioned to have low self-efficacy and feel inferior by the type of discourses and practices they are exposed to. Like good is better than evil, right is better than wrong, native is better than non-native, these brands are encumbered with judgments. Therefore, NSs of English versus NNSs of English is a "power driven, identity laden, and confidence affecting" contrast (Davies, 1991, as cited in Liu, 1999, 85).

Definitions of 'native speaker' have emphasized traits such as birth, heredity, and innateness of linguistic qualities (Mahboob, 2011). Additionally, there is an abstracted notion of an idealized native speaker of English from which ethnic and linguistic minorities are automatically excluded (Leung, Harris & Rampton, 1997). Therefore, notions of "Native English Speaker" are associated with marginalization and 'othering' based on race, linguistic variety, and skin color.

One source of such 'othering' could be seen in the discourse on the website of ELIC (English Language Institute/China), an organization that yearly sends Christian teachers, mainly from the United States, to teach English in Chinese universities across the country. Apart from clearly supporting a simple argument about the superiority of English, this website's view of the richness of English also ascribes certain qualities to native speakers of English - the idea that native English speakers are role models who have the power to influence and save the narrow-minded. Native speakers are portrayed as superior not only because of their knowledge of the English language, but because of certain higher inherent qualities granted to them as native speakers of English. Consider the following excerpt taken from recruitment messages, which appeared on the ELIC website in April 2004:

> ELIC (English Language Institute/China) first broke ground in 1982 by sending our first team of teachers into China . . . . Your passion to serve these people and **bring them excellence** in the English language will provide opportunity for you to **influence each individual**, one life at a

> time. Deep within China's Himalayan frontier . . . **the English language is revered**. . . . You'll provide these students with a language **they so desire to learn** and a **hope they so passionately seek** . . . (emphasis added)

These writings produce discourse of Self and Other and construct speakers of English from the native speaker/non-native speaker dichotomy and subscribing a lower status to one versus the other.

When examining job ads posted for English language teachers, the above assertions are corroborated. Two examples are shared below:

> International ESL Jobs
> EQuest Company (www.equest.edu.vn)
> 22 July 2008 email:
> Job posting:
> Job description: ….....
> Requirement: ….....
> Salary:
>
> The salary is based on the degrees, teaching certificates, teaching experiences, how long you commit to work, results of the TOEFL IBT tests (2) taken at the company and the trial sessions. Salary is paid on the last day of the calendar month. Teacher from US, England, Australia, Canada: 1200-1500 USD/month
>
> Teacher from India, The Philippines, South Africa and countries where people are bilingual: 700-1000 USD/month

This posting email explicitly privileges NES teachers from the 'inner circle' countries. The bilingual speakers of English, no matter their language proficiency, added linguistic resources, pedagogical knowledge or qualifications, are discriminated against by being offered less salary. These discriminatory discourse and practices is strong in both the native-English speaking and the non-English speaking countries and is shared by both expatriate and local program administrators. As discussed above, in hegemonic practices the supremacy of English is often unquestioned and taken to be an obvious matter of common sense (Eslami,2013). The dominated group assumes that certain ideas and discursive positions are natural and universal (Gramsci, 1971).

In many cases, especially in non-English speaking countries, this power structure leads to hiring practices in language schools that privilege native-English speakers over non-native speakers, even if a native speaker has no English language teaching credentials. The assumption that native speakers provide the best models and serve as the best teachers has been labeled the "native speaker myth". The notion of a native speaker is

further tied in with issues of racism in English language education. For a ELT paradigm shift to occur, research, publication and critical pedagogy that eradicate the NS/NNS dichotomy need to be established. There is no intrinsic relationship between 'nativeness' and ability and authority of English, yet these binary labels are influential and impact the identity of the NNEST (Non-native English Speaking Teachers).

The differential treatment given to native and non-native English speakers results in discriminatory hiring practices and pay scales. In addition to dichotomizing NESTs (Native English Speaking Teachers) and NNESTs, there are other cultural and political agendas that privilege NESTs. One of these is the relationship between English and Christianity (Mahboob, 2011). The role of Christianity in the spread of English language is discussed in the next section.

Christianity and the Spread of English Language

Discourses of Christianity have been strongly entangled in the field of English language teaching. These links go back to the times of colonization. The non-Christian world was seen as a barbarous place that needed to be saved and rescued from their imminent doom (Mahboob, 2011). As submitted by Hixon (2008), Christianity has been central to the spread of Euro-American values and languages worldwide. Christianity is also at the heart of the Myth of America, the view that the USA has a God-given right to spread its values worldwide by military and economic force (cited by Phillipson 2008b).

Missionaries believed that the study of English could pave the way for Christianity by allowing other people to grasp the key concepts of the Christian worldview and enabling them to read the English Bible and other religious materials in their original form. English language training was viewed as the path of least resistance through which to bring the hearts and minds of people to God. Others promoted English as a way to introduce Western ideas to the world to undermine "backward" traditions. Thus, from the beginning, English language instruction was used to save the savages by converting them to Christianity, replacing their native languages with English (Rafael, 2000).

However, the spread of English was not only based on moral values; economic aspirations were tightly connected to it. This missionary element in English language teaching is particularly important in understanding the discourses on English and how English as a "global" language is not a neutral phenomenon, but laden with colonial implications. Consider the

following examples taken from different websites recruiting native English speaking language teachers and promoting English language teaching:

> It's your chance to impact two generations - shepherds and the sheep - with your language and life. We desire to educate and train superbly competent teachers of English, the global language of modernization and development, to enable those in developing countries to maximize their contribution to the holistic progress of society. (Source: English Language Institute China Website)

The discourse used above not only asserts the superiority of English; it also promotes the idea that native English speakers are role models who have the power to influence and save the unenlightened. Mahboob (2011, 51-52) cites several other English teacher recruitment advertisements to illustrate these organizations do not require training in TESOL and the main qualifications listed for the jobs are being a believer in Jesus as Lord and Savior and a native speaker of American English. The concept of nativeness is tied to Christianity and shows how Christian native speakers are recruited to be sent abroad to enlighten the unenlightened.

Conclusion

The teaching and learning of English in a third-world/postcolonial country is never a simple transparent process with clear-cut meanings and this complexity of English in cultures bespeaks the resilience of the 'expanding circle' countries (Mahboob, 2011; Kandiah, 2001; Robinson, 2009). English discourse and its use are heavily vested ideologically, affirming and legitimizing particular ways of seeing the world, forms of knowledge, and particular relations of power (Phillipson, 2008a and b). The legacy of English language teaching embedded in colonial relations defines and complicates the connection between local specificities and the global context of the hegemony of English.

The rapid spread of English internationally has created a paradox. The language promoted as a liberating and equalizing force has furthered social, cultural, political, economic, and linguistic imbalance. Thus incorporating culturally and critically responsive instruction should be the paramount concern of educators because it is necessary to "unpack unequal distributions of power and privilege, and teach students . . . cultural competence about themselves and each other" (Gay, 2003, 181). The goal of education should be to benefit the public good. Therefore, universities should be accountable for supporting parallel language competencies and by instructing future educators that "language policy

efforts need to be concentrated on diverse local language ecologies and maintaining a healthy balance between English and other languages" (Phillipson, 2008a, 7). Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1996) advocate an *ecology-of-language* paradigm as proposed by Tsuda (1997). This paradigm can be viewed not as the antithesis of the *diffusion-of-English* paradigm, which focuses on capitalism and monolingualism, but rather the far end of the continuum on different language policy approaches. The *ecology-of-language* paradigm endorses:

1. a human rights perspective
2. equality in communication
3. multilingualism
4. maintenance of languages and cultures
5. protection of national sovereignties
6. promotion of foreign language education (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1996, p. 436)

These paradigm characteristics should find their way not only into language policy decisions but also in classroom curriculum and instruction decisions. Language policy concerns might seem out of the sphere of a teacher's control; however teachers can change perspectives by supporting additive rather than subtractive language learning and acceptance and inclusion of varieties of English. Often teachers are advised to promote an English only policy in the classroom, silencing the identity of the learner and ignoring research findings that show:

> a learner-centered position which prioritizes language learning objectives while simultaneously advocating the exclusive use of the target language is untenable. The majority of current pedagogical thought holds that optimal L1 use can enhance and support L2 learning as well as contributing to the development of multilingual and multicultural language learner identities (Rivers, 2011, 104).

As suggested by Eslami (2013), in order to promote multilingualism and preserve vibrant local cultures and languages, it is of essence to have governmental, non-governmental, international, and nationally based concerted efforts and appropriate policies. Supporting bilingualism in the classroom will encourage a debunking of the majority of "the monolingual fallacy, the native speaker fallacy, the early start fallacy, the maximum exposure fallacy, the subtractive fallacy" (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000, 37), all currently endorsed by the TESOL community. Continuing multilingualism will not only support the learners' identity, but also the identity of the

bilingual speaker of English teacher. Seidlhofer (1996) posits that "native speakers know the destination, but not the terrain that has to be crossed to get there: they themselves have not travelled the same route" (70), thus bilingualism should be viewed as a benefit not a liability. Additionally, Seidlhofer maintains that too often "in communicative language teaching, the emphasis has tended to be on the target competence of the learner, but not on the pedagogic competence the teacher needs to have in order to facilitate learning" (1999, 237). Learners can only flourish under the guidance and tutelage of well-trained and qualified educators that endorse culturally and linguistically responsive curriculum.

Furthermore, ethics regarding the spread of English has a place in language teacher training and education. Ignoring the fundamental role ethics play in language policy and teaching only promotes linguicism and linguistic imperialism. Linguicism and linguistic imperialism need to be resisted with vigilance and awareness. Supporting an ecology-of-language paradigm as well as "consider[ing] which agents promote or constrain English and for what purposes" (Phillipson, 2008b, 251) will elevate the TESOL field and equip learners to be critical thinkers aware of the power and privilege of English.

References

Ammon, U. (2000). Towards more fairness in international English: linguistic rights of non-native speakers? in Phillipson, R. (Ed), *Rights to Language, Equity, Power, and Education: Celebrating the 60th Birthday of Tove Skutnabb-Kangas*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 111-16.

Canagarajah, S. (2007). The ecology of global English. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 1(2) 89-100.*

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

Edge, J. (2003). Imperial troopers and servants of the lord: A vision of TESOL for the 21st century. *TESOL Quarterly, 37,* 701-709.

Eslami. Z. R. (2013) Ethical Issues in the Spread of English as a Global Language: Is the Spread of English a Cure or a Curse? In H. Bashir, P.W. Gray, and E. Masad (Eds).*Co-Existing in a globalized World: Key Themes in Inter-Professional Ethics* (pp. 135-147). Lexington Books

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53,* 106-116.

Gramsci, A. (1971). Selections from the prison notebooks. International Publishers.

Hixson,W. L. (2008). *The myth of American diplomacy. National identity and U.S. foreign policy.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2006). The spread of EIL: A testing time for testers. *ELT Journal, 60,* 42-50.

Jenkins, Jennifer (2009) World Englishes: a resource book for students, 2nd edition, London, UK, Routledge.

Kandiah, T. (2001). Whose meanings? Probing the dialectics of English as a global language. In R. Goh, et al., (Eds.) *Ariels – departures and returns: a Festschrift for Edwin Thumboo.* Singapore (pp.102-121) Oxford University Press.

Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly, 31,* 543 - 560.

Liu, L. (Ed.). (1999). *Tokens of exchange: The problems of translation in global circulations*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

McKay SL. (2002). Teaching English as an International Language: Rethinking Goals and Approaches. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mahboob, A. (2011) English: The industry. *Journal of Postcolonial Cultures and Societies*. *2(4),* 46-61.

Modiano, M. (2004). Monoculturalization and language dissemination. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *3*(3), 215-227.

Pennycook, A. (2000). English, politics and ideology. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies* (pp.107-120). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

—. (2010). Language as a Local Practice. London, England: Routledge.

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

—. (2008b). Lingua franca or lingua frankensteinia? English in European integration and globalisation. *World Englishes, 27*(2), 250-284.

Phillipson, R. & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1996). English only worldwide or language ecology. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (3), 429-452.

Rafael, V. (2000). *White Love and Other Events in Filipino History.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Rivers, D. J. (2011). Politics without pedagogy: Questioning linguistic exclusion. *ELT Journal, 65,* 103-113.

Robison, R. (2009). Truth in Teaching English. In M. Wong & S. Canagarajah (Eds.) *Christian and Critical English Language Educators in Dialogue: Pedagogical and Ethical Dilemmas.* New York: Routledge. Seidlhofer, B. (1996). 'It is an undulating feeling . . . ':

The importance of being a non-native teacher of English. *Views* 5 (1-2), 63-80.

Seidlhofer, B. (1999). Double standards: Teacher education in the expanding circle. *World Englishes, 18,* 233-245.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education - or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, New Jersey & London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tollefson, J. (2000). Policy and ideology in the spread of English. In J K Hall and W Eggington (Eds) *The sociopolitics of English language teaching* (pp. 7-20). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Teodorescu, A. (2010). Multiple perspectives on English as an international language. *Petroleum - Gas University of Ploiesti Bulletin, Philology Series*, 62(2), 75-80. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Tsuda, Y. (1997). Hegemony of English vs. Ecology of Language: Building equality in international communication. In L. E. Smith & M. L. Forman (Eds.), *World Englishes 2000: Selected essays* (pp. 21–31). Honolulu, HI: College of Language, Linguistics and Literature, University of Hawaii and the East-West Center.