

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Today in Taiwan English learning has become an enormous craze from toddlers to retirees. Indeed the status of English has long been considered to be more important than any other language and it has been deemed as an international language; however, further discussion about its features and application is needed to ensure whether the teaching and the learning in the classroom agree with this fast-developing paradigm. In this chapter, we will review: (1) the theory and application of EIL, (2) EIL and teacher education and, (3) one of the most significant parts of EIL development: the phonology teaching of EIL.

2.1 EIL

EIL is commonly known as EAL (English as an additional language), which is based on the standards of either American English or British English. Unlike EAL, it emphasizes learning English with different intelligible varieties—instead of conforming to one standard, EIL teaching aims to equip students with accommodation skill to communicate internationally.

2.1.1 The Theory of EIL

The modern concept of EIL does not exist in isolation, but has been evolved gradually in the history of the English language.

According to Kachru's renowned sociolinguistic concentric circles (1985), three circles are categorized to present the types of spread, the patterns of acquisition, and the functional allocation of English in diverse cultural contexts.

First, the Inner Circle refers to native-speaker (NS) varieties of English, such as American, British and Australian English. People in this circle are traditionally deemed as the norm-providing speakers of English.

Secondly, the Outer Circle refers to the countries where English was introduced

as a colonial language for administrative purposes, such as Singapore, Philippines, India, etc. They represent the institutionalized non-native speaker (NNS) varieties. People in this circle learn English as a second language (ESL) and they are norm-developing speakers of English.

Last, the Expanding Circle includes such countries as China, Israel, Japan, Korea and Taiwan, where English is introduced as a foreign language (EFL), and the varieties lack official status and are typically restricted in their uses. They are norm-dependent speakers of English.

With the notion of Krachru's classification of English spread and use, the following is a review of how EIL is defined.

2.1.1.1 Definition of EIL

As English achieves its present status and develops a special role that is recognized by every country (Crystal, 1997), various terms pertaining to its different features appeared, including English as a global language (Crystal, 1997), English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), World Englishes (WEs), and English as an international language (EIL). With their different focuses on the features of English function, EIL is becoming established as the appropriate term to refer to most of the current uses of English worldwide (Llurda, 2004).

Unlike the traditional view of English as a language belonging to a certain group of its NSs, EIL involves NNSs interacting in English both with NSs and other NNSs. Though a variety of difficulties exist in getting an accurate count of the current numbers of English users in the three circles, it is not difficult to imagine that present NNSs greatly outnumber the NSs and the gap between will be wider in the following decades (Mckay, 2002).

When defining the term "international language", Smith (1976) states its features regarding its relationship with culture:

- (a) its learners do not need to internalize the cultural norms of native speakers of that language.
- (b) the ownership of an international language becomes ‘de-nationalized.’
- (c) the educational goal of learning it is to enable learners to communicate their ideas and culture to others.

From the above statement, it is concluded that the traditional view of EFL, which internalizes the cultural norms of Inner Circle countries in order to use the language effectively as a medium of wider communication (Mckay, 2002), doesn’t apply to the EIL framework. This new shift of language focus leads to a tremendous change in ideology and the future of English, as Modiano (2001) suggests:

there is a ‘growing assertiveness’ among countries adopting English as a second language that English is now their language, through which they can express their own values and identities, create their own intellectual property and export goods and services to other countries. The same can be said of foreign-language speakers.

What Modiano says leads us to one of the most important issues in EIL framework—who should claim the ownership of English.

2.1.1.2 The Ownership of English

There have been two schools of thought regarding the owners of the English language: the “purist” and the “pragmatist” schools (Jenkins, 2006; Wee). The former proposes that the ownership of English lies with all the native speakers, while the latter argues that English is no longer solely owned by the native speakers. As for their tolerance for the new varieties of English, the former treats them as deviations and speakers of the newer varieties should look to native speakers for the standard setting and language pedagogy. However, the latter treats newer varieties as reasonable and natural tendency during the language development, and they think it

unnecessary to regard native speakers as the models or the owners of English.

As Widdowson (1994), one of the believers in the pragmatist theory, earlier states, “the very fact that English is an international language means that no nation can have custody over it... it is only international to the extent that it is not their (NSs) language... Other people actually own it.” What Widdowson holds on to is the belief that in speaking English, there are no native speakers because of English’s special status in the modern world.

Apart from Widdowson’s argument, there has been a keen debate on how ELT profession should treat native-speakerism. Modiano (1999) argues that “proficiency” in speaking English is no longer determined by birth but by the capacity to use the language properly. Rampton (1990) even suggests that we displace “native-speakerism” with “expertise” “affiliation”, and “inheritance”.

The pragmatist theory and many other ELT professionals give their supports to the NNSs and grant learners in the Outer and Expanding Circles scholarly reason to claim their ownership of English, just as Bourdieu (1977) maintains, “if learners of English cannot claim ownership of a language, they might not consider themselves legitimate speakers of that language.” However, the reality is that many NNSs, noted by Jenkins (2001), still prefer a model of the English variety associated with NSs. They appear reluctant to claim ownership of the English language. She suggests that this reluctance could be related to learners’ “lack of confidence” as “non-native teachers and students alike are intimidated by the native-speaker norm”.

Apart from Jenkins’ assumption of learners’ lack of confidence, another more complicated reason for NNSs’ unwillingness to claim the ownership of English is found in Holliday’s book (2005). She analyzes the complexity of her email interviewee by saying that native-speakerism is so deep-rooted in the TESOL psyche that it is difficult to eradicate. The following is the interview transcription of her

participant, an English teacher from Taiwan:

Although I did feel comfortable to be told that I did not have to be native-speaker like, I would definitely feel upset if I could not reach my expectation in pronunciation....If we take Jenkins's view and tell them (my students) to stay where they are—you don't need to twist your tongue this way and that and it's perfectly all right to keep your accent—at some point, we would terribly upset the learners because they might want to.

Besides, in Matsuda's (2003 a) study, she found that students in Japan learning English "perceive English as an international language in a sense that it is being used internationally, but "they do not believe it belongs internationally."

From Jenkins's assumption to Matsuda's findings, it can be concluded that though the notion of the ownership of English, which tried to return the pride and confidence to the NNSs, has been asserted for a long time, not every learner or teacher, native or non-native, wants to totally buy it on account of various complicated reasons.

2.1.1.3 Norms, Standards, Models, and Attitude

The renowned debate (Phillipson, 1992) between Randolph Quirk and Braj Kachru at a 1984 conference provides two different views on how norms and standards in EIL are dealt with.

Quirk deems British English as the only internationally acceptable standard, which should be learned and treated as the target for all the NNSs around the world. Teachers who are not English-speaking natives should stick to this standard by keeping in close and constant touch with it and help their students reach the near-native goal in learning.

While for Kachru, Quirk's "deficit linguistics" approach "ignores the sociolinguistic and pragmatic realities of the huge range of contexts" where English is

used as an international language. As he (1985) argues,

In my view, the global diffusion of English has taken an interesting turn: the native speakers of this language seem to have lost the exclusive prerogative to control its standardization.... What we need now are new paradigms and perspectives for linguistic and pedagogical research and for understanding the linguistic creativity in multilingual situations across cultures. (p. 30)

Kachru's view is that other forms of English, i.e. New Englishes, are now fast developing in other parts of the world where English serves as a tool for communication in multi-lingual communities. Each form has its own standard and could and should be the target for English teaching at schools. These new standards might be different from Standard British and American English, yet they should be taught in schools and should be respected as Emerging Standards.

From the EFL/ESL perspective, standard represents "correctness" in the language use; however, in light of EIL, no one is perfect in the use of this language (Kowalski, 2004). A great number of ELT educators and teachers, especially NNSs, believe in the misleading concept of "absolute proficiency" in language, trying to reach the goal of perfection. For example, Medgyes (1994) in his book illustrates interlanguage continuum, in which all users fall somewhere between zero proficiency and an absolute proficiency. He contends that NNSs of English may constantly move along the continuum as long as they learn English. Also, in the final part of the book, he also demonstrates several tips on improving language proficiency for non-native English teachers (NNETs).

However, EIL perspectives hold that language perfection is not only unattainable but also nonexistent (Kowalski, 2004). Alptekin (2002) also claims that in the EIL point of view, standardized native speaker norms are unrealistic and constraining, i.e. the model of English is found to be utopian in the real world because

there is no standard in EIL.

In reference to the models in EIL, it is necessary to first distinguish the difference between “norm” and “model.” As Dalton and Seidlhofer (1994) maintain: rather than approaching the teaching of a native speaker accent as the norm, it should be approached as a model that learners can use as a point of reference, preventing speakers of English from moving too far apart in their pronunciation.

Therefore, in EIL, there shouldn't be solely one model since English is spoken with an unrestricted choice of accent in different parts of the world. As Kachru believes (1982), “if English is used in a culturally and linguistic pluralistic context, the norm for the model should cut across the linguistic and cultural boundaries.”

For example, in a traditional ESL/ EFL class, NNETs refer to the listening materials with the recording of NSs, such as Americans and the British, as the “authentic” models. As most teachers take British and American models for the only standards in English learning, students are only exposed to a very limited spectrum of sounds in their learning experience. However, in an EIL-oriented classroom, the teachers, being native or non native, will acquaint students with different accents, regardless of the nationalities, so that students can learn English more neutrally and truthfully.

As for what might be the best models for EIL learners, Jenkins (2001) has her own answer:

I believe that the optimum pronunciation models for EIL are those of NNS fluent bilingual speakers of English. These are both more realistic and more appropriate than L1 models and yet sacrifice nothing in intelligibility. Fluent bilingual models incorporate all the core features and are thus internationally intelligible. (p. 226)

Sincerely as Jenkins suggests above and as many EIL believers argue that all

varieties of English should be treated equally because they are fully systematic and regulated by a set of rules, not everyone holds the same view. As Strevens (1987) mentions,

Many native speakers, even among teachers of English, overtly or unconsciously despise these varieties...The basic reason for these native speakers' attitudes is ignorance...Most NS, including teachers of EFL/ESL, have not experienced NNS varieties of English. (p. 37)

Fortunately, Strevens' observation about the natives' bias towards EIL has improved greatly recently. However, under certain circumstances, people simply prefer one variety of English to another. McKay (2002) states, "Whereas all varieties of English are linguistically equal, they are not considered to be socially equal. The variety with the most prestige is typically referred to as Standard English." For example, when NNETs speak English, they feel responsible to maintain a GA (general American) or RP (Received Pronunciation) accent for their students because sounding like an American may help them secure a better image of a professional English teacher. This part will be discussed later in the following accent and identity issue.

In a word, though people have improved their attitude towards EIL these days, certain users of English may have a more difficult time using English to totally reflect their identity and image as freely as they want.

2.1.2 The Application of EIL

One of the differences between EIL and ESL/EFL lies in the practicality of the language use—in a traditional EFL/ESL classroom, teaching overemphasizes learners' accuracy and conscious control over several skills, but communication inside and out of the EFL/ESL classroom differs greatly. While in an EIL classroom, teaching depends on a multitude of circumstances (Sifakis, 2003), and gives students more opportunities to be exposed to the real communication. As we take this gap between

theoretical and practical uses of English more seriously, we have to admit that English, being used by more NNSs than by NSs, calls for mutual comprehensibility. As English no longer belongs to a certain group of people, a system of intelligibility should be built up to help learners, native or non-natives, understand each other and further respect different registers of English.

2.1.2.1 Intelligibility

As we shift our emphasis in English learning from one single variety and standard, e.g. American English or British English, to multiple varieties, it is necessary to re-create a new way of understanding each other by setting up intelligibility.

Intelligibility is defined as “the overall assessment of how well a speaker can make himself or herself understood” (Subtelny et al., 1980, p. 87). In reference to EIL, as Bamgbose (1998) puts it, the traditional goal of English learning is “a one-way process in which non native speakers are striving to make themselves understood by native speakers whose prerogative was to decide what is intelligible and what is not.” However, in the EIL view, speakers of English, native or non native, have the responsibility to successfully communicate with the listeners. Once Smith (1984) argues,

native speakers are not the sole judges of what is intelligible, nor are they always more intelligible than non-native speakers. ..the greater the familiarity a speaker has with a variety of English, the more likely it is that s/he will understand and be understood by members of that speech community.

What Smith suggests above reflects one of the features of EIL—an open-minded view towards the varieties of English. For example, when it comes to non-native accent issues, some educators, Jenkins particularly, have been trying to set up a system of intelligibility for learners to learn English in an EIL manner. Jenkins (2001) maintains

that pronunciation classes should mainly concentrate on the areas with the greatest influence on intelligibility, namely, particular segmentals, nuclear stress, and articulatory setting. Other parts of pronunciation teaching should be taught exclusively on the level of reception rather than production.

In other words, in pronunciation teaching Jenkins focuses on intelligibility—helping students to understand many varieties of accents from different NNSs rather than helping students to sound like any group of NSs. Such goal is reachable as well as reasonable for EIL learners.

2.1.2.2 The Impact of EIL on TESOL

As EIL gains more attention and higher status in the ELT profession, the merely traditional dichotomy of ESL and EFL has become inadequate to satisfy the innovative trend of how language should be taught internationally (Liao, 2005).

Calls for the paradigm shift from ESL/ EFL to EIL have therefore come into play. In Richard's (2002) reflection of 30 years of TEFL/TESL, when speaking of the goals of teaching English, he believes that since "English has become the language of globalization, international communication, commerce and trade, the media and pop culture.... English is no longer viewed as the property of the English-speaking world, but is an international commodity." Jenkins (2001) also strongly contends that "we should be teaching English as an international language, rather than as a language attached to a specific culture from the English-speaking West."

Unlike the original version of TESOL position (Holliday, 2005), which takes the stance that native-speakerism is the norm and should be strictly followed, the EIL position stresses that English is international and the local context is the norm. Such change of focus has brought about, though slowly, different views of how English teaching and learning should be conducted in the TESOL profession, which will lead to the difference in how people, not only in the Inner Circle but also in the Outer and

Expanding Circle, think of themselves as speakers and learners of English.

As for the impact of EIL on the TESOL environment in Taiwan, though EIL has been a prevalent notion in the TESOL profession, it remains a vague term to a lot of English professionals in Taiwan. Very few publications and no thesis related to EIL can be found in Taiwan's English teaching profession. In addition, most programs in Taiwan's teacher education scarcely provide pre-service teachers with courses on EIL.

Furthermore, most people still hold that Taiwan is an EFL environment, which aims to teach English to its speakers as a subject to help learners to communicate with the native speakers of English. As commonly seen in the ads, English programs in Taiwan aim to help learners speak "like an American" by teaching them American slang or colloquial, which may not be appropriate in the EIL communication context. The government even promotes the idea that one of the important national development plans should include changing Taiwan into an ESL country and using English as an official language by 2008. Trapped in this outdated and parochial dichotomy of EFL and ESL, professionals and learners in Taiwan should recognize that there is a great need of understanding what EIL is and how it can transform our teaching and learning English.

2.1.2.3 EIL in the Classroom

Kachru (1982) suggests that a teacher should initiate a paradigm shift, from EFL/ESL to EIL teaching, attitudinally and methodologically by exposing students to a wider repertoire of major varieties of English, native and non native, and that teachers can focus on one specific variety and at the same time emphasize awareness and functional validity of other varieties.

Mckay (2002) writes about the teaching goals for EIL in her book--first, to ensure intelligibility among the speakers of English; secondly, to help learners develop strategies to achieve comity when English is used with speakers from other cultures;

thirdly, to develop textual competence so as to get easy access to information.

Alptekin (2002) also contends that the EIL pedagogy should prepare learners “to be both global and local speakers of English and to feel at home in both international and national culture.”

Some ELT educators also emphasize the importance of teaching materials innovation to help EIL implemented in the classroom. Chuang (2002) encourages the infusion of local culture study into the present instruction materials. He argues that the present weakness of English materials in the market lies in the lack of local culture involvement, which is suppressed by the mainstream U.K or U.S. publication. Alptekin (2002) claims that only by producing instructional materials that emphasize diversity both within and across cultures can one perhaps avoid presenting English meanings in fragmented and trivialized ways. McKay (2003) also urges the need to re-examine the traditional use of Western cultural content, mainly of the inner circle, in ELT texts.

The following is her statement:

There are clear advantages to the use of source culture content. Such content minimize the potential of marginalizing the values and lived experiences of the learners. Source culture content can also encourage learners to gain a deeper understanding of their own culture so that they can share these insights when using EIL with individuals from different cultures. Perhaps most significantly, source culture content does not place local teachers in the difficult position of trying to teach someone else’s culture.

All in all, in order to help students “think globally but act locally” (McKay, 2002), EIL goals in the classroom should be tenable by taking the local need and practicality into consideration, so that the diversities in the Outer and Expanding Circles can be fully developed and learners can express themselves and introduce their cultures in English.

2.2 EIL and Teacher Education

To demonstrate the traditional view of treating NSs as the only qualified teachers and the modified concept of accepting NNSs as the same qualified ones, Holliday (2005, p. 12) makes a table to summarize two positions in her book. Position 1 represents what she believes to be the major features of native-speakerism, and Position 2 stands for a more mutually inclusive identity of non native-speakerism.

Table 2.1: From native-speakerism to Position 2

	Native-speakerism	Position 2
Orientation	Traditional, “us”-“them” position. Setting superior “native speakers” against inferior “non-native speakers”. Cultural difference.	Struggling to make new relationships. ‘We are all in this together.’ Cultural continuity.
Language and context	English is foreign. The ‘native speaker’ is the norm.	English is international. The local context is the norm.
ESOL educator from outside the English-speaking West	She is a ‘non-native speaker.’ English is someone else’s, with a foreign culture and expertise.	She is a teacher at home. English is hers. She has her own ways of doing things. There is an instrumental use of foreign expertise. She can also be a teacher ‘abroad’, like any other

		teacher.
ESOL educator from the English-speaking West	She is a ‘native speaker’. She brings her English and culture to the uninitiated. She has theories of exotic foreign cultures.	She is a speaker of a dominant English variety—but perhaps parochial. She needs to rethink the normality of what she brings and what she meets.

Holliday claims that no one person or practice would fall neatly into one or the other, but she emphasizes that the change of the attitude is upon us.

Since position 2 from Holliday’s table is EIL-oriented and is more desired to be implemented in the present TESOL environment, teacher education has to be modified as well to cope with the paradigm shift.

When EIL is taught throughout the world, it should be more than just a theory to replace the EFL and ESL paradigm. English teachers, non native ones especially, play a very significant role in introducing EIL to their students. Brown (1995) states the importance of teacher education in the promotion of World Englishes:

Teacher education programs inculcate skills, values, and attitudes into educators who will shape what their learners acquire for an entire generation. It is appropriate for them to infuse a WE (World Englishes) perspective into their programs precisely because this perspective draws upon the truly global nature of language teaching.

Though Brown talks about World Englishes, emphasizing the covering of all varieties of English worldwide and various ways of describing and analyzing them (Jenkins, 2006), World Englishes share lots of similarities with EIL.

Matsuda (2003b) also reminds that “to incorporate WE in ELT, teacher

themselves must be aware of the current landscape of the English language.” She asserts that programs for pre-service EFL teachers focus too much on the inner circle and they would otherwise benefit from incorporating a WE perspective into their courses.

Therefore, to make a paradigm shift from EFL/ ESL to EIL, teacher education should be first modified so as to equip teachers with necessary knowledge to teach in an EIL manner.

2.3 The Significance of EIL in Boosting Non-Native Teachers’ Self-Image

As the EIL perspective encourages the development of other English varieties around the world, non native learners should be able to feel more comfortable with their English ability to express themselves. NNETs, advanced learners of English themselves, should be first to be informed of this shift and benefit from it.

A number of studies indicate that NNETs have a slightly negative self-image towards their English proficiency even though they are all qualified teachers of English in their countries. In Butler’s (2004) research, she investigated what level of English proficiency elementary school teachers themselves think they need to attain to teach their EFL students well. Her participants were from Korea, Taiwan and Japan. Her study showed that the participants perceived their proficiency levels to be lower than the minimum levels they thought necessary to teach English. Butler concludes that the resulting knowledge of their proficiency level could seriously influence their confidence, pedagogical skills, student motivation, and ultimately students’ success in acquiring English.

However, Butler’s suggestion for her participants is very norm-bound as she urges them to improve their English proficiency to implement their country’s English language policies. Instead of bringing up for her participants the fallacious assumption of EFL perspective in acquiring near-native proficiency, Butler encourages them to

work harder to polish their language skills. Such suggestion is very likely to exacerbate their lack of confidence and deepen their language anxiety instead since nativeness is unattainable and impractical in the English learning for NNETs in light of EIL.

In McDonald and Kasule's study (2005), they also found that the confidence of NNETs with regard to their command of English, which affects the effectiveness and efficiency of their teaching, is low.

Again, one particular questionnaire (Seidlhofer, 1999) asking about teachers' self-image suggests that being a NNS makes teachers feel insecure rather than confident, and that the main emphasis during their teacher training studies was more on near-native language proficiency than on effective teaching.

Though some case studies show that NNETs who feel inferior or self-doubt about their English competence are not necessarily incapable of using English (Tsui, 2003), they cannot help but think they are never good enough to teach comfortably under the long-term influence of intimidating EFL ideology.

Unfortunately, in the ELT job market, NNETs are also degraded because of their identity even though they are qualified and experienced teachers (Braine, 1999a; Rampton, 1990; McKay, 2003). Their status is unfairly lowered by their accent and nationality just because they don't look or sound like a NS, which in return deepens their inferiority. In Liu's study (1999), he indicates that NETs are given preference and NNETs to some extent experience discrimination in the job hunting process.

Salzberger-Wittenberg et al (1983) believe that when teachers do not have positive self-image, they need to spend time figuring out what is going on. They think that teachers' academic ability is constantly appraised and critically reviewed. Teachers' different attitudes toward criticism result in different outcome. "It's therefore essential that he has self-awareness and tolerance of his own shortcomings.

It's equally important that he has enough confidence to be able to distinguish between critical comment....” In the case of ELT profession, NNETs tend to underestimate themselves in terms of language competence because of their self-awareness of being a NNE user. Reves and Medgyes (1994) conclude in their study about the negative self-image of non-native English speaking teachers:

A constant realization of their limitations in the use of English may lead to a poorer self-image, which may further deteriorate language performance, and in turn may lead to a cumulatively stronger feeling of inferiority.

Fortunately, with EIL's recent infusion into the ELT community, NNETs start to re-estimate their values and qualities in the teaching. Several related studies (Brown, 1993, Seidlhofer, 1999) in the past decade, mostly conducted in EFL program in the U.S, indicate that informing NNETs of EIL concepts could help them boost their self-image and confidence. For example, one of the non-native EFL teachers from Taiwan in Brown's research (1993) echoes that she used to try very hard to be *accent-free* (italics mine), but later when she found that she could never speak exactly like a NS, she still told herself that she had to achieve the goal. She states,

“The concept that I was introduced to in this term of not having to speak native-like and still be a speaker of English is *liberating*(italics mine) to me... this important concept will enable me to help my students, in the future, as not to acquire accent-free English, but English that is intelligible to others.”

This reflective response is significant in proliferating NNETs' self-image so as to free them from the traditional paradigm.

Other EIL educators further indicate the advantages of how NNETs can benefit their students. Seidlhofer (1999) mentions that NNETs having the same language learning experience with their students could help constitute the basis for their teaching confidence, not for their insecurity.

In the ELT profession, under the influence of EIL, more and more efforts have been paid to enhance NNETs' status. For example, George Braine, founder of TESOL's NNET Caucus, illustrates their aim of the caucus: "to create a nondiscriminatory professional environment for all TESOL members regardless of native language and place of birth," "to encourage the formal and informal gatherings of nonnative speakers at TESOL and affiliate conferences," "to encourage research and publications on the role of nonnative speaker teachers in ESL and EFL contexts," "and to promote the role of nonnative speakers members in TESOL and affiliate leadership positions. (1999 b)"

Another example of NNETs' willingness to re-examine their qualities and values is the publication of several books written by NNETs. For example, Medgyes (1994) wrote "*The Non-Native Teacher*", comparing the qualities of NETs and NNETs and how NNETs should see themselves in the ELT profession. Secondly, Kamhi-Stein (2004) edited the book "*Learning and Teaching from Experience—Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professional*", asking many NNETs to tell stories of their identity issue. A similar qualitative research book is Braine's (1999) "*Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching*." These publication represents the rise of the EIL ideology in the ELT community.

2.4 The Phonology Teaching of EIL

Jenkins (2001) reveals that if EIL is genuinely to be the language for all English speakers as its name implies, there are four areas that should be put emphasis on:

First, in pronunciation in teacher education; secondly, in the testing of pronunciation; thirdly, in the status of NNS' pronunciation teachers; and fourthly, in the need for (EIL) pronunciation learning for NSs.

As the goal of EIL is to help learners use English, even with their own accent, to effectively communicate with other speakers of English, be they native or

non-native, the traditional phonology pedagogy can no longer meet the teaching goals. There are three commonly-used alternatives to replace the traditional EFL phonology teaching (Jenkins, 2001) –first, the use of a Scottish or GA model, secondly, learners focusing on any first language regional variety that appeals to them, and lastly, cloning whatever accents they find intelligible.

The above three solutions do not prove persuasive enough to replace traditional phonology teaching in that they don't take the nature of the interactions of the largest group of EIL users, i.e. NNSs. into consideration (Jenkins, 2001). In the present research, Jenkins' view is adopted mainly because she is the guru in the EIL phonology teaching and her suggestion serves as the basis for the innovative teaching of EIL phonology.

2.4.1 Traditional Vs. EIL Pronunciation Teaching

As Jenkins compares the goals of traditional and desired EIL phonology teaching, she notes that traditionally the goal of teaching pronunciation to L2 learners of English is to “mimic the accents of native speakers, either British speakers with RP accents or American speakers with GA accents.” For example, in an EFL/ESL classroom, teachers are often seen to use recording materials recorded by NSs as the target of their students' pronunciation. Students listen to the NSs repeatedly and pay effort to imitate what they hear.

In reference to the EIL pronunciation, she continues her comparison—“the rapid expansion of the number of non-native speakers of English around the world, especially in the Expanding Circle” has changed the teaching goal. Instead of focusing on how NSs speak English among themselves or to the NNSs, we need to find out “what non-native speakers do and need to be able to do when they speak English to each other in international contexts.” The new teaching goal has changed the emphasis from NSs being the standard to NNSs being the targets to deal with.

Therefore, she suggests three required goals in the EIL phonology teaching: first, mutual intelligibility among NNSs—since NNSs outnumber the NSs and become the main body of English users, the chance of NNSs’ communication among themselves is much greater than that among NSs. Secondly, the use of empirical evidence from EIL communication—instead of paying attention to NSNS (native speakers to native speakers) communication and NS intuition, we should begin to put our emphasis on the authentic communication in the EIL environment. Thirdly, greater consideration to teachability—instead of assuming students will learn whatever teachers teach, teachers should take the elements of teachable pronunciation into account. Lastly, a need to redefine error in EIL—instead of seeing whatever differs from a NS variant as an “error”, EIL teachers should accept the emerging L2 regional varieties of English. A table about the traditional and EIL phonology teaching adapted by Jenkins (2008) is shown in the following discussion.

2.4.2 EIL Phonology Teaching Application

In discussion of the procedures of teaching EIL phonology, Jenkins (2008) illustrates three steps to take.

First, teach for **intelligibility**—she suggests using the “Lingua Franca Core” (LFC), the pronunciation features which aim to “safeguard the mutual intelligibility of pronunciation in communication” since NNSs greatly outnumber NSs. She encourages EIL learners that “instead of speaking a monolithic variety of English, it is considered more important for speakers of World Englishes and English as Lingua Franca to be able to adjust their speech in order to be intelligible.”

Jenkins’ LFC is a series of pronunciation teaching requirements based on the intelligibility in EIL. Referring to empirical data drawn from EIL interactions, Jenkins decides which items may cause miscommunication regularly and which would not. The former items were designated ‘core’ for EIL phonology, while the latter, which

only differ from the NSs' ways of pronouncing but rarely cause miscommunication, were designated "non-core" Instead of treating non-core as errors in the traditional pronunciation teaching, teachers should regard it as instances of L2 regional variation. The following table illustrates the traditional pronunciation syllabus and the LFC syllabus.

Table 2.2: Traditional and intelligibility-based pronunciation targets for production

English Pronunciation features	Traditional pronunciation syllabus (used for EFL)	Lingua Franca Core (recommended for EIL)
1. Consonant sounds	all 24 sounds of RP	all sounds except /t/, /ʌ/ and /k/
2. Consonant clusters	all word positions	word initially, word medially
3. Vowel quantity (i.e. length)	long-short contrast	long-short contrast
4. Vowel quality	close to the 20 sounds of RP	L2 (consistent) regional qualities plus /ɜ:/
5. Weak forms	essential for 'naturalness'	unhelpful to intelligibility
6. Features of connected speech	all essential for 'naturalness'	inconsequential or unhelpful
7. Stress-timed rhythm	important	unnecessary / does not exist
8. Word stress	critical	unteachable / can reduce flexibility
9. Pitch movement	important for indicating attitudes and grammar	unteachable / incorrectly linked to NS attitudes and grammar
10. Nuclear (tonic) stress	critical	critical

Adapted from Jenkins, 2008

From the above table, we can conclude that when teaching EIL pronunciation, there would be items which we have to adhere to just as we used to traditionally, but there are items which we have to try not to intervene since they are "unteachable."

The second step is to leave the unteachable and the "non-core" items for acquisition through **exposure**. After the introduction of LFC, the teacher has to, instead of asking students to acquire native-like pronunciation from the non-LFC, help students to be exposed to a wide range of "NNS" regional accents, "an essential part of learning EIL... applies even more to teachers than to their student" (Jenkins, 2001). Schnitzer (1995) also asserts the importance of being exposed to a variety of accents:

What EIL users need to aim for, then, is clarity of pronunciation and skill in comprehending English spoken with a variety of accents with which they are likely to be in contact. Audio and video materials must, therefore, include speakers from all the three circles. It is a mystery why it is supposed that understanding Inner Circle speakers interacting leads to understanding all English users, especially when we look beyond the level of pronunciation to the full range of culturally determined aspects of communication.

To reach the consensus of more exposure, teachers and students both need to be instilled the importance of involving NNSs' accents into their teaching and learning. This task of awareness-raising is significant from the perspective of EIL and "applies even more to teachers than to their students." (Jenkins, 2008)

Taylor (1991) also takes the position that teachers have to take the initiative in maintaining the awareness of English varieties, as he believes, "in view of the great variety of pronunciations that teachers and learners will be expected to deal with, teachers will have to be even more phonetically aware than they are now."

Unfortunately, as mentioned earlier, courses concerning EIL ideology in the teacher education are still lacking, let alone the EIL phonology teaching program. Jenkins (2001: 199) points out that "The major obstacle to the modernizing of English pronunciation teaching in recent years has been the failure to *educate* teachers." She

challenges the present programs in the Inner Circle lacking the EIL infusion in their courses—“The approach is still oriented towards educating teachers in either RP or GA.”, which would in turn results in the fact that the NNETs “stay in the same place teaching in exactly the same way for the rest of their working lives.”

The third step is to allow for expression of **identity**. Since respect for L2 accents features EIL, EIL phonology teaching should also free learners from their mother tongue accents. As Jenkins (2001) argues, “many L2 speakers of English may have no desire to speak it (English) fluently, let alone like a ‘native.’”

Lastly, involve **native speakers** in the EIL phonology teaching-- to raise NSs’ awareness of NNSs’ accents. According to Jenkins (2008), communication is not a “one-way process,” if NNSs need to adjust their attitudes towards speaking English, NSs in the Inner Circle are responsible for this paradigm shift, too. Campell (1983) states the importance of NS’s being re-educated: “native speakers of English need training in the use of their own language in international settings.” Derwing et al. (2002) also emphasize the need for awareness-raising among the NSs to teach them accent varieties from the Expanding and Outer Circle that “they are likely to hear, and of the language rights of their speakers.”

In conclusion, EIL phonology teaching requires efforts from teachers, EIL users from the Outer, Expanding circles, and those from the Inner Circle. Each plays an important role in the success of a more friendly global community where everyone can mutually communicate efficiently and harmoniously.

2.4.3 Accent and Identity

In phonology teaching, many claims are made for the importance of accent as it is the most salient features of spoken language (Schnitzer, 1995). Besides, accent and identity are often brought up and treated as two sides of one coin, since “accent is particularly closely bound up with both personal and group identity.” (Jenkins, 2001)

When using a language, one cannot succeed in reducing it as “an entirely neutral medium for the conveyance of information” because “as soon as the human factor intrudes, the language grows, changes, varies, becomes subject to the identifying need of speakers to express their own identity” (Widdowson, 1982). In sociolinguistics, a common observation has been made—as Jenkins quoted Jennifer (1992),

Many learners, on facing up to the realities of native-like voice quality and articulation...may decide that although they wish to speak English fluently, they neither want nor need to sound like a native speaker. They may wish to preserve some vestige of a foreign accent as a mark of their identity or nationality, and as a signal to the listener to “make allowance. (p. 39)

Also, Dalton and Seidlhofer (1994) make the similar comment:

Pronunciation is so much a matter of self-image that students may prefer to keep their accent deliberately, in order to retain their self-respect or to gain the approval of their peers...

To them, asking students to faithfully conform to a certain target language pronunciation norm and reduce the accent of their mother tongue “may even be seen as forcing them to reject their own identity” (Dalton and Seidlhofer, 1994). When people are asked to get rid of their accents, it’s like to cut “the umbilical cord which ties them to their mothers” (Jenkins, 2008).

However, Kachru (1982) argues that “non-native speakers of English often aim at a close approximation of these models, even at the risk of sounding affected.” For Norton (1997), what Kachru believes can be explained since “identity relates to desire—the desire for recognition, the desire for affiliation, and the desire for security and safety.” Whether learners choose to retain or reduce their accents indeed is closely connected with certain factors which should be further delved into.

Jenkins (2001) also admits that the above identity and accent tendency depends on the context of learning—whether the learner is in a monolingual classroom (in their own country) or in a multilingual classroom (in a L1 English country) has a lot to do with the learners' intention to retain their accents. Also, according to Gardner's integrative motivation theory (1972) — characterized by the learner's positive attitudes towards the target language group and the desire to integrate into the target language community, learners' attitudes towards their identities vary from person to person as well. In the real life context, discrimination towards L2 accents in the L1 countries is also found. For example, Jenkins (2008) lists instances of discrimination towards L2 accents in some studies (Bonfiglio, 2002; Lippi-Green, 1997; Derwing, 2003). She found numerous evidences concerning how NNSs in the US, the UK and Canada being disrespected and treated unfairly just because of their L2 accents. Lastly, in the study of Bresnahan et al (2001), they note that the strength of ethnic identity is closely related to one's preference for the accent-- people exhibiting strong ethnic identity prefer American English while people with weak ethnic identity are more willing to accept foreign accents.

We can therefore conclude that in investigating the identity and accent issue, other factors should be taken into account in order that an optimum interpretation could be found.

As we expand our discussion to the NNETs' identity towards their accents, several studies have shown that ELT professionals themselves seeing dealing with their accented English a great conundrum. Seidlhofer (1999) concludes from her empirical studies that “future (non-native) EFL teachers in the Expanding Circle tend to prefer, identify with, and aspire to native English accents while looking down on their own local varieties. What Seidlhofer believes might be associated with the fact that NNETs, in many questionnaires (Tang, 1997; Reves & Medgyes, 1994), regard

their pronunciation inferior to NETs. Still convinced in the concept of Standard English norm, NNETs feel less incompetent in dealing with their accented English. Secondly, in the ELT job markets, as mentioned earlier, NNETs with accents are not favored as much as NETs. The above two explanations result from the *linguistic insecurity*, coined by Labov (Jenkins, 2001). Jenkins analyzes how NNETs view their accented English:

It is difficult for speakers of English with L2 accents to gain places on teacher training courses and impossible for them to secure jobs teaching English in either country. Unsurprisingly, then, they have developed an inferiority complex about their English. They come to regard the real experts of English as an *international* language as being 'NSs' of English as a *national* language, and themselves as second best. (p211)

Different from common EIL users, NNETs' might be even more sensitive in their attitudes towards accents and identity issue as they are the so-called professionals in their countries.