

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results of the interview and study group meetings were analyzed and presented. The discussion based on three research questions is divided into three parts. First, how do senior high school English teachers view EIL in terms of the ownership of English, the standard issue and intelligibility in EIL? Secondly, how does EIL change their self-image? Lastly, how do they welcome EIL phonology teaching?

4.1 How Do They See EIL?

From the data in the teacher interview and study group meetings, recurring themes pertaining to several important issues in the EIL framework were analyzed.

4.1.1 The Ownership of English

Table 4.1 Who do you consider to be the ‘rightful owner’ of the English language?
Rate in order of importance.

	The native speakers	Bilinguals	Any fluent speakers	Those who attempt to speak it	No one
Emma	1/1	2/2	3/3	4/4	5/*
Melody	1/1	2/2	3/3	4/4	*/*
Jenny	1/2	*/3	2/4	3/5	*/1

One specific question concerning ‘the ownership of English’ issue was asked on the questionnaire before and after the study group meetings. The question, “Who do you consider to be the ‘rightful owner’ of the English language?” was designed to investigate the participants’ beliefs about this issue. They were asked to rate the answer in order of importance.

Table 4.1 roughly demonstrates the results from the questionnaires. The left side of the slash represents the first questionnaire result and the right side the second result.

The asterisk represents the blank answer from the questionnaires.

From the table, it is indicated that neither Emma nor Melody had a change in their beliefs—they adhered to their belief that native speakers are the most rightful owners of English.

Also in the second study group meeting, when asked how they thought of Widdowson's idea about "no nation owns English", Melody said,

"I think we were not born to speak English, so I find it natural to say that this language belongs to them (native speakers)...I still think we need to have a standard, or I wouldn't know what to follow in the future...I think such discussion is meaningless (the other two participants nodded) because Americans and the British wouldn't say that they own the language (in public)...if you say English is an international language, then who cares who owns the language."

Melody, in her discussion, believed that the ownership of a language was dependent on the birth and found it difficult to believe that English indeed belonged to her, as a non-native speaker, even though she was the only one among the participants who had already taken an EIL-related course in the U.K. during her graduate study. Throughout the discussion, she as well as the other two participants also mentioned the lack of 'standard' in the EIL framework several times, indicating that they couldn't tolerate a language without a standard to adhere to, especially for English teachers. Furthermore, she also believed that claiming an international language's ownership, as Widdowson did, was meaningless, since it is already internationalized.

However, from their answer to the ownership and the standard issues, it is clear that they had misunderstood the EIL ideology—instead of abiding by one single standard, such as the American English variety, EIL puts great emphasis on multiple standards in different contexts. For example, learners in Singapore can speak Singlish

just as Chinglish can also be adopted among Chinese-speaking learners. What led the subjects to have had misunderstandings towards the EIL standard issue might result from their inadequate time for the infusion to happen.

Emma, who was even more reluctant to accept Widdowson's quote, simply couldn't believe how Widdowson thought it up, as if it was her very first time to learn of such concept. As Emma's education background—an English literature major in college and her graduate study was on education—was slightly different from the majority of English teachers whose courses are mostly about TESOL, she seemed to be less sensitive to the paradigms in the ELT profession. Unlike Melody and Jenny, she showed less interest in EIL ideology.

Only Jenny changed her belief concerning this issue—she replaced 'native speakers' as the most rightful owners with 'no one' in the questionnaire. What was more interesting was that her later answer was neither based on the traditional EFL view, which she claimed she preferred, nor on the EIL ideology. Her change of belief demonstrates the fact that she was not convinced of the new paradigm shift totally even though she had read about the EIL ideology in the study group meetings and claimed that it was a refreshing learning opportunity to be in the study group to learn of EIL and that she needed more time to digest the materials. When asked how she liked the Widdowson's quote, she said,

“I think it's very unreasonable if you want to persuade native speakers to believe that English is not their language. It's like they tell us that Chinese is not our language....I think it (EIL ideology) didn't fulfill its effect as he (Widdowson) expected. Even if you try to educate or brainwash me into believing this... as I encounter difficulties in the learning process, I still feel defeated.”

Like Melody, Jenny saw birth as a yardstick to assess the ownership of a

language. Without recognizing that English has a special status around the world in history because of political and economical reasons (Crystal, 1997), they treated English as equally as other languages. Secondly, she assumed that English learning difficulties were directly related to the lack of ownership of English. However, in actual context, few native speakers, the owners of English as Jenny believed, can acclaim that they can easily use English efficiently and appropriately in the international context without paying efforts to be immersed in the intercultural varieties. As Jenkins (2008) argued, even native speakers of English should be re-educated and reminded the importance of different varieties from different countries. Jenny mistakenly believed that native speakers were the rightful owners of English, so they did not have to learn from other varieties anymore in the EIL environment.

4.1.2 Standard in EIL

The participants' attitudes towards the standard issue in EIL did not have obvious change as well. The only difference before and after the study group meetings was that they began to notice the existence of Jenkins' Lingua Franca Core (LFC) and claimed that they could accept LFC concept, but would not teach it in class though.

In the interview, when asked whether they had a standard in mind when teaching students pronunciation, three of the participants had different answers.

For Emma, when teaching English pronunciation, she viewed people from the U.S and the U.K as the standard providers, but she also argued that in terms of accent, there was no standard. She took her honeymoon trip to the Czech Republic as an example of how accents differ from country to country, describing how people there had very different consonant sounds from others, so she had to make effort to understand what they said. She seemed to demonstrate her belief that when teaching pronunciation in the formal English class, she preferred to stick to a standard,

according to her, the American or the British standard, but when it comes to “accent”, she did not have much opinion about it.

However, after the introduction of Jenkins’ LFC in the study group meetings, when asked whether she would teach EIL core in class, she said, “I wouldn’t necessarily teach EIL core on purpose to my students in class unless it becomes a mainstream. But I still prefer the native standards.” In the second discussion of the standard issue, though Emma was informed of a new paradigm, she did not believe it would be a mainstream in the near future and in practice, she did not want to change her preference for the native standards.

Emma’s insistence on the native standards might be due to her English learning experience. In the earlier interview, she mentioned that as a student, she used to strive to sound like a native by attending English courses taught by native speakers after school and after work as a means of self-improvement from which she also gained a sense of “security”. It is very likely that Emma had the anxiety from not sounding like a native in her language learning process, and such anxiety has also strengthened her belief to stick to the native standard since she began to teach as a non-native English teacher.

In the interview with Melody, when asked which standard of accent she would adopt to teach her students, she stated:

“I don’t have a particular standard, but in Taiwan, we teach and learn American English mostly....but after taking an EIL course, I simply feel that we Taiwanese are too constrained in the use of American English and American accents....everything is American. We have too little exposure to the outside world. Unlike the Japanese and Koreans, who have more exposure and are more flexible than us, we are simply too Americanized.”

Melody seemed to express her disapproval against the Taiwanese’ parochial

attitude towards the favor for Americanization. The reason why she reacted to this topic so strongly is that as she had experienced English varieties used by EIL users globally during her stay in the U.K for a year, she came to a deep realization that English should be used as a communication tool, not just for tests, and she thought she was very ready to teach English by using CLT pedagogy. However, after coming back from the U.K., she was assigned to teach high school graduates, who were to take an entrance exam and needed teachers' help to prepare for the exam. Melody felt that she couldn't help but betray her belief in CLT as she followed the traditional paradigm again.

Also, during the interview, she shared her life in the U.K. with people from many other foreign countries, such as her Asian classmates, Israeli and Lebanese dorm mates, etc. Her belief in the standard issue had been greatly influenced by her personal experience. As Richards (1999) illustrates, "the notion of teacher change is multidimensional and is triggered both by personal factor as well as by the professional contexts in which teacher work." Melody as well as other two participants would share their personal experiences, trips abroad in the present study, as examples of how they dealt with other English varieties. Only it is discovered that Melody was influenced by the EIL view on the standard more than Emma due to the fact that first, she took EIL course in the U.K, and secondly, she had a longer stay abroad compared with Emma. Melody's exposure to other varieties of English and knowledge on EIL might have triggered her to involve EIL in her teaching practice.

However, in the study group meeting, she showed no difference as the other two participants in the willingness to give up using 'standard' in teaching because, according to her, "it (EIL ideology) kind of relaxes students", which is a disadvantage for students' preparation for the exam. Though she was speaking of the example of the deletion of the third person singular verb in the recent trend, she seemed to feel

obliged to safeguard the standard in her profession so as to help students learn 'correct' English.

When interviewed what standard she adhered to when teaching English, Jenny was very sure that she only taught American English. As she noted, she was teaching American English to her students, so her standard was American English. At the beginning of the interview, she claimed that only American English was international because that was the variety she often heard in the international settings, such as in the airports or from the radio broadcast. She also mentioned her trip to New Zealand as an example that most native speakers sounded more American than British. Later, she adjusted a bit her statement by saying that she wouldn't exclude the British English from the international language category, but she still believed that American English was spoken more internationally. What Jenny believed, before the introduction of the EIL ideology, reflects her lack of knowledge in World Englishes, and like other non-native speakers in Taiwan, she preferred American English to British English simply because she had limited exposure to the latter.

Also, Jenny talked about a critical incident in her listening and speaking class. She once chose a video clip about a Scottish magician downloaded from the YouTube website. When asked why she wanted to introduce her students to English with the Scottish accent, she said:

“That was not my purposeful choice...and I think I don't have to evade this issue (other English varieties) to let my students know there are other accents than the one we are learning now.”

Jenny, from the incident, took a very monolithic view in terms of the English varieties. She believed that other than American English, other varieties were in fact used in real life, but they couldn't be taken as a standard in the teaching.

In the study group discussion, Jenny still insisted on her belief by saying “I still

think it necessary to have a standard. We teachers still need to have a standard when teaching.” Like the other two participants, she also felt obliged to teach her students with a standard so that students could learn correct and good English.

The reason why the three participants favored a certain standard in their teaching is not difficult to comprehend. First, as English is taught as a subject in Taiwan, it is naturally held that English teachers are the experts of this subject just as a math teacher should be good at math, and once the only yardstick for the standard of their expertise is at the risk of being played down, they would feel uncomfortable about the change. Secondly, their teaching environment is a test-oriented milieu, where the most important task of theirs is to help their students become proficient learners to compete with other learners in the entrance exam, so when the only yardstick for their students is also being questioned, they become uncertain about it. Lastly, what’s interesting, the participants all mentioned the influence of one or two native or non-native English teachers on them in their learning experience as students in the school days, which seem to suggest that they are trying to follow in their teachers’ footsteps by teaching with a standard. As Clark and Peterson (1986) proposed (discussed in Richard, 1999),

The most resilient or “core” teachers’ beliefs are formed on the basis of teachers own schooling as young students while observing teachers who taught them.

Subsequent teacher education appears not to disturb these early beliefs, not least, perhaps, because it rarely addresses them.

It is therefore presumed that part of the participants’ unwillingness to accept the EIL ideology is because of the influence from their previous learning experience and their teachers.

After a bit discussion about the Jenkins’ “core” concept, Jenny continued:

“I welcome EIL core because I think we should enlarge our scope of concept....

The influence EIL might have on me is my different attitude towards my students' errors.... When students make mistakes next time, I would know whether their errors are within the core or not.”

From Jenny's answer, a mixed sense of feeling toward the EIL was observed.

Though she decided not to adopt the EIL core value of the standard issue in her teaching for the sake of her professional need, she somewhat had changed the way she treated her students' accent problems. Earlier in the interview, she claimed that she did correct her students' Taiwanese accents, but after the infusion of the EIL ideology, Jenny had changed her attitude towards the accent issue and decided to be more tolerant of her students' errors in the future.

4.1.3 Intelligibility

Table 4.2. Which of the following is more important when using English?

Rate in order of importance.

	To be able to speak accent-free English	To be able to communicate, even with accent	To avoid using Chinese at any cost
Emma	3	1	2
Melody	3	1	2
Jenny	3	1	2

Before the study group meetings, one question from the questionnaire asked the participants to rate in order of importance of how students should use English. Three of the participants all agreed that for students “to be able to communicate, even with accent” was more important than “to avoid using Chinese at any cost” and “to be able to speak accent-free English”

The result of the questionnaire was not surprising. As CLT (communicative

language teaching) has been implemented in senior high schools in Taiwan from 1999, whose goal is to involve students in communicative activities of real-life situation, communication becomes the paramount part of English learning. Therefore, English teachers holding CLT teaching belief regard fluency more important than accuracy, and accented English is accepted as long as students can communicate. Furthermore, several studies conducted English teachers' perceptions about the CLT indicate that English teachers in the secondary school hold positive attitudes towards CLT (Chang, 2001; Hsu 2003). Especially in Hsu's study, he concludes that "senior high school English teachers held positive and favorable perceptions of CLT, and that they were willing to apply these perceptions to English teaching."

In the interview, when asked whether students should speak with a native-like accent, three of the participants all agreed that students' accents being able to be understood was enough, and native-like accent was unnecessary. As Jenny believed:

"No, I think as long as they (students) can communicate, it would be okay...speaking like a native should be a goal. I think communication is prior to accuracy of pronunciation.... my teaching goal is not to ask them to sound like a native, but to create enough exposure and opportunities for them to express themselves and improve themselves. That's all. As for how well they can do it, it depends on their efforts and their self-expectations.... it has a lot to do with their personality."

Jenny took intelligibility as the basic criterion students were required to meet; however, she was still convinced that to be like a native in speaking was possible for students to achieve as long as they worked hard enough. Besides, she also believed that self-demanding and personality played an important role in sounding like a native. The reason why she thought native-like accent was possible was that she had the same experience of working hard to achieve the goal and she was confident that she had

done a good job. In the interview, she shared how she strove to sound like a native as a secondary school student by reading aloud and listening to the tapes again and again to imitate native speakers. Jenny's belief reflects what Grossman (1990, discussed in Tsui, 2003) has pointed out earlier:

Teachers' memories of themselves as students often shape their expectations of students as well as their conceptions of how students learn....teachers often compare what their students are like now with what they themselves were like when they were students and expect the former to behave similarly.

However, when asked whether they had different expectations for themselves in speaking English as a teacher, their answers changed. As Jenny answered, "Yeah, because I am their model.... I have to give them a standardized model....I have to be native like..."

Though Jenny saw intelligibility as the basic requirement for students, she did not agree that it was enough for her because she had the professional need. In this case, she held that she had to sound like a native so that she might be more confident in teaching. For example, in the earlier interview, when asked whether she would feel threatened if her students said that she sounded like a Taiwanese, she replied,

"Mmm...very much...I really cannot imagine (situation like that)...this (sounding like a native) is sort of like the source of my confidence, so I cannot accept being commented like that....I would be very upset, very."

Jenny's source of confidence comes from her positive view on her own accent-free English, which reflects the fact that near-native proficiency is the bedrock of the non-native English teacher's professional confidence (Murdoch, 1994). That is to say, in terms of intelligibility, it is a basic requirement from non-native English teachers for their students, but it cannot satisfy the non-native English teachers' professional needs as an excellent command of English is a major factor in their

success of being a language teacher (Britten, 1985).

4.2 EIL Infusion and Their Change in Self-Image and Identity Claiming

At the beginning of the interview, participants were asked to share how they had taken a pleasure in learning English as students. Melody and Emma had the same experience of gaining sense of achievement from English learning by doing well in the exams as young learners and continued their passion for English learning since then. While Jenny, unlike them, became enthusiastic about learning English because of her father's encouragement, all of them had very positive self-image towards themselves in the early stage of their learning process. In addition, both Melody and Jenny mentioned how they were influenced by their English teachers at school, which also prompted them to take their teachers as their role models. For example, Melody recalled how her teacher in the college, Miss Lee, had impressed and encouraged her: "Miss Lee had perfect pronunciation....I wish my pronunciation could be as good as hers....she can speak slowly and very clearly....very clearly."

As for Jenny, she was especially impressed by one of her college professors, a native speaker, who taught English pronunciation. When she talked about that professor in the class, she said as follows:

"He would open his mouth, very wide, before you, without concerning his image as a college professor....He would tell you how to pronounce this sound and that....in a very comfortable way."

When asked whether that professor would correct her classmates' Taiwanese accents, she said:

"I wasn't sure whether he corrected my classmates or not, but I could feel that he simply wanted us to just sound like him."

In addition, both Emma and Jenny had shared that they had worked very hard to sound like natives when they were learning English in the school even though Emma

claimed that later she realized that fluency mattered more than accent because accent was hard to pick up, while fluency was something she could make effort to improve.

Based on their early learning experience, it can be concluded that positive self-image, resulting from extrinsic motivation such as high score in school exams and the participants' pleasant model learning, plays a crucial role in non-native English teachers' success in their previous English learning experience.

When asked whether they had experienced being threatened by their students because of their Taiwanese accents in English speaking, they all disagreed that they had strong Taiwanese accents, if any, so they didn't particularly feel threatened, but they all agreed that making grammatical mistakes did lead to great humiliation and guilt since English was taught as a subject in Taiwan. Interestingly, both Melody and Jenny also mentioned that most students in Taiwan used teachers' pronunciation as an indicator to judge whether they had good command of English.

Also when asked to give themselves a score on their pronunciation, their answers varied. Jenny said:

“Should be 90. I myself like my own voice when speaking English, and I often get compliments from others....from my classmates, my friends, and foreigners....yeah, I never had a long stay abroad. I've been learning English only in Taiwan.”

When asked whether she thought she sounded like a native, she said, “If I were that 'perfect', I would give myself 100.”

Jenny was very confident of her own English pronunciation, and she also held that sounding like a native speaker was 'perfect'.

Emma, when asked to give herself a score, said that she was actually dissatisfied with her vocabulary, instead of her pronunciation, which she didn't pay much attention to, and gave herself only 70.

Melody gave herself 85 points, but claiming that many of the foreigners she met had praised her excellent English pronunciation from time to time.

All in all, before the infusion of the EIL ideology, three of the participants generally had already had positive self-image towards their English pronunciation, but they also admitted that they were not ‘perfect’ enough, either in the pronunciation, or in their command of English vocabulary and fluency.

Later in the study group meetings, when asked whether they felt their identity threatened when learning and teaching English, they had different answers.

Jenny admitted that she could feel the superiority of the west and the inferiority of her culture when it comes to culture learning. As she said:

“I admit that when I was a student, I regarded culture learning as a very essential but difficult part of the learning, so I had to try all means to read related books or to learn their ways of behavior from movies.”

When asked if she felt puzzled about her identity, i.e. whether she felt she was someone else when striving to master a foreign language, she responded:

“No, but as I was under such a system of learning (western-culture-oriented), I indeed felt the existence of ‘superiority’ of the others (west) and the ‘inferiority’ of us (east). ...To our knowledge, we indeed think they (native speakers) are better than us, though now we don’t stress this point anymore due to the localization (in Taiwan).”

From Jenny’s statement, it is assumed that integrative motivation, which “comes out of the interest in the target language and culture, and links to the purpose to identify with the target language society to be accepted as a member of it” (Xie reviewed Gardner, 1972) was the drive for her language learning. Though Jenny did not feel her identity threatened when learning English as a student, to some extent, she felt that she indeed experienced the loss of the value of her own culture, as she

mentioned the inferiority of her culture during the time when she strove to be native-like and took her mastery of the language as the source of her confidence in teaching. It is also assumed that it is until some point of time that she started to feel the value of her own culture. Also, in the study group meeting, when asked if their students' identity threatened in the present EFL learning milieu, she said:

“As for EFL identity, I don't think we (as teachers) ask students to abandon their identities. I think it's becoming less a threat to students' identity in Taiwan since the awareness of localization is being stressed. And I think students take learning English as a tool and students' goal of English learning varies, so it really depends on themselves.”

For Jenny, she didn't think identity claiming was an issue for her students because she recognized the awakening of localization in Taiwan recently.

As for Emma, though she neither admitted nor denied her loss of identity as a student, she talked about a critical incident when teaching culture:

“...reminds me of the time when I taught 'table manners' I felt great lack of knowledge and I thought the western custom was correct, so I turned to books about the westerners' table manners before teaching my students.”

Emma, as she could recall the critical incident vividly, at some point, regarded the target culture as a better culture when teaching a language, which suggests that she, like Jenny, subconsciously preferred the American or the British norm when teaching.

Melody, not very sure if her students had a hard time claiming their own identities, revealed some uncertainty. As she said:

“Well, I felt kind of ambivalent. In class, as I introduced the western cultures with examples from movies and TV programs, students would show admiration about how I knew so much (about the target culture), so I don't know whether it is a form of instillation of ideology from me.”

What Melody meant is she felt that she was held responsible if her students felt their self-identity threatened or if they mistakenly felt western cultures better than their own cultures because she purposefully tried to set a model for her students for understanding the target cultures very well.

Also, during the discussion, when asked whether they felt a sense of relief or being liberated after the infusion of the EIL ideology, to the researcher's great surprise, Jenny's response was contrary to the study previously reviewed about how the EIL has reinforced the self-images of the speakers from the Outer and Expanding Circle. As Jenny argued :

“Based on the experience I had this summer, what liberated me was the fact that I wasn't a native speaker, so I had the right to make mistakes. If I owned the language, I were supposed to be perfect with it.”

Jenny, shortly before the study group meeting, just finished a conference in the U.S., where she had lots of contact with native and non-native speakers from around the world. She shared how she had trouble understanding one speaker with strong Indian accent trying to pronounce 'water' in the conference, while the Americans had no difficulty communicating with that speaker. Her surmise for the successful communication of the Americans was that they might have more exposure to different varieties of English than she did. However, throughout the study group meetings, even though she believed that exposure for the students to more varieties was very important as she realized through her experience, she had very low support for the EIL ideology in her practical teaching.

Returning to the liberation of the EIL ideology for the participants, Emma had a different view from Jenny:

“I think the reason why I couldn't accept EIL might be due to the fact that I was too much influenced by the EFL ideology. I do admit I feel a bit relieved by the

EIL ideology, but I just couldn't bring myself to totally accept EIL. I welcome EIL but presently I wouldn't adopt it (in my teaching).”

Interestingly, though Emma acknowledged the importance of the EIL ideology, she also admitted that she was very native-speaker-norm-bound and would not instill the EIL ideology into her students because, as she herself claimed, the poison of the EFL ideology, i.e. the monolithic view of only one native standard, was deep-rooted in her belief. She seemed to have no struggle with the discrepancy between the EIL ideology and its practicality in her own present teaching milieu since the EIL ideology “wouldn't be a mainstream”, according to her earlier statement.

As for Melody, she seemed to suggest that, in terms of self-liberation, she herself had not changed much before and after the infusion of the EIL ideology, but in terms of applying the EIL ideology into her teaching, she repeatedly argued that Taiwan's education environment, the exam-oriented conundrum in using CLT, was the factor in stopping her from adopting the new paradigm in her teaching practice.

In conclusion, participants in the present study were convinced that they had already had positive self-image and had no problem with their language identity before the infusion of the EIL ideology. However, with closer inspection, their statement, to some extent, also had disclosed a certain degree of dissatisfaction toward the conventional monolithic view in EFL, especially in the culture teaching, and a certain degree of acknowledgement that the EIL ideology had helped them reviewing what stance they had taken when teaching English.

4.3 EIL Phonology Teaching

In the interview, the participants were asked about if and how they taught pronunciation in class. Neither Melody nor Emma taught English pronunciation in class, but they both claimed that asking students to repeat after them during the vocabulary teaching was the only time they corrected students' pronunciation. Jenny

did teach pronunciation by asking students to practice dialogue in groups and making comments afterwards. The yardstick Melody and Emma held in assessing students' pronunciation roughly corresponds to the EIL framework, in which intelligibility is paramount in communication. However, Jenny added that her pronunciation teaching principle was basically based on the American standard because of her own learning background and that American English was taught as a mainstream in Taiwan and it was more international than other varieties, too. In addition, she also corrected students' Taiwanese accents, especially students' tendency to add an extra vowel in pronouncing consonants.

Jenny's teaching belief in pronunciation teaching was more influenced by the conventional view of EFL ideology than Melody and Emma. The former took accent-free English as her teaching goal so as to correct students' accents, which did not match her earlier answer in the questionnaire about how she took intelligibility as the most important ingredient in students' English speaking. (Table 2) Such inconsistency illustrates that theoretically speaking, Jenny had the knowledge that intelligibility should be the yardstick when teaching speaking in class, but under the influence of her own learning experience and the earlier EFL ideology in the teacher education, she still preferred adopting the native-speakerism as her teaching canon. As for Emma and Melody, they seemed to have fewer struggles toward adopting EIL-oriented belief in their pronunciation teaching.

Also, in the interview, they admitted that other than the American accent variety, they showed no intention to include other accent varieties in their teaching materials.

The following are their answers:

Emma: well, I'd mention (other varieties) only a bit, not for the whole class....because students need to lay the foundation by learning American/British standards first and then they can infer what others (non-native speakers)

say from the content....because the American and the British standards are more authentic, so they have to learn the authentic ones....after they graduate from the senior high school, if they still have the need (to understand different varieties of accents), they have to figure out a way to survive.

Jenny: it depends, only when my students have good foundation of American English, I'll use this (non-native variety) to let them know there are other varieties, if not, I'll try not to confuse them by giving them so much confusing knowledge...they wouldn't know what to do....because the input influences....their pronunciation....I would only give them one (variety), that's all,....as long as their language basis is solid, they'll naturally understand other varieties....

Melody: no, because it's not practical....they wouldn't be tested on that....also I am not professional enough as I don't have the (EIL phonology) knowledge, so I dare not to teach (other varieties)....I would at most tell them there are other varieties than English, that's all... because in teaching English speaking, we should focus more on how to encourage them to speak up.... why bothers mentioning so much?...I think it (other varieties exposure) is too difficult for senior high school students because they only begin to have more opportunities to improve their listening in senior high, and they have already had a hard time understanding the American accent,....it would too great a challenge for them....maybe they should wait till they are in college, or till they take English as a major (do they get to be exposed to other varieties)....though I know it (the EIL-oriented teaching) is a trend now, I think in practice it's still too difficult.

From the participants' reasoning about how they wouldn't adopt EIL-oriented materials in class, it can be concluded that they all held that students should first be familiarized with the native-speaker norm, i.e. the American standard, and take it as

a foundation in the senior high school stage because of the following factors which concerned them. First, the native-speaker norms are more authentic and should serve the standard in teaching. Secondly, senior high school students have already had trouble understanding one variety, the American variety, let alone many other varieties. Thirdly, especially for Melody, teaching other varieties might not be practical enough since students wouldn't be tested on listening. Fourth, they seemed to think that once the American variety is totally comprehended, students would naturally conquer the difficulty of understanding other varieties without any training or teaching.

The participants' above reasoning about why they would not adopt the EIL-oriented phonology teaching materials seems to lead to Jenkins' suggestion (2001) in the promotion of the paradigm shift in EIL pronunciation,

.... if EIL is genuinely to be—at least accent-wise—the language for all English speakers that its name implies, I see these shifts leading to radical change in four main areas: firstly, 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 pronunciation learning for "NSs."

Jenkins' first and second suggestions explain the participants' concerns for their lack of professional knowledge toward the EIL phonology teaching and the need for pronunciation exam adjustment.

During the study group meetings, after one reading regarding Jenkins' EIL phonology teaching was introduced, the most heated discussion participants were involved was Jenkins' Lingua Franca Core (LFC). At first, they all questioned Jenkins' sampling in establishing the LFC because they argued that different non-native speakers from different countries should have a lot more difficulties in being intelligible than Jenkins' theory. As Jenny protested:

“I think the range the LFC covers is simply too limited....more should be included because I think our native language causes lots more misunderstanding than Jenkins listed....I think the LFC would vary from country to country.”

What puzzled Jenny was that the establishment of the LFC should be more complicated than the present one, which for her was too general and should be nation-dependent. As for Melody, she questioned Jenkins’ data quantity in establishing the LFC, too.

After the discussion of LFC, when asked, again, whether they would use a LFC-based material in teaching phonology, their answers are as follows:

Emma: I wouldn’t use LFC....I do admit that the EIL ideology relieves me a bit (in I really don’t have to sound like a native), but I would not use LFC in class to teach pronunciation.

Melody: I think it would be a burden for me, as a teacher, to remember what is the core and what is not. It’s like I have to restart and to remember a new system (of teaching pronunciation)....I think we should play it by ear. We can always adjust our understating once we get along with people long enough.... there’s no necessity to teach a whole new system.

Jenny:I like Jenkins’ LFC proposal but I am waiting for its maturation. And I think understanding LFC helps me differentiate what is important and what is not (in teaching pronunciation). I would try to be more tolerant towards students’ pronunciation errors (in the future).

Only Jenny, among the three, had claimed that Jenkins’ phonology teaching proposal based on the LFC in EIL had helped her readjust her teaching belief in correcting students’ pronunciation. As for Emma and Melody, no change had occurred in their teaching beliefs. Contrary to the researcher’s belief, Melody, the only one who had taken the EIL course in the U.K., had very low willingness to integrate the

EIL-based phonology teaching as she believed that a new paradigm shift would burden her with more efforts in preparation for the teaching. Melody's refusal to adopt LFC in her teaching was very likely due to, as mentioned earlier, her frustration toward how Taiwan's exam-oriented education environment had disconnected itself from the outside world. Instead of resorting to pedagogical innovation one bit at a time, Melody chose to conform to the status quo to fulfill her duty, as she believed, to help students prepare for the college entrance exam without taking students' future needs into consideration.

Melody's negative attitudes towards the EIL paradigm application in teaching also reflect Jenkins' observation (2001:200);

They (English teachers) may be aware of the existence of a phenomenon known as 'English as an International Language', 'Global English', 'World English', or the like, but they are unlikely to have been asked to consider the implications of this phenomenon for the teaching of pronunciation.

What Jenkins implies above is that even if teachers of English have been informed of the ideology of EIL, they are not necessarily serious about implementing it in their teaching, and Melody, constrained by the present education ambiance in Taiwan as she claimed, was one of the cases.

Unlike Melody, Jenny, who throughout the study demonstrated strong interest in the native-speakerism norm, was with the most adaptability and willingness to incorporate the EIL ideology into her teaching beliefs in terms of students' pronunciation correction. Though the change she was willing to make might seem minimal, as Freeman (1989) asserts (summarized in Richards, 1999), "change is not necessarily immediate or complete. Some changes occur over time", Jenny's room for innovation under the influence of the EIL ideology in her future teaching might increase over time.