

2017

# Language Planning

Farahnaz Faez

*The University of Western Ontario*

Shelley K. Taylor

*The University of Western Ontario, [tayshelley@gmail.com](mailto:tayshelley@gmail.com)*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/edupub>

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

## Citation of this paper:

Faez, F., & Taylor, S. K. (2017). Language planning in teaching English as an international language. In John I. Liontas, Editor in Chief (Project Editor: Margo DelliCarpini; Vol. Ed.: Shahid Abrar-ul-Hassan), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching: Teaching speaking and pronunciation in TESOL* (pp. 1-13). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

## **Language Planning**

Farahnaz Faez and Shelley K. Taylor

### **I Intellectual and Social Context**

English users speak many different mother tongues (L1s) and a variety of “Englishes.” They use English for different (cross-cultural and/or international) communicative purposes, depending on their contexts, needs, and their own unique “plurilingual” backgrounds (discussed in Part III). In many of today’s globalized societies, mobility and change are key features. Language planners, multi-national stakeholders, and transnational individuals affected by mobility and change view English as crucial to their interests, and frequently claim it as their own. English also has imperial and (post-) colonial legacies; hence, many localized forms of English have been developed and are used internationally, making English a context-specific, dynamic, international language. The term English as an international language (EIL) describes both the language (English/es), and its linguistic function in international contexts.

The primary aim of educating professionals for teaching EIL (or TEIL) is to enable them to teach English, but additional goals include raising learners’ awareness that multiple forms of “English” exist, and teaching them

to use language forms that are appropriate for specific contexts. The primary form of English that learners have access to in national contexts is, in large part, predetermined by domestic language planners. In concert with national politicians, language planners determine the desired status and variety of English to be used across contexts and domains. To achieve their long-term goals for English use in society, they oversee the development of teacher education and language-in-education programs to promote the acquisition of acceptable varieties of English at school. Similarly, language planners take these decisions in concert with community stakeholders' visions and desires (including scientific and technological communities, and higher education). Their visions may be informed by how they "imagine" the role English currently plays to be, or by the role they want it to play in their communities (and the nation's economy) in the future. Language planners then mediate status and acquisition planning decisions through top-down (macro) implementation of comprehensive language-in-education policies and measures—ranging from standardized tests to matriculation requirements, program models (including age of entry and the medium of instruction), curriculum development, initial and in-service teacher education, materials development, and pedagogical and linguistic practices. Top-down language planning also positions TEIL within national parameters related to language status issues such as English norms and standards, which have implications

for micro (school- based) policies and measures (e.g., curriculum choices, pedagogical material selection or development, and professional development initiatives). TEIL is framed within these parameters.

TEIL educators and stakeholders (learners, parents, and community members) may have bottom-up (micro) concerns, but limited agency; they may have the option of making some programmatic choices, and some voice in policy making, and they may resist macro policies and measures. They may disagree with the imposition of “standard” English at the expense of a local variety of the language used by *plurilingual* learners and teachers; or they may disagree with medium-of- instruction policies. While they may have preferences for “Which English(es)?” and the role of their L1, they may also have limited awareness of possibilities or long-term consequences. They may also feel pressured by what society dictates as “doing what is best for their children,” without having the conceptual background or economic affordances needed to decide freely (e.g., awareness of issues related to the “ownership” of English, or its implications for TEIL; Ferguson, 2012). Some communities are, however, highly cognizant of their linguistic human rights, and exert considerable micro influence.

If one were to tell teachers, parents, or other members of dominant language speech communities (e.g., Farsi in Iran, Spanish in Cuba, or Japanese in Japan) that foreign language learners could redefine the varieties considered

the norm for *standard* Farsi, Spanish, or Japanese, the dominant group speakers might react chauvinistically. Speakers of Saora, a tribal language in Odisha, India, who have experience of Odia-medium schooling and life in a linguistically complex society, might, on the other hand, have a different reaction. Their lived experience of multilingual socialization and competences may well have led them to the recognition that different varieties of standard languages are only problematic when the variation between them is so great as to mar mutual comprehensibility. While all the language users listed above may have different tolerance levels for acceptable levels of variation (as opposed to “errors” in oral communication), and different views on “ownership” of high-status norms (e.g., for written language), many aspects of their reactions would be context dependent. The same holds true for English, but reactions to it are further complicated due to its status as an international language.

Not all L1 speakers of English, or learners of English as a second (L2), foreign (FL), or additional language who reside in countries such as Australia, Denmark, or Hong Kong, may have heard of the possibility of EIL users making it their *own*; and even those who hear it may not be amenable to the possibility. Nonetheless, they would recognize that EIL looks, sounds, and sometimes reads differently in different geographic, economic, or literate/oral

contexts. Some applied linguists and practitioners have argued that English has become “denationalized” due to its international status and currency, and others have argued that it has been “neutralized” (i.e., it is merely a tool for communication that can be stripped of cultural origins). A growing number of applied linguists no longer see the ownership of English standards as residing solely in the hands of L1 speakers; they see plurilingual, global EIL users as having equal rights to set the norms for *Englishes*. Discordant views are still heard as well.

Three decades ago, Randolph Quirk and Braj Kachru debated whether it was better to maintain a monolithic, codified model of the English language as spoken and written by native speakers (NSs), or to support the development of an educated, standard variety of different Englishes (McKay, 2012). The debate has evolved—and terms such as NS/NNS problematized—but continues (see Parts III and IV); however, the sheer number of NNSs of English has given their claim to ownership of English/es a life of its own. Still, NSs’ hegemony over English continues. It sometimes gains support from unexpected parties. These include multi-national corporations such as Nokia, heads of state, language planners, and transnational individuals such as immigrants who adopt normative English practices to succeed economically in English-speaking countries, and thus “buy in” to discourses around the need for “standard language” and NS norms. Politicians and

language planners may associate NS norms with economic advantages, and learners themselves may associate these norms with “imagined communities” (e.g., access to “American culture” or “the English”). Thus, support for maintaining NS norms can be found across the full spectrum of English users.

The view that Standard English is needed to achieve success harks back to Lisa Delpit’s (1995/2006) argument that blocking disenfranchised groups’ access to Standard English blocks their access to the “capital” needed for good jobs and upward mobility. Conversely, she views efforts to promote lingua-culturally appropriate, but less prestigious (stigmatized) varieties of English as well intentioned, but ultimately inequitable as they do not translate into the same *capital* and jobs as Standard English. She argues that by not explicitly contrasting stigmatized and standard varieties of English, or teaching standard norms, teachers limit access to the halls of power for children from stigmatized backgrounds. This example illustrates the sorts of tensions and conflicting ideologies that can influence language planning at macro (societal) and micro (classroom) levels. They can trigger a trickle-down effect on program offerings, teacher education, pedagogical materials, and classroom management—mechanisms and effects of language planning that can determine how TEIL is implemented.

Ideologically based, “imagined community” beliefs about English

capital have gained ground among some echelons of society in India, yet face growing critique by researchers (Mohanty, 2010). Though India is a multilingual country, English plays a diglossic role in relation to its other languages. English enjoys a high status, and is used in “high” domains such as formal education and government offices, and is necessary for well-paid employment. Community leaders, and parents of “tribal” and formerly “untouchable” (Dalit) children, increasingly believe that the key to their children’s and their communities’ future well-being lies in competence in English. This belief leads many to favor English-medium instruction for children from a very early age, rather than L1-medium instruction; however, research evidence supports the claim that L1-medium instruction is needed for school retention, and school retention is needed for children and their communities to escape the cycle of poverty (Mohanty, 2010). Children need to add English to a strong L1 base gained through L1-medium instruction, especially in the early grades, but for as long as can be sustained (Coleman, 2011). This same research evidence led the state of Odisha, India, to write support for the right to L1-medium instruction into law in 2014. Still, communities and parents across the Indian sub-continent and internationally continue to demand English-medium instruction for very young children; such is the lure of “goddess English” (Taylor, 2014). Planning TEIL is also positioned in conflicting views on its role as a medium of instruction,



beginning at what age, and for whom.

## **II Major Dimensions of the Topic**

### **EIL**

EIL is used as an umbrella term to characterize the use of English between any L2 speakers (whether they share the same culture or not), as well as between L1 and L2 speakers of English. Scholarly discussion of the global spread of English has grown tremendously over the past three decades, as has debate on notions encompassed by EIL such as World Englishes and English as a lingua franca, which are discussed below. Many researchers view EIL as a more comprehensive, linguistically complex notion than World Englishes or English as a lingua franca, which are increasingly viewed as limited because of accelerated levels of mobility, multilingualism, and social change in today's globalized world. Discussions in EIL tend to focus more on the status and positioning of English/es than on the global/local ("glocal") multilingual contexts in which TEIL is situated, the pedagogical implications arising from stakeholder and governmental goals, or English users' plurilingual identities. This imbalance is noteworthy, given the increasingly diverse backgrounds of English users worldwide.

### **World Englishes**

“World Englishes” (WE) refers to the English that developed in former British colonies where English was used in many domains, and was influenced by local languages and cultures. Since the 1980s, traditional views of British, Australian, and North American varieties of English as being the only valid varieties of the language have shifted, and understanding of WE has grown. The WE paradigm recognizes the legitimacy of multiple distinct varieties of English worldwide, emphasizing the pluricentric nature of English and placing all varieties of Englishes on par with one another (standard British, North American, and Australian Englishes, Chinese English, African American Vernacular English, etc.). Kachru’s (1985) model of “inner,” “outer,” and “expanding” circles representing where and how English is spoken around the world is useful for understanding this notion of varieties, and highly significant for TEIL. Educators caution, however, that since power relations are embedded in specific forms of language use, students must be made aware that some varieties of English have more cachet than others (Delpit, 1995/2006), particularly in domains such as business and education. TEIL’s role is to valorize the local while also preparing students to draw on privileged varieties of English. Teachers must recognize and value bidialectalism, and plurilingualism overall, before they can raise student

awareness of appropriate use of their linguistic repertoires (Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson, Panda, & Mohanty, 2009). Plurilingualism refers to multilingualism at the level of the individual, including incomplete or partial mastery of languages, varieties, and registers. Teachers must apprise students of the role of appropriate language use in power relations, and prepare them to draw strategically from their linguistic repertoires (e.g., to avoid using low-status expressions in formal speech); however, a necessary condition for teachers to be able to do so is that they themselves must recognize and value more than their students' English competence.

### **English as a Lingua Franca**

Many FL speakers of English use it between themselves as a contact language, or “lingua franca” (ELF). It is frequently used as a lingua franca in expanding circle countries, largely in Europe, for business, political, academic, and travel purposes. International students in inner circle countries also use ELF. Proponents of ELF suggest the goal should be to acquire ELF, not standardized norms of EIL, stressing the need for mutual intelligibility and efficient communication rather than accuracy (Jenkins, 2006). More recent ELF research has positioned ELF as an “autonomous” variety of English, thus avoiding NS/NNS classifications overall (Durham, 2014). Both

views would have major implications for planning TEIL in contexts favoring ELF.

### **Native and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers and TEIL**

EIL, WE, and ELF's recognition of multiple varieties of English as legitimate parallels the non-native English-speaking teacher (NNEST) movement to recognize teachers whose L1 is not English as legitimate teachers of English who make significant contributions to TEIL. The WE and NNEST movements both problematize the NS/NNS distinction, arguing that a single categorization of Standard English and "native" norms is insufficient.

The two main criticisms of the NS/NNS dichotomy are as follows: The distinction cannot capture the unique and diverse linguistic identities of individuals in today's globalized world (Faez, 2011), and it unjustly privileges users and teachers from inner circle countries, resulting in discriminatory practices that work against other users of English. First, immigrant parents and children living in English-speaking countries, individuals residing in multilingual contexts, and users of outer circle varieties of English often find that the NS/NNS dichotomy ignores and limits their multiple, situated, linguistic identities (Faez, 2011); issues of race and ethnicity play into the NS/NNS categorization (Faez, 2012), and the power of whiteness dominates who is included in (or excluded from) the privileged NS category. Second, the

NS/NNS dichotomy is discriminatory as it variously ascribes positive/negative attributes to the two groups: NESTs are associated with unaccented English, superior knowledge of the language, idiomatic expressions, and cultural expertise; NNESTs are associated with limited proficiency in English and accented speech. Uncritical acceptance of these ascribed attributes results in hiring practices that discriminate against NNESTs.

Research on NNESTs and TEIL draws attention to English standards and norms, and to teacher qualifications. EIL highlights that English is used differently around the world, including within inner circle countries. Individuals have their own ways of communicating and expressing themselves, and there is no single national accent, Standard English, or international English norm; rather, its spread has led to local EIL norms. TEIL recognizes multiple, situated standards and norms. From this perspective, being an NS from an inner circle country does not immediately qualify someone to be an English teacher; rather, TEIL recognizes that all teachers, regardless of their language background, need to obtain a range of knowledge and expertise to qualify as successful English teachers, making teaching credentials more important than a teacher's variety of English or accent.

### **III Changes Over Time in Language Planning in TEIL and Its**

#### **Treatment**

Many English users from outer and expanding circle countries continue to favor British and American Englishes (sometimes as part of their “imagined communities”); however, scholarly discussions and the results of international research speak to the existence and use of many localized forms of English in outer and expanding circle countries. The umbrella term “EIL” consolidated the scholarly legitimation that multiple varieties of English gained from WE research, and the acceptance of “imperfect” English resulting from work by ELF scholars. The view that the English spoken in inner circle countries is an international language that fulfills linguistic functions has led to changes in TEIL, as has the recognition that English/es are but one component of teachers’ and students’ linguistic repertoires.

The major conceptual changes in EIL-inspired teaching over time relate to English being increasingly viewed as a communication tool for international users, and the claim sometimes made that it can be a “neutral” tool at that. A monolithic, codified model of English based on a variety spoken and written by educated NSs from a restricted geographic context is insufficient for it to function as an international tool. Sensitivity to context-specific aspects of the language, and *glocal* policy goals and user backgrounds, is needed. Therefore,

TEIL-inspired pedagogy must take into account learners' unique backgrounds and what they need to successfully navigate cross-cultural, international communication. This change in focus over time also represents a major shift in goals—from the illusory goal of reproducing NSs of English from limited geographical, educational, and sociocultural settings to the goal of meeting the needs of international English users with specific needs (Cook, 2007).

The view that English is the sole purview of NSs in inner circle countries does not take into account the out-of-circle trajectories they experience due to migration and transnationalism; nor does it take into account NSs who acquire other varieties of English as L1 outside of inner circle contexts. The shift toward developing context-specific sensitivities in TEIL is occurring at the same time as openness to plurilingualism is growing in the L2/FL research community. *Plurilingualism* recognizes the value of all components of an individual's linguistic repertoire. This recognition meshes well with the growing emphasis in TEIL to permit English users to draw on the full range of their linguistic resources to make meaning with NS and NNS. Plurilingual TEIL pedagogy encourages learners to draw on the L1(s), other languages, and language varieties they know to meet their lingua-cultural goals. Recognition of plurilingualism in TEIL requires a paradigm shift, as it highlights the role that languages other than English can play in learning EIL (Taylor & Snoddon, 2013), along with calling attention to the need to

recognize the situatedness of English and its users' needs and agency. This focus is important in terms of not overemphasizing "goddess English" to the point that L1 development is undermined (Taylor, 2014). For learners who are already disenfranchised, the effects they experience after sacrificing their L1 development to learn English in contexts that do not favor its acquisition can be long term and deleterious (Mohanty, 2010). They may be doubly disadvantaged by never being able to participate in their imagined communities of English use while not gaining the academic tools that L1-medium instruction affords either. The net result is that national efforts to increase literacy levels and lower poverty rates may be hampered. Even though it may not seem logical to stakeholders, teachers, or language planners, a strong L1 base increases English learning. Learners reap the benefits of a combined focus on L1 and English development in TEIL (Skutnabb-Kangaset al., 2009).

Heightened understanding of plurilingualism is linked to critical examination of the beliefs underlying monolingual teaching practices; namely, that only Standard English should be taught, and that there is no place for local varieties of English, or non-English L1s, in the classroom (Cummins, 2007). The influence these beliefs have had on practice may be seen in teachers' efforts to discourage translation between Standard and local



Englishes, and to stop learners from drawing on their full linguistic repertoires. These practices are based on the belief that languages, and presumably language varieties, should be kept separate; however, they are not in sync with a large body of research that recommends explicitly comparing varieties of English to raise students' awareness of features of high- and low-status varieties, and how and when to draw on different registers in their bidialectal repertoires (e.g., in formal speech). The "keep languages separate" maxim of the monolingual orientation can be summarized as follows: for communication to be efficient and mutually intelligible, the standard variety of NS English should be the shared norm, and there should be no language mixing (such as "code-meshing") (Canagarajah, 2013). Though monolingual approaches to L2/ FL teaching do not start with what learners know, they were widely adopted for over half a century, and their influence can still be felt in TEIL. The audio-lingual method discouraged L1 usage in L2/FL teaching for fear it would create bad habits that would impede learning. Belief held at the time that L1 and L2 development proceeded separately in learners' minds. The communicative approach discouraged L1 use for a different reason. It was based on the premise that learners should be exposed to "real" examples of communication between NSs, and its goal was to replicate naturalistic learning conditions. This rationale precluded the possibility of NSs being plurilinguals.

Among the current adherents of various monolingual approaches to TEIL are English teachers, parents, and policy makers. English users themselves frequently believe it to be the best approach, even though few English users can reach the (illusory) goal of NS pronunciation and lexicogrammatical knowledge. Still, the times are changing. Public examinations no longer stress “NS mastery” as the epitome of language competences; benchmarks, such as those established in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, are now couched in terms of “native-like” competence (Cook & Singleton, 2014). The shift in stance means that English users are now evaluated in comparison to other successful English users rather than measured “against” NSs, a shift that suggests applied linguists and language planners have gained greater understanding of some aspects of plurilingual language development.

While plurilingualism-inspired TEIL pedagogy (translation, translanguaging, code-meshing, etc.) has made some headway internationally, it is not widely accepted; nor are local varieties of English such as China English (Chinglish) uniformly accepted in language planning and educational circles. Planning for TEIL does not always reflect educator experiences, or the findings of research in applied linguistics. Standard English may receive support, and Chinglish may not, more as a result of “politicking” than of language planning (McKay & Bokhorst-Heng, 2008). Additionally, planning

and policy decisions may hinge on politicians' and individual stakeholders' beliefs about how to "properly" learn Standard English, or they may be linked to their goal of gaining access to an imagined English-using community. However, there are indications that the times are changing in that regard as well.

#### **IV Current Emphases in Research and Theory: English**

##### **Dominance and Inner Circle Varieties**

The centrality of English worldwide as a result of globalization and the digital age is undeniable. English is used for air traffic control, academic publications and conferences (international scholarship), business, scientific research, online communication, and navigating the Internet. Many individuals are forced to learn English for fear of losing their jobs. International diplomacy and many international organizations rely on English. A solid command of English is required to obtain information from the Internet. In most scientific fields, scholars are pressured to publish internationally (read: in English), which disadvantages international scholars and has long-term implications for domain loss in certain languages.

Due to globalization, English is also a required FL in countries such as Iran that have troubled political relationships with inner circle contexts. In many of these expanding circle contexts, longstanding language acquisition

planning debates center on the age at which children should begin learning English as a curriculum subject, at what intensity, with what materials, and what the initial medium of instruction should be. Several countries have started introducing English at younger and younger ages, in hopes that children will gain increased competences in the language by earlier exposure to English as a subject.

English is also used as a medium of instruction, either on its own or in a multilingual model, with planning predicated on the assumption of static L1s. Recent research documenting the insufficiency of Singapore's "English-knowing" bilingual policy and official "quadrilingual" educational system reflect the need to rethink old acquisition planning models of TEIL, given today's plurilingual realities (Silver & Bokhorst-Heng, 2016). Policy and practice decisions that hinge on teaching English and Singaporean children's "L1" (Mandarin, Malay, and Tamil) may be seen as an example of this claim. The children's presumed L1, L1 competence, and subsequent school placement may not align with their linguistic experiences prior to school entry. The Singaporean case illustrates the challenges that linguistic complexity poses to language-in-education programs in real-life classrooms. Macro planning for TEIL may be at odds with learners' plurilingual realities (diglossia, partial linguistic competences in standard and non-standard varieties of English, and plurilingual practices such as translanguaging).

These complexities are coming more to the fore in other contexts as well.

A prevalent belief held outside inner circle countries is that English competence leads to better career opportunities and, therefore, only English should be taught as an FL. Though many contexts exist in which languages other than English are preferable for cross-cultural communication, the notion that English is the best language for international communication is pervasive. In a circular manner, belief in the status and prestige of English solidifies its position as *the* language for international communication worldwide. Explanations for why individuals in complex multilingual societies such as Switzerland prefer to use English rather than their national languages hinge on factors such as English: (1) being regarded as neutral, and allowing for equality among national languages; (2) requiring less effort as a majority of the population understands it, but does not necessarily understand the other Swiss languages; (3) being their stronger language, aside from their L1 (i.e., stronger than their competence in their other national languages); and (4) being more readily available for pedagogical purposes (e.g., materials) than their other national languages (Durham, 2014). Whatever their reasons, in many cases the Swiss learn/use English, bypassing other Swiss national languages. Cases such as this speak to the concern that the rate of spread of English has the potential to sap multilingual development, and may lead to language death for smaller languages.

Much of the discussion surrounding the global spread of English ignores the differential privilege and access to English experienced by students from different socio-economic backgrounds. Individuals from privileged economic backgrounds can afford to travel and study abroad, and have access to opportunities to learn English; however, in other countries, even though English may be the medium of instruction, the programs made available to learners from lower economic backgrounds may be inadequate. Language planners, language policy makers, and educational delivery systems must remain cognizant of the fact that education is for all, and provide equitable opportunities for all students to learn English. This need is strongest in contexts in which English has been privileged over other (glocal) languages and deemed the medium of instruction, especially in contexts where formerly only privileged students were expected to succeed (Skutnabb-Kangas et al., 2009; Mohanty, 2010).

Currently, TEIL is often characterized by inner circle varieties of (standard) English taught monolingually by NS teachers using textbooks that showcase inner circle communication styles and cultures. While this orientation may be considered appropriate in programs preparing students to integrate in inner circle countries, it does not serve the needs of students who will use English in international contexts. The imperial and (post-)colonial legacies of English, including its politics and power struggles, must be recognized in TEIL.

## **V Future Directions in Research, Theory, and Methodology**

Research is needed on how best to plan and deliver teacher education that addresses orthodoxies such as standards and norms, highlighting how English is used differently around the globe, and prepares teachers to recognize and transcend lingua-centric views; it is needed to prepare them to assess optimal varieties of TEIL in specific contexts; and it is needed to learn how to present theories and pedagogical materials to teachers in ways that will encourage them to adopt TEIL methodology that benefits learners. Research is also needed on how to reach language planners and stakeholders whose macro decision making shapes the context for TEIL teachers, learners, and other community members; they too need to learn to understand that TEIL involves teaching varieties of English linked to power, but also involves valorizing local-specific varieties, and supporting L1 use as a language-learning tool. Language planners, and others in educational delivery systems (including teachers), must realize the need for pedagogical materials that expose learners to WEs, and the role various varieties play across EIL contexts. Regardless of the variety of English students use, they must realize that it is but one of many possibilities in the wider linguistic landscape of English. They should be exposed to other varieties through supplementary audio and visual materials, including local ones, to learn about the range of diversity that exists in

English pronunciation and about lexico-grammatical differences. In so doing, they also will learn that all varieties have sociocultural significance to English users somewhere; knowledge that will expand learners' lingua-cultural horizons and combat lingua-centric views.

A major concern in incorporating plurilingual perspectives falls back on the discussion of "which English/es?" The implications of this debate for teaching methodology are enormous, since what is at stake is which variety of English should be taught in classrooms. The options range from a standard variety (i.e., a variety established in an inner or outer circle country), to an international variety (e.g., Chinglish), to a variety that is context sensitive (e.g., related to learners' glocal circumstances and long-term goals). EIL teachers must weigh all of the following to make informed decisions about which English variety/(ies) to teach: local languages; accepted standards of English locally and nationally; the full gamut of stakeholder goals for English instruction; the learners' ages and proficiency levels in their languages; learner attitudes toward their local languages and English. EIL teachers must have sufficient teacher education backgrounds to be able to weigh these factors and make informed decisions; they must also have the English competences needed to teach what turns out to be the most contextually relevant variety of English. Culturally/linguistically responsive research is



needed to investigate whether EIL teachers have the knowledge base and English competences needed to teach optimum varieties of English and, if not, how to meet the challenge of assisting their development of the needed skills; a challenge that behooves the involvement of national language planners and the local TEIL community.

Perhaps the greatest challenge for the TEIL community is to engage in participatory action research. Language planners should assess local resources, desires, and potentialities; then inform stakeholders of the same, and involve them in goal setting and finding solutions to problems. While it is understood that many language-in-education policy decisions relate more to “politicking” than to planning, it is clear that collaborative research and decision making are necessary: to develop stakeholders’ knowledge base of TEIL; to shift anachronistic attitudes not in learners’ best interests; to lead to the development and implementation of curricula, materials, and methodologies that enable learners to develop context-sensitive English competences that meet their current needs; and to prepare them to access standard varieties that will pave their way to imagined (yet attainable) futures.

**SEE ALSO:** Assessment Norms; Critical Language Awareness; English as a Lingua Franca; Identity and the Ownership of English; Needs Assessment in Professional Development (PD); NNESTs; Sociocultural Aspects of English

Language Teaching Through World Events; World Englishes

### References

- Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Coleman, H. (2011) Developing countries and the English language: Rhetoric, risks, roles and recommendations. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Dreams and realities: Developing countries and the English language* (pp. 9–21). London, England: British Council. Retrieved from:<http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/Z413%20English%20Development%20Book.pdf>
- Cook, V. J. (2007). The goals of ELT: Reproducing native-speakers or promoting multi-competence among second language users? In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *Handbook on English language teaching* (pp. 237–48). New York, NY: Springer.

- Cook, V., & Singleton, D. (2014). *Key topics in second language acquisition*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221–40.
- Delpit, L. (1995/2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Durham, M. (2014). *The acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in a lingua franca context*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Faez, F. (2012). Linguistic identities and experiences of generation 1.5 teachers: Race matters. *TESL Canada*, 29(6), 124–41.
- Faez, F. (2011). Reconceptualizing the native/nonnative speaker dichotomy. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 10, 231–49.  
doi:10.1080/15348458.2011.598127
- Ferguson, G. (2012). English in language policy and management. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy* (pp. 475–98). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 157–81.  
doi:10.2307/40264515
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H.

- Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- McKay, S. L. (2012). *English as an international language*. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Pedagogy and practice in second language teaching* (pp. 15–22). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- McKay, S. L., & Bokhorst-Heng, W. D. (2008). *International English in its sociolinguistic context: Towards a socially sensitive EIL pedagogy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mohanty, A. K. (2010). Languages, inequality and marginalization: Implications of the double divide in Indian multilingualism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 205, 131–154.  
doi:10.1515/ijsl.2010.042
- Silver, R., & Bokhorst-Heng, W. (Eds.). (2016). *Quadrilingual education in Singapore: Pedagogical innovation in language education*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Phillipson, R., Panda, M., & Mohanty, A. J. (2009). Multilingual education concepts, goals, needs and expense: English for all or achieving justice. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. K. Mohanty, & M. Panda (Eds.), *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 320–44). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Taylor, S. K. (2014). From ‘monolingual’ multilingual classrooms to

‘multilingual’ multilingual classrooms: Managing cultural and linguistic diversity in the Nepali educational system. In D. Little, C. Leung, & P. Van Avermaet (Eds.), *Managing diversity in education: Key issues and some responses* (pp. 259–74). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Taylor, S. K., & Snoddon, K. (2013). Plurilingualism in TESOL: Promising controversies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 439–45. doi:10.1002/tesq.127

### **Suggested Readings**

Bunce, P., Phillipson, R., Rapatahana, V., & Tupas, R. (Eds.). (2016). *Why English? Confronting the Hydra* (Vol. 13). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Copland, F., Garton, S., & Mann, S. J. (Eds.). (2016). *LETs and NESTs: Voices, views and vignettes*. London, England: British Council.

Kubanyiova, M., & Crookes, G. (2016). Re-envisioning the roles, tasks, and contributions of language teachers in the multilingual era of language education research and practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), 117–32.

Matsuda, A. (Ed.). (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.