

Theories and Practices in English as an International Language (EIL), World Englishes (WE), English as an Lingua Franca (ELF) Seen in Students Perception Data (1)

Michiko Nakano*¹, Clarence Ng*², Barley S. Y. Mak*³, K. Owada*⁴, N. Ueda*⁵,
Y. Kondo*¹, S. Yoshida*¹, S. Maswana*¹

*¹Waseda University, Japan, *²Australian University of Catholic, Australia,

*³The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong,

*⁴Tokyo College of Music, Japan, *⁵Komazawa University, Japan

0467

The Asian Conference on Education 2013

Official Conference Proceedings 2013

Abstract

This paper addresses the issues of the gap between theoretical stances and inferential data in WE, EIL and ELF, on one hand, and university students' judgments and perception about theoretical stances and inferential data. We collected students' responses about these issues. The participants are students who have taken the cyber course called World Englishes or those who have cyber interactions among Asian countries and who have used English as ELF. In this globalized world, most of learners are exposed to English use in their daily life, such as newspapers, TV, music, movies, the Internet and other social networking services. This suggests that our students must have their own judgments about the functions of English. We try to investigate whether their judgments agree with the factual claims made by WE proponents, and ELF proponents.

Kirkpatrick (2012) mentions that the goal of English education among the outer circle and expanding circle countries should be set at the level of successful ELF users rather than that of Native Speakers. This suggests the paradigm shift of the traditional model of English Language Education which heavily dependent on native speaker norms to a bilingual or multilingual model. The paper also addresses what images and concepts Asian learners of English have toward the concept of successful bilinguals.

1 Introduction

Professor Larry Smith had offered in the 70's English Language Teaching Courses for Asian teachers of English at East-West Center, University of Hawaii at Manoa. He discovered that while he could not understand their English sometimes but not always, their various forms of English were well understood among themselves as the intra-communication tool within Asian users of English. He then claimed that, other than Native Speaker English, there exists English as an International English (EIL) in the world, by proposing three criteria of Intelligibility, Comprehensibility and Interpretability at the same time (Smith, 1976). As far as any English is intelligible, comprehensible and interpretable, it can be a candidate for English as an International Language. All the candidates are equally important as a language of communication.

In the 80's and 90's, Kachru expanded this fair-minded thinking to English variations all over the world and proposed the three-concentric circle model which can address World Englishes (WE; Kachru, 1992, etc.). The inner-circle English encompasses Native Speaker (NS) Englishes in UK, USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The outer circle countries include all the former colonies by British Empire: due to this historical reasons, English had been introduced as a tool of communication for more than 100 years, sometimes 250 years such as in India. Since Englishes in the colonial area became nativized and finally institutionalized, they developed their own norms which are independent of NS norms. The proponents of World Englishes thus asserted that the outer circle Englishes should be recognized as a marker of their identity and they should be proud of expressing their native cultures in their use of Englishes. The expanding Circle includes such countries as China, Japan, Korea, Thailand etc., where English is learned as a foreign language (EFL). Kachru's three-concentric circles can describe the historical spread of English as well as it fits our common sense of the divisions among NS norm-providing Englishes, ESL norm-independent Englishes and EFL norm-dependent Englishes. His model received great popularity among English Language Teaching practitioners.

The notion of World Englishes drew European researchers' attention, since Englishes in Europe began to spread as a common tool of communication since the establishment in European Union (EU). Barbara Seidlehofer and Jennifer Jenkins promoted the notion of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). ELF stands for non-native speaker interactions whose first languages are different from each other and ELF includes NNS-NNS interactions as well as NS-NNS interactions, as far as their first languages are different. Based on the empirical data, Seidlehofer proposed ELF lexico-grammar and Jenkins, a reduced inventory of phonetic teaching and supra-segmental teaching items. As Hung (2007) indicates, for NNS speakers, NS competence and NS spoken fluency are unattainable and thus, unrealistic goal of learning; particularly the size of vocabulary and idiomatic knowledge and pronunciation accuracy is beyond the ability range of most learners of English. ELF thus lexico-grammar lists the following six features

1. non-use of the third person present tense -s, (as in “She look very sad.”)
2. omissions of the definite and indefinite articles where they are obligatory in NS English, and insertion where they do not occur in NS English
3. heavy reliance on verbs of high semantic generality, such as get, make, have, do, etc
4. pluralization of nouns which are considered uncountable in NS English, e.g., informations, staffs, advices, furnitures, softwares
5. addition of unnecessary prepositions, such as “discuss about” or “study about.”
6. use of an all-purpose tag questions, e.g., isn’t it? or no?

Adapted from Seidlhofer (2004:220) Cited by Jenkins (2005:5)

As you can see, these negative features are common not only among European users of English, but also among Asian users of English. This led Kirkpatrick (2010) speculate universal simplification of grammar acquisition of English across global learners whose first languages are different.

Kirkpatrick (2009, 2010) thus proposed the realistic goal of English Language Learning as successful bilinguals, due to two factors: the underlying universal simplification of syntax learning and the fact that NS competence and fluency is an unattainable goal of English language education.

In this survey, we are investigating in Part I how much Asian learners know about EIL, WE and ELF, and in Part II how much they agree with the theoretical messages given by EIL, WE and ELF researchers. Part III attempts to clarify learners’ notion of successful bilinguals.

2 Method

2.1 Participants

The participants of this survey were 367 university students ($M_{age} = 20.3$; $SD = 2.7$). Many of these students were enrolled either in *World Englishes and Miscommunications* or in *Cross-Cultural Distance Learning (CCDL)*, both of which are English courses offered by Open Education Center at Waseda University (for details, see below), and recruited from the following universities: The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Waseda University, Korea University, Tamkang University, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai Finance University, Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai University of Political Science and Law, Shanghai University of Electric Power, Anhui University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, and Wuhan University. Table1 summarizes the details of the participants.

Table 1: Participants

Nationality	<i>n</i>	%
Chinese	186	50.7%
Japanese	88	24.0%
Taiwanese	53	14.4%
Korean	19	5.2%
Hong Kong	18	4.9%
Malaysian	2	0.5%
Singaporean	1	0.3%
Total	367	100

Note: Some Hong Kong students might be counted as Chinese students because their responses on nationality were submitted as *People's Republic of China*.

World Englishes and Miscommunications is offered for students to learn phonetic features, syntactic features, socio-cultural differences, and para-linguistic features that might cause misunderstanding among native speakers and Asian interlocutors. Professors of several major universities in Asia jointly created the omnibus course. The course consists of five live sessions using a videoconferencing system and on-demand lectures. *CCDL*— comprised of three theme-based courses: Social & Global Issues, Media, and International Career Path—is characterized by collaborative joint cyber seminars among Asian Universities initiated by Waseda University, Japan. *CCDL* typically includes five online video chats, two video conferencing sessions, and an international students' forum.

2.2 Questionnaire

On the basis of the previous research (e.g., He & Miller, 2011), we developed a questionnaire called the “Asian English Survey,” consisting of three parts corresponding to the objectives of this study. The questionnaire also included some items concerning the participants' background information such as nationality, age, years of English learning and use of English in her/his daily life, family life and at school.

The first part (henceforth, Part1), which is titled *How much do you know the current status of English in the world?*, is concerned with to what extent our students know the current status of English in the world. The followings are the items included in Part 1.

1. There are more people in Asia who use English as their second language or as a foreign language than native speakers.
2. ... As our native language has various dialects, so are Englishes in Asia.
3. Received Pronunciation (RP) is pronunciation norms taught in Britain. The RP speakers are only 4 % in Britain.
4. General American (GA) has been regarded as pronunciation norms in the North America. GA speakers are only 2 % in USA.
5. In your country, which variety is officially recognized as a model for learners? Circle one or two. (Choose from 9 options)

6. In 2050, half of the world population will use English for their working life.
7. Currently more NNS-NNS interactions are taking place than NS-NNS interactions.

The participants were supposed to make a response to the above 7 questions by choosing from *Yes*, *Uncertain*, or *No*.

The second part (henceforth, Part 2), which is titled ***What is your opinion about World Englishes (WE), English as an International Language (EIL), a common tool of communication among non-native speakers (ELF)?***, consists of 13 items intended to ask how each of the students think of the Asian and native varieties of English as well as to what extent they understand the notions of WE, EIL and ELF. The following list shows each of the items in Part 2.

1. Some varieties in Asia show marked features which are unintelligible to users of other varieties.
2. Asian Englishes are easier to understand than Native Speaker Englishes.
3. There must be a globally intelligible English as English as an International Language (EIL).
4. English can function as a common tool of communication among non-native speakers (ELF) in Asia.
5. Which variety is the best candidate for EIL? Choose one (from 9 English options + Common Core of all the varieties but it does not exist in reality)
6. The interactions with non-native speakers are useful in improving our communication skills.
7. The interactions with native speakers are the only way we can improve our communication skills.
8. Bilinguals have more advantages over mono-lingual NS speakers, since bilinguals know two cultures well enough.
9. Kachru's three concentric circles refer to the three categories roughly corresponding to EFL, ESL and NS Englishes.
10. The inner circle is norm-independent.
11. The outer-circle is norm-dependent.
12. The expanding circle is norm-providing.
13. Kachru's three concentric circles refer to the three geographical areas in the world.

In responding to the above items, the students were asked to choose from *Yes*, *Uncertain*, or *No* in the same manner as in Part 1, except for the item 5 where they

had to choose a best item from a number of options.

The third part (henceforth, Part 3), titled *Tell us your ideas of successful bilinguals*, included the following 13 items.

1. The successful bilinguals have clear pronunciation, but they can have local accent.
2. The successful bilinguals know more than () words.
3000 5000 8000 10000 13000 more than 15000
3. The successful bilinguals can use effectively roughly () English words.
3000 5000 8000 10000 13000 more than 15000
4. The successful bilinguals seldom make grammatical errors in writing.
5. The successful bilinguals can talk about one's culture and society in English.
6. The successful bilinguals can communicate with other Asians effectively.
7. The successful bilinguals can communicate with Native Speakers effectively.
8. The successful bilinguals can read various genres in English.
9. The successful bilinguals can write and speak about one's own professional fields.
10. The successful bilinguals are familiar with the English pronunciation of other Asians.
11. The successful bilinguals are familiar with the English grammar of other Asians.
12. The successful bilinguals are familiar with the cultures of other Asians.
13. The successful bilinguals can use communication strategies to overcome communication breakdowns.

These items, except for items 2 and 3, were designed to delineate what kind of image the participants have of *successful bilinguals*. To do so, using 5-point Likert scale, we asked the participants to reflect to what extent they agreed with each of the item descriptions. In responding to these two items, the participants were supposed to choose one of the options, which they thought sounded appropriate for the questions.

2.3 Data collection

In order to gather the responses from a number of participating universities, we developed an online questionnaire. We also made a paper-based version available. The survey took about 10 minutes for each student to complete, and was conducted in a classroom or at students' convenience between June 4, 2013 and October 6, 2013. The participation of the students was primarily called by the teachers of *World Englishes and Miscommunications* and *CCDL*.

At the early period of the data collection, there were two design errors in the online questionnaire: with the first students could only choose one answer although they needed to choose one or two answers (Part 1, Item 5); the second allowed students to choose multiple answers although they needed to choose only one answer (Part 2, Item 5). The survey team fixed the design problems quickly and deleted inappropriate answers only for the items concerned.

2.4 Data Analysis

The students' responses on the items in Parts 1 and 2 were analyzed in terms of frequency distribution and cross tabulation because the data were collected in the form of nominal scale. As for the items in Part 3, we computed the means and standard deviations for each item because the data were in the form of Likert scale.

It is also important to note here that in order to further discuss the students' attitudes toward the Asian as well as the native varieties of English, we divided the students into two groups called "Mastery" and "Not mastery" on the basis of the responses on the following questions: (1) items concerning the current status of English (items 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 in Part 1), and (2) items concerning the notions of WE (items 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 in Part2). Because each of these 10 items had a correct answer, we tallied the number of the correct answers within each participant and then, regarded those who had more than 8 correct answers as Mastery. Thus, the students in Mastery group can be said to have enough knowledge on the current status of English as well as the concepts or notions of WE. The second group is called Not mastery, where those who had less than 7 correct answers on the items were grouped. On the basis of the two groups, we discussed the students' attitudes toward Asian varieties as well as native varieties of English.

3. Result

3.1 Background Questionnaire

Tables 2-4 show the result of background questionnaire concerning (1) *use of English in her/his daily life*, (2) *use of English in her/his family life*, and (3) *use of English at school*, respectively.

Table 2: Use of English in daily life

Nationality	rare	often	every day	Total
Japanese	58 (65.9%)	21 (23.9%)	9 (10.2%)	88
Korean	7 (36.8%)	8 (42.1%)	4 (21.1%)	19
Chinese	91 (49.7%)	63 (34.4%)	29 (15.8%)	183
Taiwanese	15 (28.3%)	24 (45.3%)	14 (26.4%)	53
Hong Kong	6 (33.3%)	7 (38.9%)	5 (27.8%)	18
Malaysian	0 (00.0%)	0 (00.0%)	2 (100.0%)	2
Singaporean	0 (00.0%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (100.0%)	1
	177 (48.6%)	123 (33.8%)	64 (17.6%)	364

Note: Those who had not responded to the item were excluded.

Table 3: Use of English in his or her family life

Nationality	rare	often	every day	Total
Japanese	82 (94.3%)	4 (04.6%)	1 (01.1%)	87
Korean	15 (78.9%)	3 (15.8%)	1 (05.3%)	19
Chinese	174 (95.1%)	7 (03.8%)	2 (01.1%)	183
Taiwanese	45 (84.9%)	7 (13.2%)	1 (01.9%)	53
Hong Kong	15 (83.3%)	2 (11.1%)	1 (05.6%)	18
Malaysian	2 (100.0%)	0 (00.0%)	0 (00.0%)	2
Singaporean	1 (100.0%)	0 (00.0%)	0 (00.0%)	1
	334 (92.0%)	23 (06.3%)	6 (01.7%)	363

Note: Those who had not responded to the item were excluded.

Table 4: Use of English at school

Nationality	rare	often	every day	Total
Japanese	37 (42.5%)	37 (42.5%)	13 (14.9%)	87
Korean	3 (15.8%)	10 (52.6%)	6 (31.6%)	19
Chinese	47 (28.0%)	69 (41.1%)	52 (31.0%)	168
Taiwanese	1 (01.9%)	27 (51.9%)	24 (46.2%)	52
Hong Kong	2 (11.1%)	7 (38.9%)	9 (50.0%)	18
Malaysian	0 (00.0%)	2 (100.0%)	0 (00.0%)	2
Singaporean	0 (00.0%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (100.0%)	1
	90 (25.9%)	152 (43.8%)	105 (30.3%)	347

Note: Those who had not responded to the item were excluded.

First, on the question concerning the use of English in daily life, most students belonging to the expanding circle, that is, Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Taiwanese students reported that they rarely or often use English in their daily life. On the other hand, as we expected, the students belonging to the outer circle, that is, Malaysian and Singaporean students reported that they use English every day. As for Hong Kong students, who are said to be belonging to the outer circle, they showed almost the same proportions as the students in the expanding circle¹. Second, on the question concerning the use of English in family life, almost all the students reported that they rarely use English in their family lives. Lastly, on the question concerning use of English at school, over 70 percent of the students in the expanding circle reported that they use English *often* or *every day* at school, but a large population of the Japanese students, say more than 40 percent, reported that they rarely use English at school.

¹ The result might be inconclusive because some Hong Kong students were counted not as Hong Kong students but as Chinese students as discussed above.

This result may reflect the current situation of English language education at the tertiary-level in Japan, where most of the classes are conducted in their mother tongue.

Part 1

Tables 4-5 show the results of frequency distributions of the items in Part 1.

Table 4: Frequency Distribution of the items in Part 1.

	Group	Yes	Uncertain	No
item 1	Not Mastery	244 (71.1%)	69 (20.1%)	30 (08.7%)
	Mastery	22 (95.7%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (04.3%)
	Total	266 (72.7%)	69 (18.9%)	31 (08.5%)
item 2	Not Mastery	213 (62.1%)	72 (21.0%)	58 (16.9%)
	Mastery	20 (87.0%)	3 (13.0%)	3 (13.0%)
	Total	233 (63.7%)	75 (20.5%)	58 (15.8%)
item 3	Not Mastery	59 (17.2%)	242 (70.6%)	42 (12.2%)
	Mastery	22 (95.7%)	1 (04.3%)	0 (00.0%)
	Total	81 (22.1%)	243 (66.4%)	42 (11.5%)
item 4	Not Mastery	46 (13.5%)	240 (70.2%)	56 (16.4%)
	Mastery	15 (65.2%)	6 (26.1%)	2 (08.7%)
	Total	61 (16.7%)	246 (67.4%)	58 (15.9%)
item 6	Not Mastery	169 (49.3%)	128 (37.3%)	46 (13.4%)
	Mastery	22 (95.7%)	1 (04.3%)	0 (00.0%)
	Total	191 (52.2%)	129 (35.2%)	46 (12.6%)
item 7	Not Mastery	174 (50.7%)	129 (37.6%)	40 (11.7%)
	Mastery	20 (87.0%)	3 (13.0%)	0 (00.0%)
	Total	194 (53.0%)	132 (36.1%)	40 (10.9%)

As Table 4 shows, most of the students in Mastery group (over 80 %, on average) chose *Yes*, a correct answer for each question, on the items in Part, except for item 4, which asks the current status of GA in USA. It is also important to note that most of the students in Not Mastery (over 80 % in each item) did not recognize that the RP speakers are only 4 % in Britain (item 3) and that GA speakers are only 2 % in USA.

Table 5: Frequency distribution of item5 in Part 1

Varieties of English	Group		
	Not Mastery	Mastery	Total
AE	180 (52.3%)	12 (52.2%)	192 (52.3%)
AE, BE	5 (01.5%)	1 (04.3%)	6 (01.6%)
AE, BE, CE	1 (00.3%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (00.3%)
AE, BE, CE, IE	0 (00.0%)	1 (04.3%)	1 (00.3%)
AE, BE, CCV	1 (00.3%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (00.3%)
AE, CE	2 (00.6%)	0 (00.0%)	2 (00.5%)
AE, SE	1 (00.3%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (00.3%)
BE	82 (23.8%)	3 (13.0%)	85 (23.2%)
BE, CCV	1 (00.3%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (00.3%)
CE	19 (05.5%)	1 (04.3%)	20 (05.4%)
CCV	42 (12.2%)	4 (17.4%)	46 (12.5%)
IE	1 (00.3%)	1 (04.3%)	2 (00.5%)
KE	1 (00.3%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (00.3%)
SE	5 (01.5%)	0 (00.0%)	5 (01.4%)
SE, CCV	1 (00.3%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (00.3%)
Missing	2 (00.6%)	0 (00.0%)	2 (00.5%)
Total	344 (100.0%)	23 (100.0%)	367 (100.0%)

Note: AE, BE, CE, CCV, IE, KE and SE stand for American English, British English, Chinese English, Common Core of All the Varieties of English but not exists in reality, Indian English, Korean English and Singapore English, respectively.

The result indicates almost the same pattern between the students in Not Mastery and Mastery. Indeed, over 70 % of the students (in total) chose native varieties of English, that is, American English or British English, as those officially recognized as a model for English learners in their own countries.

Part2

Tables 6-7 show the results of frequency distribution of the items in Part 2.

Table 6: Frequency Distribution of the items in Part 2

	Group	Yes	Uncertain	No
item 1 (Part2)	Not Mastery	167 (48.7%)	146 (42.6%)	30 (08.7%)
	Mastery	19 (82.6%)	4 (17.4%)	0 (00.0%)
	Total	186 (50.8%)	150 (41.0%)	30 (08.2%)
item 2 (Part2)	Not Mastery	87 (25.4%)	81 (23.6%)	175 (51.0%)
	Mastery	12 (54.5%)	3 (13.6%)	7 (31.8%)
	Total	99 (27.1%)	84 (23.0%)	182 (49.9%)
item 3 (Part2)	Not Mastery	185 (53.8%)	108 (31.4%)	51 (14.8%)
	Mastery	16 (69.6%)	4 (17.4%)	3 (13.0%)
	Total	201 (54.8%)	112 (30.5%)	54 (14.7%)
item 4 (Part2)	Not Mastery	251 (73.0%)	64 (18.6%)	29 (08.4%)
	Mastery	23 (100.0%)	0 (00.0%)	0 (00.0%)
	Total	274 (74.7%)	64 (17.4%)	29 (07.9%)
item 6 (Part2)	Not Mastery	227 (66.4%)	73 (21.3%)	42 (12.3%)
	Mastery	21 (95.5%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (04.5%)
	Total	248 (68.1%)	73 (20.1%)	43 (11.8%)
item 7 (Part2)	Not Mastery	50 (14.6%)	62 (18.1%)	230 (67.3%)
	Mastery	9 (40.9%)	1 (04.5%)	12 (54.5%)
	Total	59 (16.2%)	63 (17.3%)	242 (66.5%)
item 8 (Part2)	Not Mastery	200 (58.7%)	103 (30.2%)	38 (11.1%)
	Mastery	19 (82.6%)	3 (13.0%)	1 (04.3%)
	Total	219 (60.2%)	106 (29.1%)	39 (10.7%)
item 9 (Part2)	Not Mastery	95 (27.8%)	230 (67.3%)	17 (05.0%)
	Mastery	23 (100.0%)	0 (00.0%)	0 (00.0%)
	Total	118 (32.3%)	230 (63.0%)	17 (04.7%)
item 10 (Part2)	Not Mastery	78 (22.7%)	234 (68.2%)	31 (09.0%)
	Mastery	21 (91.3%)	0 (00.0%)	2 (08.7%)
	Total	99 (27.0%)	234 (63.9%)	33 (09.0%)
item 11 (Part2)	Not Mastery	66 (19.3%)	248 (72.5%)	28 (08.2%)
	Mastery	23 (100.0%)	0 (00.0%)	0 (00.0%)
	Total	89 (24.4%)	248 (67.9%)	28 (07.7%)
item 12 (Part2)	Not Mastery	75 (21.9%)	236 (69.0%)	31 (09.1%)
	Mastery	22 (95.7%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (04.3%)
	Total	97 (26.6%)	236 (64.7%)	32 (08.8%)
item 13 (Part2)	Not Mastery	71 (20.7%)	222 (64.7%)	50 (14.6%)
	Mastery	14 (60.9%)	1 (04.3%)	8 (34.8%)
	Total	85 (23.2%)	223 (60.9%)	58 (15.8%)

Table 7: Frequency Distribution of the item 5 in Part 2

Varieties of English	Group		Total
	Not Mastery	Mastery	
AE	180 (52.3%)	12 (52.2%)	192 (52.3%)
AE, BE	5 (01.5%)	1 (04.3%)	6 (01.6%)
AE, BE, CE	1 (00.3%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (00.3%)
AE, BE, CE, IE	0 (00.0%)	1 (04.3%)	1 (00.3%)
AE, BE, CCV	1 (00.3%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (00.3%)
AE, CE	2 (00.6%)	0 (00.0%)	2 (00.5%)
AE, SE	1 (00.3%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (00.3%)
BE	82 (23.8%)	3 (13.0%)	85 (23.2%)
BE, CCV	1 (00.3%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (00.3%)
CE	19 (05.5%)	1 (04.3%)	20 (05.4%)
CCV	42 (12.2%)	4 (17.4%)	46 (12.5%)
IE	1 (00.3%)	1 (04.3%)	2 (00.5%)
KE	1 (00.3%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (00.3%)
SE	5 (01.5%)	0 (00.0%)	5 (01.4%)
SE, CCV	1 (00.3%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (00.3%)
missing	2 (00.6%)	0 (00.0%)	2 (00.5%)
Total	344 (100.0%)	23 (100.0%)	367 (100.0%)

Note: AE, BE, CE, CCV, IE, KE and SE stand for American English, British English, Chinese English, Common Core of All the Varieties of English but not exists in reality, Indian English, Korean English and Singapore English, respectively.

It is particularly important to note here that, although about half of the students (in total) thought some varieties in Asia would have some marked features which might be unintelligible to users of other varieties, about 75% of the students (in total) still thought English could function as a common tool of communication among non-native speakers (ELF) in Asia (item 4).

Part3

Table 8 shows the descriptive statistics for the items 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in Part 3. Table 9 summarizes the frequency distributions of items 2 and 3.

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics for the items 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in Part 3

item	Group		
	Not Mastery	Mastery	Total
item1 (Part3)	3.47 (1.09)	2.82 (1.50)	3.43 (1.13)
item4 (Part3)	3.21 (1.10)	2.48 (1.16)	3.16 (1.12)
item5 (Part3)	3.85 (0.93)	3.43 (1.38)	3.82 (0.97)
item6 (Part3)	3.78 (0.94)	3.48 (1.27)	3.77 (0.96)
item7 (Part3)	4.02 (0.93)	3.43 (1.44)	3.98 (0.98)
item8 (Part3)	3.70 (0.92)	3.17 (1.34)	3.66 (0.96)
item9 (Part3)	3.81 (0.89)	3.43 (1.38)	3.79 (0.93)
item10 (Part3)	3.18 (1.04)	2.87 (1.22)	3.16 (1.05)
item11 (Part3)	3.03 (1.02)	2.59 (1.10)	3.00 (1.03)
item12 (Part3)	3.08 (0.97)	2.77 (1.11)	3.06 (0.98)
item13 (Part3)	3.77 (0.88)	3.39 (1.41)	3.75 (0.92)

Note: The values in the parenthesis show standard deviations.

Table 9: Frequency Distribution of the items 2 and 3 in Part 3

item	Group	Group							Total
		3000	5000	8000	10000	13000	morethan15000	missing	
item 2 (Part3)	Not Mastery	11 (03.2%)	44 (12.8%)	51 (14.8%)	102 (29.7%)	33 (09.6%)	101 (29.4%)	2 (00.6%)	344 (100.0%)
	Mastery	5 (21.7%)	3 (13.0%)	4 (17.4%)	5 (21.7%)	1 (04.3%)	4 (17.4%)	1 (04.3%)	23 (100.0%)
	Total	16 (04.4%)	47 (12.8%)	55 (15.0%)	107 (29.2%)	34 (09.3%)	105 (28.6%)	3 (00.8%)	367 (100.0%)
item3 (Part 3)	Not Mastery	40 (11.6%)	79 (23.0%)	88 (25.6%)	66 (19.2%)	16 (04.7%)	51 (14.8%)	4 (01.2%)	344 (100.0%)
	Mastery	6 (26.1%)	7 (30.4%)	6 (26.1%)	3 (13.0%)	0 (00.0%)	1 (04.3%)	0 (00.0%)	23 (100.0%)
	Total	46 (12.5%)	86 (23.4%)	94 (25.6%)	69 (18.8%)	16 (04.4%)	52 (14.2%)	4 (01.1%)	367 (100.0%)

4 Discussion

4.1 The knowledge of English and the image of successful bilinguals that the students have

In this section, we report what we have learned through the survey. The items below are about the interactions among non-native speakers of English.

P2-4: English can function as a common tool of communication among non-native speakers (ELF) in Asia (75% answered Yes).

P2-6: The interactions with non-native speakers are useful in improving our communication skills (68% answered Yes).

P2-7: The interactions with native speakers are the only way we can improve our communication skills (67% answered No).

About 75% of the students think English is a common tool of communication in Asia. And about 70% of the students think that the interactions among non-native speakers make their English better and the interaction with native speakers are not the only way they can improve our communication skills. The results imply that the students think that new English is locally developed. Then native speakers of English are irrelevant to such English. For our students, to be a member of the native speakers' community is just one of their purposes of their English language learning. They learn English to be a member of international communities. This is also claimed in Widdowson (2003) and McKay (2002). To acquire the competence of the native speakers of English is one of the final goals of their English language learning. The final goal of vast majority of learners of English is to be a member of international

communities where English is used as a communication tool.

The next finding is that students think that there are two kinds of English: our students think that English we end up with and English that we target at in learning English. For the answers to the question, “Which variety is the best candidate for EIL?” about 80% of the students think that American or British English should be set as a models of EIL. The students think that they need a model in their English language learning. On the other hand, however, our students accept English that is locally developed, Asian Englishes, which is indicated to the answers to the question below. About 50% of the student think Asian Englishes are intelligible and are easier to understand than native speaker Englishes. The results indicate that there are two kinds of English: English we end up with and English we target at in learning English.

P2-1: Some varieties in Asia show marked features which are unintelligible to users of other varieties (50% answered No or Uncertain).

P2-2: Asian Englishes are easier to understand than Native Speaker Englishes (50% answered Yes or Uncertain).

The third finding is the knowledge of English and the image of successful bilinguals. The 19 items is about the knowledge of English and the image of successful bilinguals in our questionnaire. The items are designed to measure the knowledge on the current environment surrounding English. We divided the students into two groups, based on the sum of the scores of these items: Mastery (8 or more points) and Not Mastery (below 8 points). If students get the score of 8 or more, we call them Mastery. If students get the score of below 8, we call them Not Mastery. Below is the items about the knowledge of English.

P1-1: There are more people in Asia who use English as their second language or as a foreign language than native speakers.

P1-3: Received Pronunciation (RP) is pronunciation norms taught in Britain. The RP speakers are only 4 % in Britain.

P1-4: General American (GA) has been regarded as pronunciation norms in the North America. GA speakers are only 2 % in USA.

P1-6: In 2050, half of the world population will use English for their working life.

P1-7: Currently more NNS-NNS interactions are taking place than NS-NNS interactions.

P2-9: Kachru’s three concentric circles refer to the three categories roughly corresponding to EFL, ESL and NS Englishes.

P2-10: The inner circle is norm-independent.

P2-11: The outer-circle is norm-dependent.

P2-12: The expanding circle is norm-providing.

P2-13: Kachru’s three concentric circles refer to the three geographical areas in the world.

If we divide our students into two groups: Mastery and Not Mastery, we can find differences between two groups. These are items about the image of successful bilinguals. These are items with 5-point scale: 1 strongly disagree and 5 means strongly agree. For example, if one agrees with the statement of an item, he/she choose 5. The students of Not Mastery tend to give higher scores to all the items about the image of successful bilinguals than the students of Mastery. The items are

shown below. Table 10 shows the average scores of the items. The expectation for the proficiency of successful bilinguals that the students of Mastery is not so high. If people cannot communicate with the native speakers effectively, we can call them successful bilinguals. Since we are English users, it is difficult for us to always communicate with the native speakers effectively. Sometimes we cannot communicate with them in an effective manner.

- P3-4: The successful bilinguals seldom make grammatical errors in writing.
- P3-6: The successful bilinguals can communicate with other Asians effectively.
- P3-7: The successful bilinguals can communicate with Native Speakers effectively.
- P3-8: The successful bilinguals can read various genres in English.
- P3-9: The successful bilinguals can write and speak about one's own professional fields.
- P3-10: The successful bilinguals are familiar with the English pronunciation of other Asians.
- P3-11: The successful bilinguals are familiar with the English grammar of other Asians.
- P3-12: The successful bilinguals are familiar with the cultures of other Asians.
- P3-13: The successful bilinguals can use communication strategies to overcome communication breakdowns.

Table 10: The means of the items on the image of successful bilinguals

	P3-4	P3-6	P3-7	P3-8	P3-9	P3-10	P3-11	P3-12	P3-13
Not Mastery	3.2	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.7
Mastery	2.4	3.4	3.4	3.1	3.4	2.8	2.5	2.7	3.3
All	3.1	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.7	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.7

4.2 How do Japanese students who have had interactions with Asian students come to view their English and Asian Englishes?

4.2.1 CCDL Course Evaluation Questionnaire Survey

In this section we report on some of the results of the CCDL Course Evaluation Questionnaire Survey (see Owada et al., 2012). The purpose of this survey was to investigate how Japanese students who engaged in cross-cultural interactions with Asian counterparts came to perceive their own English and Asian Englishes. This survey, which consists of 54 items written in Japanese, was administered to 92 students at the end of CCDL Courses in the spring semester of the academic year 2012. The mean age of the participants was 20.41 years old (Range: 19-24). Out of 92, 54 students reported their TOEIC scores, whose mean score was 777.80 (SD = 107.25).

Here we focus on the four items related to Japanese students' perception toward varieties of English: Japanese English, Asian Englishes, and native English. The students responded to each of the four items on the scale of 7, with 1 being 'strongly disagree' and 7 being 'strongly agree.' In the following discussion we regarded 5 and more as 'agree,' 4 as 'neither agree nor disagree,' and 3 and less as 'disagree.'

The four items and one sample scale are the following:

Item 26: Through the CCDL Course, I got to realize that we can speak English with some Japanese accent as long as we can communicate effectively.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

Strongly disagree strongly
agree

Item 27: Through the CCDL Course, I got to realize that Asian people can speak English with their own accent as long as they can communicate effectively.

Item 28: Through the CCDL Course, I got to realize that we need to make my English closer to native-like pronunciation in order to communicate effectively.

Item 29: Through the CCDL Course, I got to realize that Asian people need to make their English closer to native-like pronunciation in order to communicate effectively.

4.2.2 Analysis of the four items

We analyze the four items in contingency tables of items 26 and 28 as well as items 27 and 29 in order to find out how the Japanese students came to view their English model. Items 26 and 28 were intended for what the Japanese students think is their ideal English model. As in Table 11, 25 out of 92 students (27%) responded that while they should aim for native-like pronunciation, they should accept Japanese accent.

Table 11: What do Japanese students think is their ideal English mode? (N = 92)

		Item 28. native-like pronunciation		
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree
Item 26. Japanese accent	Disagree	0	5	19
	Neither agree nor disagree	4	2	10
	Agree	20	7	25

Items 27 and 29 were intended for what the Japanese students think is the ideal English model for Asians. Table 12 shows that 25 out of 92 students (27%) showed their agreement for both Japanese accent and native-live pronunciation. In other words, they seemed to believe that both Japanese accent and the native model can coexist in the cross-cultural setting.

Table 12: What do Japanese students think is the ideal English mode for Asians?
 (N = 92)

		Item 29. native-like pronunciation		
		Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree
Item 27. Asian accent	Disagree	0	5	14
	Neither agree nor disagree	2	9	6
	Agree	22	9	25

4.2.3 Findings

As we have seen, less than one third of the students (27%) showed positive attitudes toward both Japanese accented English and native-like pronunciation for both the Japanese and Asians. It seems that they became aware of the importance of ELF (English as a Lingua Franca) through interactions with Asian students. At the same time, however, they felt the need to speak English with native-like pronunciation. Therefore, we can argue that students have come to recognize the importance of Japanese English in particular and Asian Englishes in general while aiming for a native variety as their model for English in the cross-cultural setting provided by the CCDL Courses. In future research, we plan to investigate what kind of thought processes in the actual ELF context of the CCDL Courses lead to the necessity of balancing competing goals for Asian Englishes and native-like pronunciation

References

- He, D., & Miller, L. (2011). English teacher preference: the case of China's non-English-major students. *World Englishes*, 30, 3, 428-443.
- Hung T. N. T. (2007). English as a global language: The teaching of pronunciation. In M. Nakano (ed.), *World Englishes and Miscommunications*. Tokyo: Waseda University International. 3-12.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The other tongue English accross cultures*. 2nd edition. Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2009). English as the international academic language: implications for 'other' knowledge. In F. Sharifian (Ed.) *New Perspectives on Language and Education Clevedon*. Multilingual Matters: 254-270.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a Lingua Franca in ASEAN: A Multilingual Model*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English as an International Language in Asia: Implications for language education. In Kirkpatrick, A. & Sussex, R (Eds.). *English as an International Language in Asia: Implications for language education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language*. Oxford: OUP.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209-239.
- Smith, L. E. (1976). English as an International Auxiliary Language. *RELC Journal*. 38-42.
- Owada, K., Ueda, N. & Yoshida, S. (2012, December). *Nihonjindaigakuseino ajiano daigakuseinitaisuru ibunkarikai —eigoo baikaitoshita ibunkakoryukurasuniokeru gakushukokasokuteio mezashite* [Cross-cultural understanding between Japanese and Asian university students: Measuring the learning effect in English-medium cross-cultural classes]. Paper presented at the 31st National Conference of the Japanese Association for Asian Englishes (JAFAE), Tokyo.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.

