

INTERNATIONALIZATION AND GLOBALIZATION OF LANGUAGE EDUCATION; AN ACADEMIC PROGRAMME FOR GLOBAL CONCERN

John Ode Adikpe

Abstract

In reaction to the postmodern internationalization and globalization era characterized by porous geographical boundaries allowing people, ideas, services and goods to move rapidly across borders, many tertiary institutions in different parts of the world have developed strategies (approaches) for internationalizing their educational programmes. International awareness, intercultural communication skills, and open-mindedness lie at the centre of the goals of international education, different practices for these goals to be achieved have been implemented. Some educational contexts mandate the teaching of English to all non-English speaking background students, yet other emphasize the incorporation of issues of cultural diversification into all aspects of the learning curriculum. Meanwhile, numerous studies claim that both problematic and mono-cultural chauvinistic. This has resulted to a question whether an internationalized academic programme that attempt to fully react to the complicated landscape that globalization has created exists. The paper focuses on a case study of how our international/intercultural communication focused programme offered by a university in Nigeria reacts to the landscape adequately. Based on in-depth interviews with two domestic Nigerian students and two international students on their learning experiences in the programme, the contributory roles has played in challenging ethnocentric and self-deprecating perceptions. The study provides internationally-oriented curriculum developers which will enhance an academic programme in today's international and intercultural communicative encounters.

The inextricably interconnection world created by the rapid forces of internationalization or globalization has greatly prompted many educational institutions at all levels of study and within a wide range of disciplines to re-conceptualize the kind of knowledge, mindsets, and skills they expect their students to develop. A little wonder then, many tertiary institutions have started to develop or have developed strategic plans to internationalize their education. They either offer or claim to offer learning programmes and curricula that provide their students with international exposure and equip them with intercultural knowledge, intercultural mindsets, and intercultural communication skills. In reality, as providers of internationalized education, some if not all, tertiary institutions establish a policy of compulsory English Language instruction for all their students from all disciplines. This is driven by the awareness of the international status and increasingly important functions of English in today's world. However, other tertiary institutions emphasize the incorporation of issues related to cultural diversity, multiculturalism, or intercultural communication into all learning programmes. This has created a mismatch between the rhetoric and reality. This presupposes that some institutions claim that their programmes or curricula are internationally-oriented in reality, yet they still have not been able to escape a monocultural chauvinistic perspective. That is why Trevaskes, Eisenchelas and Liddicoat (2003) expressed surprise whether learning programmes really exist that truly provide

internationally flavoured education which genuinely prepares its graduates for the landscape globalization has created.

In this work, the author put forward a case study of how an international/intercultural communication focused undergraduate programme offered by a university in Nigeria has attempted to respond to this landscape without falling into the trap of an Anglo-centric mindset. On the basis of in-depth interviews from four former students of the programme, the author brought to lime-light the contributory roles the programme had played in prompting them to develop the knowledge and perceptions for living effectively in today's international as well as intercultural globalizing environments. Before this, I shall briefly discussed the conceptual frameworks upon which the premises of this paper's arguments is based.

Conceptual Framework

Internationalization/Globalization: Its Various Interpretations

The concept of internationalization or globalization is not at any level an unfamiliar concept as it has been widely and extensively discussed by scholars from a wide range of academic disciplines including that of political science, history, education, cultural studies, sociology and economics. The meaning of this concept has become rather stretchy leading the cultural critic Jenkins (2009) remarked that internationalization or globalization has become the modern or post modern version of the proverbial elephant, described by its blind observers in so many diverse ways in his critical analysis of the definitions of globalization found in most academic, corporate, official and popular discussions of things globally, Scholte (2002), mentioned four concepts that are usually synonymous to the concept of globalization namely; internationalization, liberalization, universalization and westernization. However, since these do not provide important insights into historically relatively new key circumstances of our time, he proposes instead to view internationalization or globalization as the spread of transplanetary connections between people. This presupposes that internationalization/globalization involves unprecedented growth in transworld contacts, meaning that the porosity of geographical borders increasingly allow global humans to physically, culturally, psychologically and legally engage with each other. In essence, the rise and expansion of transnational corporations, has increased human mobility across the globe, and the advancement of Information Communication Technology (ICT) has actually increased the frequency of encounters between people from different parts of the world, and as such, physical access to people from various backgrounds can result in exchanges of cultural practices, values, trades, ideologies and worldviews. Internationalization/globalization emphasizes the relevant roles of mass communication as rightly observed by Mckay and Bokhorst-Heng (2008), will be used as a conceptual framework in this paper.

Internationalization of Education

In response to the above landscape that globalization has created, many educational institutions particularly tertiary institutions have a policy and have already developed strategies of internationalization (Haigh, 2002 & Yang, 2012) in which graduates are required to learn to develop genuine knowledge, awareness and necessary skills to communicate across cultures. The concept of internationalization of education is diversely conceived, different tertiary institutions have their own understanding of the concept and therefore, their own practices of internationalizing its education. This is in line with Trevaskes, Lisenchlas & Fiddicoat (2009) who divided internationalization into weak and strong forms. Believing by a marketing and quality assurance paradigm the weak form of

internationalization shows concern for maximizing profit through the recruitment of fee-paying international students, they continually argued that this is a superficial engagement with the spirit of internationalization. According to Knight and de Wit's (2009) have a view of internationalization as a meaningless term unless there is a conscious effort to integrate intercultural dimension into education, the strongest form emphasizes developing internationally and inter-culturally focused learning programmes and curricula. In these issues of cultural diversification and the aim to equip students with the knowledge and skill base to engage successfully in intercultural communications and relations is therefore, central.

Although universities usually claim to have developed the strongest form of internationalization, but this claim is still far from being realized (Hayward, 2002; Tevases, Eisenchras & Liddicoat, A.I. 2003; Stier, 2004; Briguglio, 2007; Stella & Liston 2008). The question of whether programmes/curricula that truly reflect the strong form of internationalization exist has been raised. A world-wide survey of internationalization by the International Association of universities in 2003 found that while two thirds of the institutions appear to have an internationalization policy and strategy in place, only about half of these institutions have budgets and a monitoring framework to support the implementation (Knight 2003). Nigerian universities in particular while claiming to have developed an internationalized curriculum as a means to inculcate cultural diversity, demonstrate no measures of success (Stella & Liston 2008). This is an indication that the strong form of internationalization seems to remain only at a theoretical level. While at practical level, universities cannot escape the weak form and a mono-cultural chauvinistic approach to internationalization.

Like in Nigeria it is nearly an empty programme in place because of government policy and unstable nature of our universities as government has been playing on gallery. There seems to be minimal attempt made to educationally utilize this cultural and linguistic richness to develop a culturally literate, interculturally capable society in Nigeria. Even if there is, the attempt seems to go as far as including international perspectives in a learning syllabus and may be adding word international to a title of a course.

Another important strategy of internationalization of education that has been implemented by some universities in the world is the teaching of English Language. In countries where English is the national or official language (like Nigeria) some if not all universities incorporate isolated remedial English Language classes within the normal degree structure (Haigh 2002) for non-English speaking background international students, so that they are up to speed with the dominant tradition. Some countries where English is not the national or official language, some universities mandate the teaching of English to students from all disciplines and adopt English as the medium of instructions (Carrol-Boegh 2005 & Manakul 2007).

All the same, these practices are still problematic and have been criticized for not internationalized enough for a number of reasons. One of such reasons is the isolation of remedial language classes which creates a binary opposition of us and them and a view of non-English speaking background international students as deficits. They as well legitimize the view of the mainstream tradition as unquestionably normal and restrict the incorporation of multicultural skills into the system at large (Haigh 2002). The second reason is that internationalization will remain monolingual and monocultural and supportive of the parochialism in scholarship if English is the only language that students are required to learn and use to gain knowledge. As Liddicoat (2003) rightly argues. *Internationalization...through the teaching of English and teaching in English to international*

students...lacks the dimension of diversity...and therefore does not adequately reflect the rhetoric of plurality and interculturality which accompanies for internationalization.

Similarly, Marginson (2010) argues that teaching English as a strategy of internationalization is a form of soft imperialism which imposes 'western' ways of thinking, doing and acting. An internationalized education needs to break out of an English only mindset by mandating the teaching of languages other than English. It is indeed undoubtedly true that learning languages other than English can guide students to develop international and intercultural communicative competence.

However, teaching and learning English also does not necessarily mean that;

- Students are westernized,
- Monolingualism and monoculturalism are promoted,
- And education fails to reflect the rhetoric of plurality and interculturality.

The question is, to what extent have the educators taken into consideration the changing sociolinguistic landscape of English in teaching the language?

English as an International Language (EIL)

The above criticism of English language teaching as a means of internationalization of education is based on a view of English as a unitary concept and the language of the 'West' and thus, has overlooked the current sociolinguistic reality of English. The global expansion of English, leading to the pluralization of its users and forms and the significant role of English in various international cultural and economic arenas have given English the status of an international language. Hence, the view of English as a homogeneous language of the 'West' is anachronistic for a number of reasons.

One major factor that contributes to the status of English as an international language is the changing demographic background of its users.

It has been widely agreed that the predominant users of English in the world today are bilingual and multilingual speakers of English and from what Kachru (2008) termed as 'Outer Circle Countries (OCC)' which include Nigeria and Singapore where English is used as an institutionalized language in conjunction with other official languages, and 'Expanding Circle Countries (ECC)' which as include China and South Korea where English is learned and taught as a foreign language. Statistically speaking, there are approximately one billion reasonably competent speakers of English from those circles (Jenkins 2009) who acquire English within their bilingual and multilingual repertoires, use English and perhaps other languages in multilingual contexts, and use English to communicate predominantly with other bilingual and multilingual speakers of English (Crystal 1997 & Gradol 2006).

Even though it is very difficult to determine the exact numbers of these speakers of English, but it is clear that the numbers of individuals from these circles are growing and have exceeded the numbers of speakers from 'Inner Circle Countries (ICC)' where English is spoken as the national language (Mckay 2003; Jenkins 2009; Graddol, 2010; Marlina & Ahn 2011,).

Furthermore, the global expansion of English and the increase in the numbers of bilingual and multilingual speakers of English in the world have as well led to emergence of different varieties of world English (Graddol 2010; Marlina & Ahn 2011) and have defined English as a pluricentric language with multiple vocabulary, grammars, accent and pragmatic discourse conventions. Whenever English enters a particular society, the language and its culture are not passively absorbed and internalized by members of that society. Rather they are 'nativized' (Kachru 2008), 'appropriated' (Matsuda 2012), and 'renationalized' (Mckay 2012) to 'suit the local tastebuds' (Marlina 2010) and to

project their own cultural and linguistic identities. And so, with its pluralized forms, English is a vehicle for users of English to project their cultural identities and to express their cultural conceptualizations (Sharifian 2011) to those outside their local milieu. The users of English either OCCs or ECCs may not necessarily communicate in inner-circle varieties of English of the world views, pragmatic norms and cultural values of those countries. Instead, as bilingual and multilingual speakers of English, these users of English are likely to speak their varieties of English in which their cultural values, pragmatic norms and world views are embedded. As Matsuda (2012) correctly described, they are likely to display their emotions such as anger, joy, affection, love, surprise, late, understanding, honesty, respect and so on in the same way as they always have, but in English. With their bilingual and multilingual repertoire, communication between these speakers is not likely to take place only in English, but also in other languages or in a code-switching manner between English and other languages like Igede, Ibo and Yoruba in Nigeria.

This rapid development of English has really encouraged Applied Linguistic and TESOL scholars to shift its notions of English education from the traditional ESL – Inner-Circle-English-oriented paradigm to the EIL-English as an international language paradigm (Matsuda 2012 & Sharifian 2009) which emphasizes the importance of teaching English as a pluricentric language for both international and intercultural communication. As such, recent publications (Alsagoffi, Mckay, Hu & Remandya, 2002 & Matsuda 2012a) provide, English language educators with ways in which this paradigm can be incorporated into their curriculum and pedagogy. Drawing from a number of several researchers and scholars (Matsuda 2002, 2005, Giri 2009, 2012b; Ahn 2011; Marlina & Mckay 2012) who are proponents of the paradigm, have the following as proposed key principles that need to inform the teaching and learning of English in today's era of globalization:

- *The variety of English needs to be relevant to the local learning contexts of the learners.*
- *Examples of different varieties of world English should be present to be internationalized.*
- *The cultures and users of English from outer and expanding circle countries should be more prominently represented.*
- *Interactions in English between bilingual and multilingual speakers of English should be present.*
- *The discourses of cultures and users of English from Outer and Expanding Circle countries should be presented in non-ethnocentric manner.*
- *Multilingualism should be promoted by recognizing and including languages other than English spoken by the students.*

The first principle above may need to be revisited in the light of the landscape that globalization has created. Even though it is genuine for students to learn a locally relevant variety of English, globalization has blurred which variety of English is and will be locally relevant. Mass migration and advancement of communication technology have led world English to travel from one circle to another (Clyne & Sharifian 2008). The linguistic and cultural backgrounds of potential interlocutors with whom learners will interact in English are often unknown as is the variety of English that will be used. Since global students cannot avoid bathing in the sea of linguistic variety (Clyne & Sharifian 2008) and encountering variation in cultural and linguistic behaviour the variety of English to which the students need to be exposed should be global by relevant.

Reacting to Internationalization and Globalization: The Undergraduate EIL Programme

I shall therefore, use the above theoretical frameworks as the section presents a case study of how an international-intercultural-communication focused undergraduate programme. That is, English as an International Language (EIL) programme offered by an internationally-oriented Nigerian university has reacted to internationalization and attempted to accomplish the university's mission of the internationalization of education. It showcases how students are guided at both the programme and classroom level to professionally develop the knowledge and skills base important for living in programme level.

To react to globalization and the university's mission of internationalization, the initial undergraduate EIL programme also known as EFSU - English for specific use that taught the use of English in the Nigerian academic discourse community to non-English speaking background (NESB) international students was revised. The main reason was to reform a deficit, monocultural-chauvinistic and assimilationistic approach to language education that underpinned the EFSU programme. This was reflected in the isolationist only NESB international students were able to study EFSU and how they were continuously required throughout their study in the programme to identify and learn to overcome problems they bilingual and multilingual speakers of English, faced in operating successfully within Nigerian society and the academic discourse community.

By contrast, the newly revised undergraduate EIL programme is an academic content driven programme that adopts EIL paradigm (Sharifian 2009 & McKay 2012) to teach international and intercultural communication to students from all backgrounds. It also provides them with knowledge English language variation and its implications for communication in English, teaching and learning English and researching English in a variety of intra/international contexts. As cultural and linguistic diversity is the core of the programme's curriculum, its main general objectives which include;

- *To guide students towards developing knowledge of English language variation;*
- *To foster the mindsets, attitudes and skills to communicate effectively and efficiently with speakers of English from diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds in a variety of intra/international contexts, and*
- *To develop understanding of the complexity of today's English language pedagogy and the skills to teach EIL (for future English teachers),* (Sharifian 2009 & McKay 2012).

To achieve these objectives, eight subjects are developed for EIL students at different levels of study. Two of the subjects studied by freshmen (100 level students) provide an introductory exploration of the notion of language variation in what ways language varies and why and based Kachru and Smith's (2008) notion of interaction as corporation, an investigation of what communicative strategies that international communicators need to learn to develop in communicating across those language varieties. Two further subjects studied by sophomones (200 level students) take these ideas one step further by exploring the impact of globalization on the use of English in face-to-face and online communication; and the use of English in media and popular culture. Sophomones are introduced to research practices and are required to conduct a small-scale project on any EIL topic of their choice. The last four subjects provide senior year students with opportunities to explore in greater depth and to do further research on the diversity of English and its implications in specific areas. The subjects range from the study of World English, all aspects of English in ICC, OCC and ECC to the study of language and culture, and from writing in EIL to the pedagogy of EIL.

As an internationally-oriented programme, it welcomes students from diverse cultural backgrounds regardless of the Nigerian circles from which they originally came. Therefore, having

students from up to twelve different nationalities in one class is not rare. EIL students not only come from the disciplines of Languages and Humanities and Social Studies, but there have also been a large number of students from Business and Economics, Information Technology, Sciences, Education and Engineering taking EIL as part of their university degree.

Classroom Level

Asserting the internationally-oriented objectives and subjects of the programme to justify the fact that the EIL programme is an internationalized programme that prepares its graduates to operate flexibly and successfully across cultures, and when really happens inside the classrooms needs to be discussed briefly because the exterior of any programme sometimes does not mirror its interior. This section therefore showcases what the EIL lecturers teach in the classroom in order to help the programme accomplish internationalization and also to guide their students towards developing knowledge, mindsets and skills needed for living in today's era of globalization.

Which Language?

As this programme teaches students about intercultural communication and the use of English for international communication, the language-focused upon is of course on English, but English with an emphasis on its plurality. In almost every lesson, the EIL lecturers incorporate examples of different varieties of world English from various circles either as the main topic for a lesson. For instance, English in China or when presenting examples to illustrate particular linguistic concept possibly in basilect vs acrolect. Students are encouraged to not just be aware of these differences, but also to study, analyze and interpret these different varieties. As classroom learning activities, students are given communicative scenario in which they encounter a variety of English with which they are not familiar and learn to develop the attitudes and strategies for dealing with familiar communicative encounters.

As multilingualism is a characteristic of today's international exchanges, the EIL lecturers are fully aware that it is impossible to teach EIL without incorporating other languages. Given the multilingual repertoires of the students, lecturers often solicit examples from their students' other languages and invite them to explain those examples to their classmates and lecturers. For instance, a lesson on politeness across cultures often includes in-depth discussions of honorifics from different languages and how they are being used by bilingual and multilingual speakers of English in their communication in English. The lecturers do not only aim at promoting multilingualism as the reality of today's communicative exchanges, but as well to show that knowledge of other languages is important for ensuring the success in international exchanges.

Which and Whose Cultures?

As English has become a vehicle for users of English to communicate their worldviews and cultural values, lecturers of the programme often use examples from different varieties especially OCC and ECC English to teach and illuminate cultural practices, values, beliefs and worldviews of the Outer and Expanding circle countries. This is done with full awareness of the risks of generating and perpetuating stereotypes. And this does not mean that the varieties of English and cultures from ICC are of no use or not considered. They are as well included in the curriculum and discussed in classrooms. Although there are some students who demand ICC English and cultures to dominate the

curriculum of the programme, the educators or the lecturers respond by referring to the multiculturalism of Nigeria and other ICCs and also to the variation of linguistic and cultural behaviour as the characteristic of communicative encounters in today's globalization era.

A pedagogical strategy often used by the EIL lecturers to promote intercultural learning is using students' cultural knowledge, cultural practices, local stories and worldviews as invaluable learning resources. The classroom learning activities are designed to diminish the role of lecturers as the knowledge – providers by prompting students to use their cultural and linguistic capital (Matsuda 2012) to educate their lecturers as well as classmates about their cultures. For instance, in a lesson on politeness in writing across cultures, students are given a scenario in which they are asked to write a professional letter responding to a customer's complaint. Monolingual English speakers respond in English, whereas bilingual and multilinguals write initially in their own mother tongue and then translate their letters into English when the students are required to share their analyses of the macro and micro-structure of their letters and explain the reasons behind these structures, they also share their own cultural values, pragmatic norms, worldviews and how these are embedded within their letters. Not only does this exercise allow everyone to gain an intercultural understanding, but it also provides the learners with opportunities to learn how to communicate their cultures in English to those who are unfamiliar with them.

What Issues are being Addressed?

To guide students towards becoming intercultural communicators, knowledge of the English language and cultural differences is not enough. For this reason, the lecturers normally refer to the issue of the politicization of cultural and linguistic differences. Moreso, the lecturers raise students' awareness of existing ideologies, policies and practices in any societies that unjustly empower some people and marginalize others based on their racial background and the language and the variety of English they speak. In addition to using their own personal observations and experiences, lecturers use movies, youtube clips, newspaper articles, policy documents and teaching materials to bring the above issues into classroom. Concepts and issues such as the unproblematized dichotomy of native and non-native English speakers, native speakerism (Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1989) Standard Language ideology (Phillipson 1992) Clippi-Green (1997), linguistic imperialism (Rubdy 2001); bontigue multiculturalism, (Holliday 2005) and creative destruction (Kumarravadivelu 2008) are highlighted.

Using these concepts as their analytical lenses, the students are encouraged to critically reflect on their observations and experiences of using, teaching and learning English. They are urged to unpack any hidden politics lying behind their experiences as well as observations of the discourse of the use of English as well as the pedagogy of English in a variety of intra/international contexts. To stress further, students are encouraged to investigate and propose strategies that can be employed to challenge this linguistically based social injustices. As these issues are sensitive, many students resist discussing them openly in the classrooms because of the fear of offending their classmates. In reaction to this, the lecturers have developed an online discussion forum where, students can courageously present a critical view point on these issues while remaining anonymous.

How are Students Assessed?

The EIL lecturers have developed a wide range assessment tasks to guide students towards developing their knowledge of EIL and intercultural communication as well as the ability to communicate across cultures and English through the following:

➤ **Journal entry** – This requires students to write in diary form their observations of and critical reflections on the theoretical concepts or debuts and issues in their daily life. For instance, students are asked to collect samples of different varieties of world English they encounter in their daily life.

➤ **Reflective oral presentations** – The focus of this task is similar to the one above, but here the students are asked to deliver their discoveries in a form of oral presentation. Students are as well required to develop activities to engage their classmates in reflections or critical dialogues.

➤ **Position paper** – This requires students to use the form of an academic essay to write about their stance, including a critical response in relation to a particular issue. Their response and instance will need them to engage with the theoretical issues and also to reflect critically on their experiences in using, learning and teaching English and if applicable other languages.

➤ **Critical movie analysis** – As the name depicts, here students are asked to use the theoretical concepts and issues they encountered as conceptual tools to analyze movies such as *Guilty Pleasure*, *Kite Runner*, *Hand of Destiny*, *The other end of the line*, etc. which contain intercultural stories, issues and examples of the use of different varieties of world English.

➤ **Research report** – It requires students to conduct a small-scale research project on any EIL related topic. It involves data collection or which they are required to carry out survey and interviews.

➤ **Stimulation or case study project** – It is a problem-solving project which students are assigned to the role of an EIL adviser in which they are required to work in groups and solve a case or a scenario which consists of issues and problems that arise from cultural and linguistic differences. The students do not only write their responses, but also have to present them orally either in a form of a role-play or a panel presentation.

➤ **Classroom-research project** – This involves students to report on their critical analyses of a number of English language learning classrooms as they are required to observe from the perspective of EIL. Their report must include critical observations, experiences and analysis of the English lecturers' teaching methodology, learning materials, classroom activities, the linguistic and cultural focus and classroom interactions.

Although each assessment task has its own focus, they all assess students on the following skills: Reflections, problem-solving, analytical, critical-thinking, application – the ability to link theory into practice and communication which include their ability to employ communicative strategies to share their cultural values, practices and worldviews in English. These tasks as well assess students on their knowledge of the current sociolinguistic reality of English, their awareness of the impact of globalization on using, learning and teaching English and the effectiveness of the communicative strategies they propose to employ in written tasks as well demonstrate in oral tasks in dealing with unfamiliar intercultural exchanges, linguistic and issues of social inequality.

The Efficacy of the EIL curricula: From Students' Perspectives

However much of the lecturers believe that the programme and curricula have successfully provided an internationalized education that graduate students will prepare for living in today's globalized world, the extent to which this confidence is warranted lies in the outcomes for the students. Thus, this section will briefly report of the learning experiences of four former EIL students, Geng (China), Juanga (South Korea), Otenga (Nigeria), and Ewa (Nigeria, all names are pseudonyms) who volunteered to be interviewed by the researcher. It specifically addresses the students' attitudes,

views and observations towards English language variation prior to studying in the programme and their experiences of how they were prompted to critically re-examine those attitudes and views. The reports on their interviews are only highlighted due to frame-set of the paper.

As expected, all participants entered the programme with minimal understanding and awareness of English language variation and therefore with a belief in the supremacy of speakers of English from ICCs, and a deficit view of speakers of English from OCCs and ECCs. Thus all participants seemed to be aware of differences being and sounding different, but these differences were regarded as deficiencies that needed to be remedied.

Both Geng and Ewa enrolled in the programme with a similar intention which was consistent with the aim of the programme, that is to learn how to use English internationally. However, when prompted to further explain what they meant they both seemed to reveal a self-deprecating and deficit view of their English. Geng and Juanga reported that they expected the programme to remedy their use of English and China and Korean accent and to help them speak like Nigerian or other English speakers from ICCs so that they would not feel behind. That presupposes on learning how to use English internationally seemed to be viewed learning how to speak like a Nigerian or Briton.

As they showed their reason for wanting to sound like Nigerian or Briton, they further showed their belief in the supremacy of those speakers and the exclusive effectiveness of their forms of English for international communication. Both believe learning how to communicate across cultures seemed to be viewed as learning to understand and perhaps sympathize with the difficulties, foibles and speed-bumps that speakers of English from OCCs and ECCs faced.

Reflecting on their experiences of studying in the programme and interacting with the lecturers and other students in the class, all participants that the EIL curricula had prompted them to develop knowledge, attitudes and skills they needed for using English to communicate across cultures. The difference in the way English is used as a result of the global speed was one major element of the curricula which all of the participants believed had broadened our horizons of the language (Ewa). Knowledge of world English was regarded as important and relevant to their daily life.

However, what needs to be highlighted is that the way the lecturers raised their awareness of world English was believed by these students to have largely prompted them to critically re-examine their previous attitudes and to develop ones that would be important for communication in today's globalized world.

The recurring emphasis on reflections on observations of their experiences and other speakers of English, using English were reported by Geng and Juanga to have encouraged them to re-examine their initial views of their own use of English. Not only had both Geng and Juanga become aware of the influence of their own cultures and multilingual repertoires on their use of English, but they had become more confident in explaining and justifying why they used English the way they did.

The practice of sharing and talking about students' own experiences of using language have also allowed participants to learn to understand and appreciate differences (Ewa), to gain knowledge about people from other cultures (Juanga & Otenga) to learn to become open-minded and understanding (Juanga & Otenga) and a critically re-visit one's initial deficit views of others (Otenga).

In addition to his understanding appreciation of differences (Ewa) added that he had also become aware of the fact that even though he was so-called native speaker of Nigerian English that did not necessarily mean that his use of English was universally comprehensible and interpretable.

Moreover, Otenga further claimed that not only had these (local) stories, experiences and thoughts shared by his classmates from other countries had driven him to 'question his mentality of

putting people into certain frameworks' but also to become more open and willing to learn further because 'there is a lot of information out there in the world which you will lose out if you stay close-minded.

Similarly with his awareness of world English, Ewa reported that he had been prompted to view how being a so-called native-speaker of English does not mean that he 'speaks correct and intelligible English, knows everything about English and can converse with anyone in English'. Rather, one still has to learn especially in today's globalization era which he anticipated, will influence the development of his idiolect.

In addition to the sharing of experiences and observations of linguistic and cultural differences, the interviews also revealed the effects of discussing issues about the politicization of difference and the way these were brought to the students' attention on their attitudes towards differences. In teaching those topics, one activity that the participants believed had long-lasting impact on them was the classroom activity called 'linguistic-identity switching activity' in which they were required to speak in only one particular unfamiliar variety of English selected by the lecturer and were penalized for any slight deviation. It was claimed that this activity and subsequent discussions of their struggle to participate in it prompted the participants to feel the importance of maintaining and taking pride in one's linguistic uniqueness (Juanga & Geng) view the importance of developing effective and efficient intercultural communicative strategies (Geng) and learning from each other (Ewa) as opposed to who should be emulated, and to become aware of the imperialistic nature and undesirable consequences of enforcing a particular group's standard language upon all (Otenga).

Although the teaching outcomes have mostly been positive, it does not necessarily mean that the participants have completely been 'EIL converted' or that people do not encounter any challenges in adopting these new views. However, the curricula seem to have effectively prompted students to develop knowledge, mindsets, and skills for communicating effectively and efficiently in today's multicultural, social and professional environments.

Discussion and Food-For-Thought

Thanks to internationalization and globalization, the inextricably interconnected world which has prompted many universities to internationalize their education by developing efficacious programmes that guide the learners to live between cultures (Besemeres & Wierzbicka 2007). Although many universities, especially in Nigeria, if not the whole Africa, claim that they have done so, many scholars (Marginson 1999; Liddicoat 2003; Liddicoat 2003; Briguglio 2007; Trevaskes, Eisenchlas & Stella & LiSTON 2008;) argue that the internationalization of education is still far from a reality. Even if it has been implemented, it will often be monocultural-chauvinistic, parochial, imperialistic, and profit-driven. Challenging these claims, this paper has demonstrated that there is an attempt by an international-oriented programme offered in a university in Africa (Nigeria) to truly execute the strong form of internationalization by teaching international and intercultural communication from an international perspective mandated by that university policy. More specific, the case study on the EIL programme demonstrates that the lecturers have designed their curricular based on their awareness of the unprecedented growth of trans world contacts, and therefore, seem to have been able to inspire their students to learn how to engage successfully with those contacts.

First and foremost, since the forces of globalization have increased the frequency of contacts and exchanges between people from diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds (Schole 2002; McKay & Bokhorst-Heng 2008), learning about and appreciating cultural differences is one of the core teaching

elements of the programme. The teaching of cultural differences goes beyond giving a superficial list of the behavioural traits of people from different countries. The students are continuously encouraged to use their knowledge of their cultures to share with and educate their classmates as well as lecturers about their cultural values, ideologies, norms and worldviews. They engage in educational dialogues in which they negotiate and interact with each other to make sense of practices, thoughts and mindsets that are culturally unfamiliar to them. This dialoguing about each other's cultural differences as an effective way to develop international and intercultural understanding (Stella & Liston 2008), and so, the teaching has shown that in order to achieve intercultural understanding, students need to study and engage in dialogue about each other's values, beliefs, cultural practices and worldviews.

Furthermore, internationalization of education that aims to equip students with the ability to communicate effectively and efficiently in trans world encounters also goes beyond simply teaching English and using English as the medium of instructions as suggested by Carrol-Boegh (2005) and Mamaku (2007). Informed by the EIL paradigm (Sharifian 2008 & Mckay 2012), the teaching of the pluricentricity of English is another core pedagogical focus of the EIL programme focus of the EIL programme. In addition to learning about each other's cultural uniqueness, students also explore, study and dialogue about why and in what way do they, as monolingual or bilingual and multilingual speakers of English, communicate in English differently from each other, and how their use of English is a reflection of their sociocultural realities and cultural identities and for some students, their multicultural and multilingual identities. The use of students' reflections on their own or observations of others' experiences of using, learning and teaching English as well as other languages is continuously encouraged in all assessment tasks and in classroom discussions. In light of this, curricula of the EIL programme have shown that the teaching of English that is based on the EIL paradigm is not necessary as Matsuda (2012) has claimed, an imperialistic means to impose the 'western' way of thinking and doing. Students have become aware of the fact that English, as an international language is no longer the language of the 'west' but it has organically processed to reflect all its users' ways of thinking and doing (Smith 1976; Kachru 1986; Canagavaijah 1999; Mckay 2002; Jenkins 2009). Moreover, other languages have been incorporated used and discussed in the curricula. The hegemonic spread and its negative effects of English in the world, and the importance of preserving the multilinguality of a nation are issues extensively discussed. The curricula of the programme show that students have neither been taught to 'Westernize' nor 'Easternize' them but to learn about and learn to negotiate each other's linguistic and cultural uniqueness to be critically mindful of imperialistic acts and practices, and to confidently project their complex linguistic and cultural identities.

Lastly, though the teaching of cultural and linguistic difference lies at the heart of the internationalization of education, it would not be internationalized enough if it did not address issues related to the politicization of cultural and linguistic differences (Clyne & Sharifian 2008). Students may come to a class with an awareness of differences from encounters in their daily life.

However, these differences are likely to be perceived and constructed from a deficit point of view which they believe need to be remedied unless this view is challenged. Such attitudes can be found in the participants' pre-EIL learning attitudes towards speakers of English from OCC and ECC and their use of (English such as 'fobs who can't speak English, foibles, speed-bumps, people who don't speak native English...please don't speak), and their full support for 'doing what the Romans do and speaking standard native English.' The EIL programmes of activities and assessment tasks are not only designed to prompt students to appreciate linguistic and cultural differences, but also to critically

examine and develop and propose strategies to deal with any practices and ideologies including their own that implicitly marginalize one group and unjustly empower the other. These activities and tasks seem to have successfully prompted the participants to question their initial deficit and ethnocentric as well as native-speakerist views of the different varieties of English and its speakers and to value learning about linguistic and cultural diversity as a never-ending journey (learn still learning). These are the essential attitudes with which students should leave an internationalized programme.

Suggestions

In the light of all these, this paper has showcased how one programme has approached internationalization to prepare its graduates for operating effectively today's international and in cultural globalized environments. Based on the curriculum described and students' responses, the EIL programme seems to have successfully accomplished its university's mission of internationalization of education. This is, however, not to claim that this particular EIL programme should be the only successful model for an academic programme that teaches intercultural communication based on the EIL paradigm. It may, however, serve as one instance for educators who are interested in developing or teaching a similar EIL programme. Suggestions for developing a programme that teaches intercultural communication based on the EIL programme:

➤ **Multiculturalism and multilingualism should lie at the heart of the programme.**

Students need to learn about, appreciate and negotiate cultural differences. Voices of students from diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds need to be made audible in order to promote intercultural dialogues and learning. Awareness of multilingualism as the reality of today's communicative exchanges and therefore the importance of knowledge of competence in other languages needs to be raised.

➤ **The pluralization of English and the implications for communication need to extensively discussed.**

Students also need to be made aware of the existence of world English and to learn to understand their roles in contributing to the pluralization of English. And one way to begin is to allow students to reflect on, observe, explore, analyze and dialogue with others about the way they use English as a natural mirror of their cultural values, norms, practices, worldview and cultural as well as linguistic identities.

➤ **Issues of the politicization of cultural and linguistic differences need to be introduced and discussed in the curriculum with 'extra case'.**

Students should be put on the knowledge of the political construction of difference and diverse or deficiency and its undesirable impacts on identity constructions these have. In order to do this, opportunities need to be given to students to observe existing ideologies and practices that implicitly promote and perpetuate social and linguistic inequality and to reflect on their past experiences of encountering such ideologies and practices in a variety of contexts. In reaction to this, students will need to investigate ways in which they can learn to respectfully and professionally deal with such ideologies and practices in their further encounters.

References

- Alsagoff, I.; McKay, S.L.; Hu, G. and Remandya, W.A. (2012). *Principles and practices for Teaching English as an International Language*, New York; Routledge.
- Clyne, M. and Sharifian (2008). English as an International Language: Challenges and Possibilities – *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 1-16.
- Graddol, D. (2010). *English in the future*. In *Analyzing a Global Context*. Edited by Burns, A. Cofin, C. New York: Routledge.
- Hayward, F. (2010). *Preliminary status report 2010: Internationalization of US higher education*, American Council of Education: Washington.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). *World Englishes: A resource book for students*, 2nd edition London/New York: Routledge.
- Kachru, Y. and Smith, I.E. (2008). *Cultures, contexts and World Englishes*. London: Routledge.
- Knight, I. (2009). *Internationalization of higher education practices and priorities*, AU survey report, International Association of Universities: Paris.
- Marginson, S. (2010). After globalization, emerging politics of education. *Journal of Education Policy* 2010, 14(1), 19-31. Cross.
- Marlina, R. (2010). *English Teaching Professional 66*. In *Teachers of English*. Keyways Publishing: Chichester.
- Martina, R. and Ahn, H.J. (2011). *Empowering English Teachers in the Globalization Era*. In *Internationalized English Teaching Materials? Please think again: A Korean case study*. Conference paper for Korean Association of Teachers of English (KATE), Yonsu University, South Korea; Seoul.
- Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and Practices of Teaching English as an International Language Multilingual Matters*: Bristol.
- Martina, A. (2012). *Teaching Materials in EIL*. In *Principles and Practices for Teaching English as an International Languages*. Edited by: Alsagoff, L.; McKay, S.L.; Hu, G. and Remandya, W.A. New York; Routledge.
- McKay, S. and Bokhorst-Heng, w.d. (2008). *International English in its socio-linguistic contexts: Towards a socially sensitive EIL Pedagogy*, London: Routledge.

- Sharifian, F. (2009). *English as an International Language Perspectives and Pedagogical Issues*. Multilingual Matters: Bristol.
- Sharifian, F. (2011). *Cultural Conceptualizations and Languages*. John Benjamins & Co., Amsterdam.