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Abstract: With the development of globalization cultural issues associated with TEFL are inevitably being transformed. In the modern world peoples were grouped within nations and communicated in speech communities largely within their own countries; communication outside the boundaries of the national speech community was not the norm for the majority of people. In the post-modern world the position of these vertical boundaries is changing to horizontal and an upper stratum of society (wherever it is located) is able, with computer technology, to communicate relatively freely across national boarders. The lingua franca of this communication is English. It is not the English of any particular country and it is developing new cultural norms, especially in the electronic media. In one stratum professional functions dominate and electronic usage closely reflects familiar print genres. In other strata more interpersonal functions occur and at the same time the language is moving away from old standard forms; this is most apparent in email and chat room discourse. Teachers have to shift from traditional notions of culture and situation and embrace the new electronic forms, finding ways to help their students participate fully in the new intercultural situation.
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Globalization has not been universally welcomed. Speaking in Singapore eight years ago one icon of British TEFL, Alan Maley, told his audience, "Culture-death is imminent. A global, leveling, lowest common denominator culture, crass and trivial, is in the process of engulfing all our local cultures, in all their rich variety, in just the same way it took over in the USA three decades ago" (1996:5).

He blamed consumerism, globalization, electronic media and the resultant trivialization. Six years later Goenawan Mohamad complained to another conference in Singapore that local languages suffer as a result of the spread of English

“Our language has been ripped from the world, stripped of shape, smell, colour and form, cleansed of the grit and graffiti, the rumpus and commotion that make up real life” (IPS, 2004).

Robert Phillipson put these concerns into perspective when he recently reminded readers, “the vast majority of the world’s citizens don’t even know English, whether as a mother tongue or a second or foreign language” (2001:1). Nevertheless at that recent Singapore conference on language trends in Asia two major speakers acknowledged the importance of globalization for ELT. Dr Rjaya Abhakorn (Chiang Mai University) observed:

“In South East Asia, the response to globalization is to acquire language skills, not in many languages, but in one, the English language, which is seen as the key to success in the globalised age” (IPS, 2004).

Prof Jo Lo Bianco (NLLIA, Australia) emphasized the inevitability of homogenization:

“Globalised modernization requires that knowledge is imparted in ways that are comparable across differences of setting, culture and language” (IPS, 2004).

Abhakorn’s and Lo Bianco’s words remind us that whatever pressures are put on traditional cultures and local languages, English offers an instrumentality that is going to be used by those who have access (or seek access) to the globalized world.

In the context of thinking about TEFL and the teaching of culture, this paper will look at the gradual spread of the English language across the globe. The positions of English in the modern and postmodern worlds will be compared and suggestions made for how the TEFL profession can adjust
to these changes. Firstly it will contextualize the discussion by dealing with
key terms: culture, then globalization, the spread of English, modernity and
post-modernity. It will then focus on that new arena for the globalized use of
English, computer-mediated communication, and consider newly developing
language norms. This will lay a platform for suggesting some implications
for TEFL teachers in SE Asia.

CULTURE

The concept of culture has a long history. Matthew Arnold’s view of
culture as "contact with the best which has been thought and said in the
world" (1869) is the one that used to inform language teaching, with teachers
generally seeing their aim as being to prepare students for the study of litera-
ture which expresses that “best”. But in 1957 Hoggart (reissued 1997) was
the first to see English working class culture in terms of daily life and values.
His work gives substance to Geertz’s statement:

“The concept of culture I espouse… is essentially a semiotic one.
Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in
webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those
webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental
science in search of law but an interpretative one in search of mean-
ing” (1973:4-5).

A more concise definition of culture is, “Culture consists of the pat-
terned behaviour (both mental and physical) that individuals learn and are
taught as members of groups” (Hunter & Whitten, 1977:28).

Modern definitions of culture point to two things: culture is about peo-
ple in daily life and cultures change and develop. For anthropologists, cul-
ture is about social organization and systems of values and beliefs. For lin-
guists the point is that to engage in society language must be used and that
language is thus a semiotic system (Halliday, 1978). As language and culture
are inextricably combined, when they change they change together.

I have sometimes asked teachers to consider whether they prefer to
think of culture as an integral part of communicative competence, or of it be-
ing a separate block in the language curriculum. Of course, in framing the
question in this way I am oversimplifying it, and of course teachers tell me
this. In fact, what can be said about culture takes many points of view; but
the debate about teaching culture can be encapsulated in three clear pos-
tions.

1. It used to be considered that conveying high culture was the real aim of
language teaching so language-focused lessons were seen as introduc-
tory. Liddicoat and Crozet refer to this point of view, without endorsing it,
thus:

Traditionally, in language-based subjects, whether they be first or second
languages, the work of teaching culture has been seen to be a part of the
work of teaching literature. In particular language students were expected
to eventually gain an introduction into the canon of literary works valued
in the particular society in which the language was spoken. This particu-
lar approach to culture starts with the materials produced by that culture
and defines culture as the valued artifacts of a particular society”
(1997:1).

2. The second is that language is essentially a vehicle of communication and
therefore it can be taught with or without culture, according to either the
teacher’s decision or national educational policy. In this view it is possi-
ble to teach information about the way of life of English speaking people
separately from teaching English as a means of communication. When
culture is taught using this approach it is sometimes referred to as teach-
ing cultural literacy. Thus “culture is often seen as mere information con-
voyed by the language, not as a feature of language itself; cultural aware-
ness becomes an educational objective in itself, separate from language”
(Kramsch, 1993:8).

3. A different view is that we cannot avoid teaching culture, even if we
would, because language is an expression of the culture in which it is
embedded, “the ‘whole way of life’ of a social group… - texts, images,
talk, codes of behaviour, and the narrative structures organising these –
which shape every aspect of social life”. (Frow and Morris, 1993; cited
by Lee and Poynton, 2000:7) “If however, language is seen as social prac-
tice culture becomes the very core of language teaching. Cultural aware-
ness must then be viewed both as enabling language proficiency and
as being the outcome of reflection on language proficiency”
(Kramsch, 1993:8).
If language teachers accept that language and culture cannot be separated then they surely have to worry about the effects of the teaching of language on the balance between different cultures in the world. The phrase “cultural imperialism”, first coined in the 1970s (White, 2000) became a vogue word by the 1990s according to Taylor (2004), who defined it as “an imbalance in the flow of information from the First World to the Third World.” The very phrase “cultural imperialism”, like the derived phrase “linguistic imperialism” (Phillipson, 1992) implies criticism of a powerful and unwelcome force. However, Garofalo finds a number of weaknesses with the concept of cultural imperialism. He thinks—quite rightly—that the outside forces are not so strong and that existing local cultures are quite able to resist them. He thinks that economic power does not always have cultural effects; he observes that “receiving” populations are not always passive or lacking in creativity (1993:18). Those of us who are involved with furthering the spread of global English must hope that he is correct; indeed it may be that the further the language spreads the less it can do the bidding of any one particular group of native speakers.

GLOBALIZATION

The term globalization is recorded as being first used in 1962 (Oxford English Dictionary). By the end of the century it was the major buzzword. One web site claims, “One can be sure that virtually every one of the 2822 academic papers on globalization written in 1998 included its own definition” (Globalization Guide.org, 2002). Many see it as a primarily economic phenomenon which involves the integration of national economic systems through the growth in international trade and investment. Stromquist (2002) notes that besides this economic globalization there is technological globalization (within which she includes the “recent information revolution” and increased international social and cultural exchange: “As others, we recognize that the intense and constant movement of goods, jobs, and capital that constitutes globalization creates political, environmental, and cultural consequences” (p.3).

Who or what is the driving agency is a political question: to what extent is the process driven by national governments, and to what extent is the power of the nation state being taken over by the multinational corporations who fund them? Some might say it is a process which has gathered such momentum that it is not possible to find clear agency or responsibility at all.

Globalization is often conceived in terms of the notion of centre and periphery, a notion applied by political scientists to study relations both within countries and among countries. The term originated in critiques of colonial systems: “Soros . . . divides the “global capitalist system” into a centre (US, Western Europe, Japan) and a periphery (Asia, Latin America, Russia, East Europe, Africa). Under this system capital flows from the centre to the periphery and back, supposedly to the mutual benefit of both.” (A.L.B., 1999)

This same notion of centre and periphery is familiar in Applied Linguistics due to Kachru using it to discuss the spread of English (see below).

THE SPREAD OF ENGLISH

For globalization to happen there does, of course, have to be a common medium of communication, a common language. That this language has turned out to be English is no random matter: there are clear historical reasons.

The phrase “English as a world language” was current in the TESOL community before the word “globalization” pushed to the forefront. Studying the history of the English language involves learning about how one tiny local dialect from southwest England spread to southeast England and then around the world. To use a metaphor: we can think of the English language as a body of water, which commenced its life as a small puddle in one part of southern England. It grew into a lake large enough to encompass first the whole of England and then the British Isles. It continued to grow and formed rivers; the first ran to the United States, others to Australia, South Africa and so on. This spread was assisted by 19th century imperialism, and so, with the break up of the British Empire in the middle of the 20th century, a contraction was anticipated. (For example the Dutch language has not survived in Indonesia, nor is French anything more than a cultural relic in Vietnam.) This anticipated contraction did not occur for three reasons. There was the resilience of some of the institutions left in former colonies. Consider for instance the British-based legal system in India: at Independence it was recog-
nized that English would be required in the short term to maintain the continuity of government and legal work and it was declared a national language for the first fifteen years only; yet it has never proved possible to phase it out. The dominance of English is also due to the military and commercial ascendancy achieved by the United States during the second half of the 20th century and the development of the globalized world economic system mentioned above. English seems quite well established, at least for the time being.

The English language had always traveled and the river has found new courses, but now it has burst its banks the trickle, that became a flow, has become a deluge. This has adjusted the relationship between language and culture. When it traveled slowly new and distinctive cultures developed. The different national varieties of English express different national cultures just as they show differences in pronunciation in America, the Caribbean and New Zealand, for example. Now, as English has more second language speakers than first language speakers (Graddol, 1997:2) the water is spreading much more thinly. For teachers who understand the links between language and culture this may seem a confusing situation: a world language that is losing its connections to specific cultures. This is the difference between the position of English in the modern world and English in the post-modern world.

**English in the Modern World**

The modern attitude (which developed during the nineteenth century) was one of certainty, a trust in rationality and in the physical laws of science. The development of nation states contributed to the idea of progress. Peoples were grouped within nations and communicated principally within the speech communities within their own countries; communication outside the boundaries of the nation and the speech communities it contained was not the norm for the majority of people. This is not to say that there were no horizontal boundaries within states; class distinctions, reflected in language use certainly existed. But the modern world was divided principally by vertical boundaries, boundaries which identified national languages as belonging to nation states. As new nations sprang into existence it made sense to legislate national languages into legal status.

In response to these modern developments, applied linguists took over the centre periphery concept from cultural anthropology. Countries at the centre were those with native speaker varieties of English. Holliday (1994a, 1994b) calls these the BANA countries because they include Britain, Australia and North America. The periphery refers to all other national varieties of English spoken in the world. Kachru (1988) divided the periphery varieties of English into two groups: the outer (or extended) circle and the extending circle (Figure 1). The outer circle referred to countries where English is used as a one of a group of first languages or as a second language, for example Singapore, Malaysia and India. The extending circle refers to countries which use English as a foreign language, such as Japan and Indonesia.

![Figure 1: Kachru's Concentric Model (1988)](image)
Yamaguchi (2002) argues that English as an International Language belongs in the expanding circle. She claims, “it is often said that non-native speakers use English more as a lingua franca between themselves than in encounters with native speakers; thus, it is no longer the property of its native speakers”. If she were correct EFL speakers would communicate principally with other EFL speakers. This is patently not the case. Her argument de-emphasizes the fact of lingua franca use across circles and is very much a modern view.

In my view it is time to stop referring to ESL and EFL countries and to confine these terms to individuals: the circumstances in which a person is learning or using English. These distinctions applied better to the modern world than to the post-modern world. Now that the modern political world of nation states is moving into the post-modern condition, the utility of the boundaries between nation states and Kachru’s circles of language use are less relevant and cultural issues associated with TEFL are being transformed.

**English in the Postmodern World**

The modern world with its faith in reason, progress, truth and facts received its first challenges early in the twentieth century (Klages, 2003) and was further challenged by the post World War Two development of relativism. This is the notion that there is no single truth, that there are different ways of looking at the same thing. (Michel Foucault (1972) was the leading philosopher to demonstrate that the thinking of society is not based on observing simple facts, but on the different ways we choose to interpret the facts.) Postmodernism involves a loss of faith by many in the answers provided by Science and all “big theories” (Sociology at Hewett, nd). In the post-modern world individuals live in a more complex world and become more complex beings. Kumar says that in postmodernism, “identity is not unitary or essential, it is fluid or shifting, fed by multiple sources and taking multiple forms” (1997:98). He emphasizes the importance for educators to understand this.

In this context Tripathi (1998) takes issue with the three static circles of Kachru’s model. Among the points he makes is that there are greater differences to be observed between speakers of English within individual countries than between countries in different circles (p.56). He points to migrations patterns in the globalized world as being responsible for this. There is also the development of global communication systems; in the post-modern world a person is able, with education and access to computer technology, to communicate freely across national borders.

I suggest a more fluid model (Figure 2). In the vertical strips countries are located in vertical bands, tall bands where most language use is not English and short bands where there is a great deal of English use. The horizontal layer at the top is filled by people in any of (ultimately all) the countries of the world who use English to communicate with each other. The English that these people use is not the English of any particular country. Further, it is developing its own culture and subcultures. In some registers it mixes freely with other languages. It is less and less driven from the centre. It is moving out of a space where it defines the identity or history of a nation, or where it can be legislated as part of a political process. It is moving freely across the world. Communications satellites and the use of internet and email technology are making a tremendous contribution to this process.

![Figure 2: Suggested Horizontal Model](image)

Where does this new English belong? **Everywhere.**

Whose is it? **No one’s; everyone’s.**
Speakers are changed by the languages they speak; languages are changed by the people who speak them. It is not just the usefulness of English that overcomes local hostility, it is also the awareness that the language is being freed from the control of the British or the Americans, and that any groups of local users can influence its development.

Newly developing norms

Applied linguists have been writing about new norms for decades. It took a while for the new post-colonial varieties of the modern era to become accepted. (Note that seminars on Indian English were being held in the 1970s (Das 1982:148) but the Oxford University Press only published its first dictionary of non-British English (Australian) in 1989 and it still has no dictionary of Indian English (Global English, n.d.). The question asked by English language teachers has shifted from, “which variety of English should be taught, British or American?” to “which varieties will our students need to use?” The answer was probably, for some time, “British, American and SE Asian English – they must at least have a receptive command of those three”. Then “International English” was included. Its relevance has been primarily for business people and the tourist industry; now there is a second regionless variety, or group of varieties: e-language, e-speak, or what David Crystal calls “netspeak” (Crystal, 2001).

The users of these varieties are the well-educated classes; these people are increasingly looking outside national boundaries for both information and interaction. Computer-mediated communication is an area accessible to the haves and not accessible to the have-nots. This matter of accessibility reinforces old barriers between privilege and the lack of it and creates new ones. This concept of the digital divide (National Telecommunications and Information Administration, 1999) is a matter of social justice which must not be ignored. But as a metaphor the “digital divide” is too simple. It suggests there simply two groups, those with and those without access to computers, but as Cisler (2000) pointed out there are many different levels of access and, as Warschauer (2003) adds, it is not the existence of the internet that is responsible for the disparities; they come from the “political, economic, institutional, cultural, and linguistics contexts that shape the meaning of the Internet in people’s lives” (p.297).

When we log onto the internet we encounter new groupings of people, new genres of discourse and new styles of writing, with English being the predominant language of the net. When our students use the internet they may be dealing with people they know face to face or those whom they do not. They may email fellow students or they may reach out across the globe. Applying this concept to educational sites we can see two main models. Some lecturers use the net to add value to conventional face-to-face teaching by putting lecture notes or a reading list on a web page or setting up a discussion group. Some courses are taught entirely on-line, with a homepage holding together a whole program of on-line study and fellow students never meeting each other face-to-face.

Crystal (2001) describes five types of internet-using situations: web pages, email, discussion groups, chat rooms and virtual worlds (2001:10-13). When he coins the term “netspeak” (p.17) for the language used there he points out that it combines features which traditionally are associated with writing only or speech only. Coghlan (2001) quotes the student who said of email, “Is this writing or talking?” This alerts us to look for new genres, to new modes of cultural expression.

The “most written” e-texts appear as web pages. Many documents originally designed for paper publication are deposited here. It is now possible to consult university handbooks and academic journals both online and in conventional printed form. Some articles written in academic style are published only on the web, but in all these cases they look like print media; traditional academic reading skills remain all that are needed to deal with them once they have been located. Whilst Google and Yahoo are extremely user-friendly, database search skills are needed for searching library and other databases online.

Most homepages, however, are quite different from print media, even from magazine pages (although these too use graphics, multicolumn layouts, and varied uses of script and graphology). Homepages typically contain short “grabs” of text with links to further information and their layout encourages the development of new patterns of eye movements. The glance has to be exploratory in all directions rather than rely on the left to right, top to bottom sweeps appropriate for reading print media. This means that for our students to develop e-literacy they must become able to deal with new graphic and graphological features in addition to the grammatical, lexical, and discourse features of language. Crystal (2001:7) notes that, because
web pages do not require direct responses from readers. In contrast, the other internet situations he mentions do. They are transient like speech, but slower than speech (Crystal, 2003:29-30). The speed of the responses required varies in different internet situations.

In this situation where new conventions are being created at incredible speed teachers must use descriptive linguistic responses rather than prescriptive ones (Crystal, 2003:63) and generalities may well prove correct only temporarily. Nevertheless I will now describe characteristics of two particular internet situations: emails and chat rooms.

The structural elements of e-mails have become fixed; mail programs provide fields for addressee, addresser, recipients of copies, subject line, and generate date, time, and automatic signature. Only the contents of the message field is left to the choice of the writer, and writers use a variety of different genres in this field. From my personal inbox I provide examples of a formal letter, a professional memo, a personal letter, a casual note, and a pair of brief, sms-style messages (Appendix 1). The formal letter is the only one to repeat the date and give the full address; the memo and the brief messages are careless with the names of senders and receivers. These illustrate — without the need for further comment — that there is no single email genre. Crystal, writes, “The language of asynchronous [situations where participants are not on-line at the same time] messaging is a curious mixture of informal letter and essay, of spoken monologue and dialogue” (p.148). The more casual the interaction becomes the more it veers towards having characteristics of spoken language.

In spoken conversation intonation, pause and body language are used to indicate a variety of things. On the internet these oral language resources are not available. Crystal notes that to supply the lack of sound and gesture, prosody and paralanguage are remade into CAPS (for shouting), S PA C I N G (for slowed production) or asterisks for *emphasis* (p.35). Smilies, or emoticons, are used to indicate emotion (=) (pp.36-7).

In face-to-face conversation turn taking is organized cooperatively using intonation, pause and body language to indicate when a person is ready to stop or start speaking. In synchronous messaging [where participants communicate in real time] although all parties are present at the same time they are not able to use these techniques to control topic and turn-taking. Crystal claims, “As with asynchronous groups, the notion of turn-taking and its associated concepts (such as interruption) is once again undermined” (p.152). This claim is made on the basis that a message can’t be sent at the same time as it is being uttered as in speech. To the writer the turn begins when they type the first symbol, but to the readers the turn does not start until the complete message appears on the screen, by which time messages from other participants may have arrived. Crystal notes that, because of this lag, people are under pressure to keep their messages short (p.156). It also explains why they often hit return several times during one message.

Chat room text is the most transient of all forms of electronic communication. There is an example of chat room text in Appendix Two. This extract starts with a discussion of musical tastes and opera and moves into a disjointed discussion of “where are the girls” and personal identity. “ID” is expressed as “asl” (age/sex/location) on the internet. In this “conversation” we find that Aaa and Ddd are both from The Phillipines, but Ddd is in New Zealand; WwW and Aaa are both close to the town of Bristol in Virginia. USA. They appear to be students (there are references to “studying” and going to “school”). JiJ is looking for girls and kisses and is quite disruptive; he leaves after expressing boredom. Hhh makes a single plea to visit a particular web site and “try to change the world” (presumably they move on to other chat rooms to make the same plea). Besides asl, two common internet expressions of feeling, lol (laugh out loud) and a smiley face B_E_S_H_E_R (2001) says chat is “the most innovative form of computer mediated communication due to the fact that they [sic] operate almost synchronously”. Crystal, and those he quotes, express surprise that participants tolerate the disruptions of topic and turn taking involved.

People don’t go to chat rooms for information; “The atmosphere, even when a topic is in sharp focus, is predominantly recreational. . . Language play is routine. Participants frequently provide each other with expressions of rapport . . .”. It would seem that, when the social advantages are so great, people make enormous semantic allowances. Several authors make the point that the presence of linguistic confusion and incoherence could be inherently attractive, because the social and personal gains — of participating in an anonymous, dynamic, transient, experimental, unpredictable world — are so great (Crystal, 2001:169).
Coghan (2001) deals with emails, forums, and chat, and wonders how to moderate (control) them; he finds that he can't! I would prefer to suggest that new interactive norms develop, that young users adapt themselves to these very quickly and that chat rooms used by older chatters move more slowly and show fewer discoursal “innovations”. Whilst it is obvious to all commentators that the www will continue to grow and the amount of computer-mediated communication will grow likewise, the future nature of its discoursal features is less clear. While a distinctive variety of language has emerged, it has not settled down, nor will it while new technologies are being developed at such a rate. “Immediate innovation is anticipated in each of the three traditional domains of communication: production, transmission, and reception” (Crystal, 2001:225).

Use of the internet gives added force to my metaphor of the postmodern horizontal layering of language use. In this horizontal layering we can find both old and new varieties of English. In the top layers scientific, technical and commercial functions dominate. Papers published on the web follow the norms of International Academic English. In the middle layers the language begins to move away from traditional standard forms. In even lower strata more interpersonal functions occur and, at the same time, more local sources are deployed. New cultural norms of English language use are being developed with a much wider acceptance of local varieties of English and the mixing of other languages.

English teachers concluded many years ago that we can no longer teach a single standard. Our students need a very broad-based receptive competence to understand, in both written and spoken modes, all the varieties they will encounter. The development of e-language means that they will encounter even more varieties. This raises the question of competing notions of correctness in different target varieties, i.e. what should be counted as errors. The range of what is acceptable is widening and as a result the notion of correctness needs to be rethought. As we become more and more used to dealing with “netspeak” we will become more and more tolerant of usage that we once would have labeled as errors.

E-speak is being built by many people with good command of standard varieties of English; it is also being built by people with imperfect command and there is no moderation. There will be “errors”. There will be various sorts of stripping down in terms of grammar, a simplification. There will continue to be many innovations in lexis. My own best prediction is that a widespread core of English, intelligible to speakers of all the major dialects will develop in addition to the varieties used by various speech communities. It will also be developed by, and contributed to, non-native speakers. Its “home” will be on the worldwide web, but it will be used in face-to-face communication also. It will have a reduced lexis. Areas of grammatical complexity (e.g. modality/modulation, complex tenses) will simplify considerably.

Is this language use in a cultural vacuum? No, it is not. It is language in a world where culture and cultures are changing dramatically. Is culture some sort of optional extra? No, it cannot be an optional extra; new language and new culture go hand in hand.

TEACHING IMPLICATIONS

The chief aim of this paper has been to show that our cultural assumptions about the teaching of English as a Foreign Language have to be revised in response to the development of the worldwide web and the language used there. Standard forms of expression and usage are changing and new translocal forms are developing. As language and culture both change so must language teaching.

The implications seem to me to point, not to a need to start with a change in methods of teaching but with a change in cultural focus. Changes in focus will lead to changes in methods, but to start with methods is to put the cart before the horse. There must be an embracing of new technology and an exploration of all its resources, less as a means of teaching the old familiar materials but as a resource for exploring and teaching new genres and new modes, for exploring new transnational cultures and for contributing to their development. Every user of the internet is also a contributor. We and our students are all contributing to the building of a new culture every time we log on.

Maley’s concern may have been overemphasized, but his message is important: in a world of competing post-modern discourses it is important to be critical and to make our students be critical. It is important to be able to chart one’s own way. He advises teachers to choose “texts which convey the values of cultures other than the consumerist culture . . . [to] focus on the weakness and the undesirable effects of the ruling paradigm [and to] reveal the agenda of Consumerism” (Maley, 1996:6-7). He recommends activities
which are “based on developing the capacity of students to ask the right questions” (p.7). Becoming able to ask the right questions is becoming critical.

So in conclusion I offer twelve suggestions to guide our thinking about EFL and culture in a globalized world:

1. The teaching of high culture can be abandoned.
2. Teaching about everyday cultures can be cut back.
3. Familiar notions of situational context are less useful to teachers than they once were.
4. Notions of the defining differences between spoken and written language will need to be revised.
5. Advanced students will continue to benefit from traditional EAP/ESP for reading conventional academic and technical documents on the web.
6. Teachers should use texts from electronic sources, even if their English appears to violate accepted norms.
7. We must teach web literacy.
8. We should discuss web pages with students as cultural documents and critique with them the values they represent.
9. We have to develop, and encourage, flexibility towards new genres and new modes of language use.
10. We should exploit our learners’ online interests wherever they lead (and follow them there).
11. At all times we should encourage students not to take things at face value, and to be critical of the values represented in the texts they read.
12. We should encourage our students to see themselves as participants in the web, and as creators of its culture.
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If you are not a resident of Indonesia, for your travel convenience, please consult the local office of the Indonesian Embassy for visa advice before your departure to Indonesia.

Sanata Dharma will be very glad if you could visit us on October 10, 2004 to discuss issues in EAP as well as "Fiction of Muluk Raj Anand". We are looking forward to seeing in Yogyakarta.

Sincerely yours,
Dr. Francis Borgias Alip, M.Pd., M.A.
Chair: The 9th ESEA Conference Committee
(Dean of Faculty of Letters, Sanata Dharma University)
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**EMAIL: OFFICE MEMO**

**From**: Hj. Matamit Ratu  
**Date**: Thursday, 9 September 2004 5:10 AM  
**To**: staff  
**Subject**: Using of Sports Complex

Please be informed that the Sports Hall of Sports Complex will be shut at 5.00 pm every Monday. This is due to the facility is used for teaching purposes.

I regret for inconveniences.

---

**EMAIL: PERSONAL LETTER**

**From**: Dave Packham  
**Date**: Thursday 13, May 2004 9.47 AM  
**To**: Gillian Perrett@staff.usd.ac.id  
**Subject**: holiday

Hi mum,

How are you? Hope that you are having a good time. I am so looking forward to coming and seeing how you have settled in. You had been there such a short time at the point of my last visit it will be fun to see how things have progressed for you.

I am feeling really busy. I got some good marks for my first lot of assessments at uni. A D for my mid semester economics exam and a D for my first Marketing assignment. To achieve this I worked very consistently but never really felt any pressure. The next to follow was my Marketing mid semester. After kicking off with a D I felt some pressure to maintain this level. I did lots of work and went into the exam feeling confident that I knew the material that was to examined. The novel did kick in a little when they said "commence writing" and I did find the format of the exam challenging. It had been four years since I have attempted that kind of assessment. We had to write six essays of two pages each in two hours. That meant 30 min a question and through discussing some practice questions in our class I knew what was expected. At least two pages of structured critical analysis. Despite feeling confident this was a challenge and the server did not help. I think I wrote four really good answers, mis read a question in a rush and possibly wrote a complete dog and was pushed for time in the last and wrote an average answer. I left the exam feeling they are all. I thought I had done well and that it was all practice and I'd do heaps better in the future with a similar level of effort put into preparation. I had a chance to read the paper again yesterday and for the one I marked up - it was a difficult question but I simply did not take the time to relax and read the question properly. It was manageable but with the pressure of the whole 20 min / two pages thing I choose to attempt a simpler question I had not properly prepared for.

There was plenty of scope to do practice questions before the exam and have them marked by your tutor but I felt I did not have time to do this. Results for the exam are out in four days so it will be interesting to see how I went.

---

**EMAIL: A CASUAL NOTE**

**From**: Dave Packham  
**Date**: Thursday 27, May 2004 10.22 AM  
**To**: gillianperrett@staff.usd.ac.id  
**Subject**: RE: URGENT

Hi mum,

Got money, don't hurry re the dentist. I am not going to get anything done until I am finished with this study. So not for two weeks.

Thanks
love you Dave
EMAIL: BRIEF SMS STYLE MESSAGES

From: Gillian Perrett <gperrett@brunet.bn>
To: Robert Bush <robert@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Hello from Ranau . Izumi & Jim
Date: Sun, 10 Oct 2004 17:12:36 +0800

Dinner Thurs? Bowling Club? G.

Appendix Two

CHAT ROOM

ddd what kina muso do you like?
kkk OPERA
kkk and lots of other stuff
jjj hey friend kiss
ddd what kina muso do you like?
ddd heh opera sue
hhh watch this url nd listen wat ur heart
says...nd try to change this world..., pls

http://digitaljournalist.org/issue0212/p101.html

jjj I need a kiss
ddd what kina muso do you like?
aaa I'm 24 m Philippines
ddd me2
bbb hey room
kkk you suck too? Is that what you said?
jjj man where are the college gurls

www How are you all tonight???
www I'mn from Virginia !!! : )
jjj hey miss
ddd I am fine urself?
jjj me too
jjj hey miss
www hey lover ... lol
jjj what so funny
www lol ... hmmm... yes
ddd WELL
sss what part of va miss www?
ddd well
www do you know a lot of male www lol
www close to Bristol!
jjj damn I got to get a kiss
www Bristol sorry
ddd there is a lot here today
sss north of it?
sss I'm like 1.5 hours north of Bristol... I think
zzz hi
ddd you must be the only girl in here today?

From: Robert Bush <robert@hotmail.com>
To: Gillian Perrett <gperrett@brunet.bn>
Subject: Re: Hello from Ranau . Izumi & Jim
Date: Sun, 10 Oct 2004 8.50 PM

excellent Idea. Its in the diary. R
www I live in this real small town lol like a little over 2 hours away from Bristol
rrr joined the room
www me no there are others I'm sure???
ppp I'm a girl too
jjj I need the only kute gurl in here now
www oh lol
ddd oh wait in line
yyy any female here to chat PM
ddd hey bucko!! Why I outa
ddd so what's your asl miss
www I'm 19/va
ddd va?
Ddd I am 24 NZ
www what part of NZ?
ddd Auckland
www North or south Island?? lol
ddd north
www very cool!!!
www I wanna travel there someday!
ddd yeah very cold
ddd that will be nice to have you here.

www well that's really sweet of you to say!!
ddd so what do you do
mmm hi
ddd hi
jjj here is bored to go now
jjj [left the room]
www hmm mm I go to school
ddd uni