

Construction and Validation of Critical Understanding of the Global Spread of English Scale (CUGSES)

Elham Naji Meidani^a

PhD Candidate of TEFL, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

Reza Pishghadam

Associate Professor of TEFL, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

Mohammad Ghazanfari

Associate Professor of TEFL, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

Received 5 January 2013; revised 13 June 2013; accepted 13 July 2013

Abstract

The present study aimed to design and validate a “Critical Understanding of the Global Spread of English” Scale (CUGSES). To this end, a framework was designed based on the tenets of linguistic imperialism, English as an International Language (EIL), and globalization. The scale was then administered to a population of 425 participants, comprising English language teachers in language institutes, English language learners in language institutes, parents whose children attended English language institutes, university students majoring in English and English-major university professors. Rasch measurement was utilized to substantiate the construct validity of the instrument. The results of the Rasch analysis revealed that except for three items, the scale is unidimensional and meets the criteria to fit to the Rasch model. Next, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to extract the factors underlying the scale. Five components were extracted and labeled as: domination of English language and culture, preference

^a *Email address:* elhanaji@gmail.com

Corresponding address: English Language Department, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Azadi Square, Mashhad, Iran

for home culture and language, age and medium of instruction, native speakerism, and localization in ELT. Implications of the newly- designed scale in the Iranian EFL context were then provided.

Key words: Linguistic imperialism; English as an International Language (EIL); Globalization; Scale; Validation

Introduction

Since the late 15th century, English has been taught to speakers of other languages all around the world (Jenkins, 2000). The global spread of English has caused tensions between global and local forces and “has had serious linguistic, ideological, sociocultural, political and pedagogical implications” (Sharifian, 2009, p.1). Two major views have been posed regarding the global spread of English, one belonging to Crystal (1997) and the other one to Phillipson (1992).

Crystal (1997) associates the dominance of English to the power and perceived success of the people and nations who speak it and simply to chance. In his view, English is a neutral tool, without any cultural and political purposes. Phillipson (1992), on the other hand, relates the power of English to the concept of imperialism. Phillipson believes that the power of the English language, which is fortified by English language teaching professionals around the world can be identified more exactly and scientifically as linguistic imperialism, which he defines as “the dominance of English asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages” (1992, p. 47). Phillipson (1992) sees a strong relationship between linguistic imperialism and cultural imperialism, which signifies the transmission of ideas about the culture of English-speaking countries through textbooks and other teaching materials. The transmission is done in a way that certain cultural stereotypes and values are shown as universal and superior, while others as inferior (Richards & Schmidt, 2002). Accordingly, Anderson (2003) sees linguistic imperialism theory as “an ongoing intellectual shift in applied linguistics that began in the 1990s” (p.81) due to the challenges it presents to the common assumptions in mainstream ELT and opening a critical view to the field. Along the same line, the important role of the local context in which language education is carried out has been highlighted (Brown, 1995; Richards, 2001).

The spread of the English language is strongly related to globalization (Bottery, 2000). As the primary means of human interaction, language plays a major role in globalization (Block & Cameron, 2002) and is even a manifestation of this phenomenon (Bourdieu, 2001; as cited in Block & Cameron, 2002). Sweeney (2006) also sees globalization hand in hand with the English cultural hegemony, spread through the vast range of messages, icons, and brands.

One of the major and controversial aspects of globalization in ELT concerns the relationship between language and culture. The point is whether globalization brings about cultural homogenization or cultural heterogenization. Since mainstream ELT sees the global spread of English as a neutral tool, it asserts that different cultures around the world can exist along with the spread of the language. However, those belonging to the linguistic imperialism camp of thought (e.g. Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1994, 2007; Canagarajah, 1999) maintain that the globalization of English and ELT pose a threat to the cultures around the world. Pennycook (2007), for example, emphasizes the importance of understanding the relationship between ELT and colonialism in terms of the historical development of ELT and remarks that this is currently happening through culture presentation and teaching materials.

English as an International Language (EIL) encompasses the idea that English does not belong to any particular country. Therefore, teaching English is not limited to the presentation of Anglo-American culture, but rather includes the learners' local culture so that they can use the language to project their own identity. In this line, Brumfit (1995) asserts that "not only has English become international in the last half century, but scholarship about English has also become international: the ownership of an interest in English has become international" (p.16). In fact, this is the price English has to pay for becoming an international language (Widdowson, 1994). In the same way, McKay (2003) argues that in the light of EIL, learners' local context is of the utmost importance in determining the appropriate teaching methodology, linguistic information and cultural content presented in English language classrooms. Therefore, bilingual teachers who are familiar with students' local culture are preferred. As McKay (2003) insists, learning English should be in a way that learners would be able to use it to tell others about their own culture.

As an international language and the world's sole 'hypercentral language' (Cook, 2008), English has made its way into all societies, and the Iranian society is no exception in this respect. The common trend in Iran at present is towards more teaching and learning of English. Private language institutes have mushroomed all around the country, and the interest in the language is rising day by day among people, from young children to adults.

Language teaching and learning do not occur in a vacuum, but within a certain context. A few studies have been conducted in the Iranian EFL context in order to examine the attitudes that exist towards the different varieties of English or the effect of the ELT enterprise on the deculturation of Iranian students (e.g. Pishghadam & Saboori, 2011; Pishghadam & Sadeghi, 2011; Ghaffar Samar & Davari, 2011). Some studies have also been done concerning the promotion of critical pedagogy in Iranian English classrooms (e.g. Akbari, 2008; Abednia, 2012). Following the current trend in ELT and the introduction of EIL and linguistic imperialism as a cover term for critical ELT, the present situation in Iran needs more investigation with regard to these issues. Thus, while most studies in the field of ELT in Iran deal with micro-level concerns, there is still a dearth of research with regard to macro-level issues and infrastructural matters. It appears that investigating such issues calls for a standardized instrument. To the best knowledge of the researchers, no instrument has been specifically designed and validated in Iran to investigate different groups' perceptions about the global status of English.

Purpose of the study

The following study attempts to design and validate a comprehensive scale for the Iranian context that would measure participants' level of critical understanding towards the global spread of English. Therefore, the present study addresses the following research questions:

1. Does the newly-designed Critical Understanding of the Global Spread of English Scale (CUGSES) enjoy psychometric properties?
2. What are the underlying constructs of CUGSES?

Methodology

Participants

The first group of participants who took part in the pilot-testing phase of the study consisted of 5 language learners, 5 language teachers, 5 parents, 3 English-major

university students and one English-major university professor. The second group of participants comprised 425 individuals who took part in the administration of the scale. They were 120 English language teachers teaching English at different private language institutes, 110 English language learners studying at different private language institutes, 100 parents whose children attended English language institutes, 80 undergraduate university students majoring in English language and literature at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad and 15 university professors teaching English literature or TEFL at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad. The following table depicts the demographic information of the participants.

Table 1
Participants' information

		Institute Teachers	Institute Learners	Parents	University Students	University Professors
Gender	Male	26.7%	36.4%	43%	38%	58%
	Female	73.3%	63.6%	57%	62%	42%
Age		19 – 54 (M= 28.45)	16 – 50 (M= 26.32)	25 – 63 (M= 40.84)	18 – 27 (M= 23.27)	29 – 59 (M= 43.21)
Education/English proficiency level/ Year of study		66.4% BA in English Literature or TEFL, 33.6% MA in TEFL or Translation Studies	15.5% elementary, 27.3% lower intermediate, 14.4% intermediate, 40.9% upper-intermediate, 1.9% advanced	40.4% high school diploma, 48.5% Bachelor's, 7.1% Master's, 4% PhD	12.5% freshman, 15% sophomore, 40% junior, 32.5% senior	100% PhD

Instrumentation

The scale designed in this study originally consisted of 29 five-point Likert scale items, ranging from 'Strongly Agree' to 'Strongly Disagree' with a 'No Idea' option in the middle. Since the participants were not all at the same level of English proficiency, the scale was designed in Persian, the participants' mother tongue, so as not to have any comprehension problems. The total reliability of the originally

designed scale was 0.732 as measured by Cronbach Alpha. After conducting Rasch analysis, rating scale category statistics indicated that the thresholds for Categories 3 and 4 were disordered. By collapsing up these two categories the thresholds were ordered. Therefore, the scale turned into a 4-point Likertscale, i.e., without the middle category of 'No Idea'. Seemingly, this redundant category adds nothing to the required information. This finding further corroborates previous research that the middle category of "No Idea", "Undecided", "Neutral" in rating scales leads to category malfunctioning and should be avoided in rating scale construction (Garland, 1991; Nunnally, 1967). Moreover, there were three misfitted items and therefore were removed from the scale. In so doing, the instrument turned into a 26 item 4 point Likert scale (See Appendix A). The reliability of the 26 items was 0.735 as measured by Cronbach Alpha. The reliability of each factor was also calculated. The following table presents the results.

Table 2
Reliability of each factor of the scale

Factors	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
1	.713	8
2	.701	7
3	.690	4
4	.590	4
5	.502	3

Procedure

At first, a checklist of factors regarding the global spread of the English language was designed. The checklist included factors such as the teaching of culture in English language classes, the role of home culture in English classes, localization in ELT, attitudes towards non-native accents, and the effect of globalization on cultures. Then based on the checklist, for each factor about 2 or 3 items were developed on a Likert-scale. At the end, a set of 29 items was attained. Following this stage, think-aloud was conducted in order to remove the ambiguities in the items and to ensure the content validity of the scale. In this stage, 5 language teachers, 5 language learners, 5 parents, 3 English-major university students, and one English-major university professor were asked to read and think aloud their opinions regarding each individual item. Some items were revised based on their comments. The revised version of the instrument was administered to 425

individuals. Subsequently, the data were entered first into Winstep version 3.74 and then SPSS version 18.

Data Analysis

Rasch measurement was utilized to substantiate the construct validity of the scale. Rasch analysis was conducted using Winsteps version 3.74. The entire dataset with 29 items and 425 persons was subjected to Rasch analysis to evaluate the fit of data to the model and assess the unidimensionality of the instrument. If these tests are satisfied and the assumptions hold, the scale is a unidimensional. Rasch scale and persons and items can be located on an interval scale. The reliability and validity of the scale were verified by Rasch Analysis. Next, the data were entered into SPSS version 18. EFA was run to extract the underlying components. This time, 26 items were scored according to the Likert type scale of four points ranging from 'Strongly Disagree' to 'Strongly Agree'. Higher scores showed higher levels of critical understanding. The scoring of some of the items had to be reversed, due to having both positive and negative statements.

Results

The analysis yielded a reliability of .74, a person separation of 1.68 and an item separation of 10.53. The root mean square error (RMSE) for items and persons were 0.05 and 0.20, respectively, which indicate quite precise measurement.

As the results of fit statistics in Table 3 show, except for three items, all items fit the Rasch model following the criteria suggested by Bond and Fox (2007). Items which do not fit the Rasch model have infit mean square (MNSQ) indices outside the acceptable range of 0.70-1.30. Misfitting items are signs of multidimensionality and model deviance. As Table 1 shows, three of the items have an infit MNSQ index outside the acceptable boundary. The three items are 7 (English is not limited to USA/Britain/Canada/ Australia and is related to all countries), 15 (The English language textbooks developed in native English-speaking countries are appropriate for Iranian students) and 29 (Speaking English to a native speaker of the language requires more self-confidence than to a non-native speaker).

Table 3
Item Estimates and Fit Statistics

Item	Estimate	Error	Infit MNSQ
1	-.20	.05	.95
2	.30	.05	1.13
3	-.05	.05	1.05
4	-.10	.05	1.08
5	.30	.05	1.07
6	-.05	.05	1.22
7	1.36	.06	1.32
8	.28	.05	1.25
9	-.20	.05	.91
10	.30	.05	.96
11	-.05	.05	1.01
12	.30	.05	.94
13	-.05	.05	1.06
14	-.10	.05	.94
15	-.63	.06	.61
16	.30	.05	.96
17	-.05	.05	.98
18	.30	.05	.91
19	-.03	.05	1.17
20	.01	.05	.76
21	.20	.05	1.04
22	.30	.05	.89
23	-.05	.05	.99
24	.30	.05	.78
25	-.05	.05	1.13
26	.01	.05	1.02
27	-.05	.05	.75
28	.30	.05	1.01
29	-.59	.06	1.39

Table 4 shows category statistics for each response option. ‘Count’ indicates how many respondents chose a particular category, summed across all items. “Irregularity in observation frequency across categories may signal aberrant category usage. A uniform distribution of observations across categories is optimal for step calibration. Other substantively meaningful distributions include unimodal

distributions peaking in central or extreme categories, and bimodal distributions peaking in extreme categories” (Linacre, 1999, p.110). The table shows that the distribution of observations for categories is bimodal with peaks at Categories 2 and 4, which is an instance of irregular observation distribution.

‘Average Measure’ is the mean of the trait estimates (in logits) for all persons who chose the corresponding category. For example, the average of the trait estimates of those who chose category 1 on any item in the scale is -3.6 (Bond & Fox, 2007). These values should monotonically increase to indicate that those with higher trait estimates choose the higher categories and vice versa (Bond & Fox, 2007). As Table 4 shows average measures are monotonically increasing for the categories in our data.

Table 4
Rating Scale Statistics

Category	Count	Average measure	Infit mean square	Threshold
1	1070	-3.6	1.17	None
2	3214	-1.7	.96	-1.40
3	2650	.14	.87	.20
4	3523	.42	1.02	.08
5	1974	.80	.94	1.12

For Likert scales, infit mean squares greater than 1.40 indicate that the category was used in an unexpected way and there is unexplained randomness in the observations. Mean squares less than .60 indicate over-predictability in the data (Bond & Fox, 2007). Table 4 shows that infit mean squares are close to their perfect value, i.e., 1 in these data.

Rating scales imply that as the level of the latent trait increases in respondents a progression should be observed in the categories of the rating scale. Each category of the rating scale is expected to be most probable (to be chosen) for a certain group of respondents; persons higher on the trait continuum are expected to choose higher categories and vice versa (Bond & Fox, 2007).

Thresholds are estimated difficulties of observing one response category over the category below (Linacre, 1999). They are the points on the rating scale

where the probability of being observed in a category and the category below is equal. Threshold estimates are expected to increase with category values. Since the first category has no lower category, there is no measure for it.

Table 4 also exhibits that the thresholds for categories 3 and 4 are disordered. This has happened because of the irregularity in the distribution of observations (Linacre, 1999). Disordering in threshold estimates, i.e., thresholds which do not advance with category values indicate that the category is rarely endorsed and has a narrow interval on the variable or the “concept is poorly defined in the minds of respondents” (Linacre, 1999, p. 114). In order to remedy the disordered threshold problem the categories were collapsed up. That is, Categories 3 and 4 were both scored four and the data were reanalyzed. The results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Rating Scale Statistics after Collapsing Categories

Category	Count	Average Measure	Infit mean square	Threshold
1	1070	-.44	1.18	none
2	3214	-.17	.89	-1.45
4	5973	-.47	.94	-.42
5	1974	1.14	.95	1.87

In order to identify the subconstructs of the scale, factor analysis was run for the 26 items with a four-point Likert scale. First, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of Sampling Adequacy was employed to find out whether employing factor analysis to extract latent variables was appropriate. The KMO statistic obtained in this study was .778 and the Barlett’s test was significant ($p=.000$). According to Pallant (2007), if KMO is .6 or above and Barlett’s test value is significant, the data set is suitable for factor analysis. Therefore, the sample selected in this study was adequate for factor analysis. The results are demonstrated in Table 6.

Table 6
KMO and Bartlett’s Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	.778
Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square
	2107.091
	df
	325
	Sig.
	.000

The construct validity of the factor structure of the scale was examined through EFA. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) extracted 8 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0. The results obtained from the Scree plot indicated that a five factor solution might provide a more suitable grouping of the items provided in the scale (Figure 1).




Figure 1: The Scree Test for Identifying the Number of Factors

The Table below displays the total variance explained by the five factors and the variances for each individual factor as well. As the results indicate, the five factors make up 45.75% of the total variance. Factor 1 explains 11.79%, factor 2 accounts for 10.58%, and factors 3, 4, and 5 form 8.55%, 7.78% and 7.03% of the total 45.75%, respectively.

Table 7
Total Variance Explained

component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	total	% of variance	cumulative %	total	% of variance	cumulative %	total	% of variance	cumulative %
	1	4.139	15.919	15.919	4.139	15.919	15.919	3.067	11.794
2	2.834	10.900	26.819	2.834	10.900	26.819	2.753	10.588	22.382
3	2.048	7.878	34.698	2.048	7.878	34.698	2.224	8.553	30.935
4	1.585	6.095	40.793	1.585	6.095	40.793	2.025	7.789	38.723
5	1.290	4.962	45.755	1.290	4.962	45.755	1.828	7.032	45.755
6	1.091	4.197	49.951						
7	1.002	3.854	53.805						
8	.974	3.747	57.552						
9	.890	3.424	60.976						
10	.859	3.303	64.279						
11	.838	3.224	67.503						
12	.771	2.964	70.467						
13	.724	2.783	73.250						
14	.685	2.636	75.887						
15	.675	2.597	78.484						
16	.664	2.553	81.037						
17	.612	2.353	83.390						
18	.587	2.259	85.650						
19	.574	2.209	87.858						
20	.533	2.050	89.909						
21	.509	1.959	91.867						
22	.497	1.911	93.779						
23	.442	1.701	95.480						
24	.421	1.618	97.098						
25	.419	1.612	98.710						
26	.335	1.290	100.000						

Then, orthogonal rotation was inspected. Varimax with Kaiser Normalization resulted in a rotated component matrix which appropriately represented the underlying factor structure. The result of this analysis is shown in Table 8.

Table 8
Rotated Components Obtained Via Principal Component Analysis and their Loadings

Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4	Component 5
22 = .726	17 = .688	9 = .758	2 = .686	19 = .771
18 = .669	16 = .614	14 = .736	8 = .626	20 = .654
25 = .658	23 = .591	6 = .688	1 = .586	26 = .606
21 = .664	4 = .588	5 = .516	12 = .552	
13 = .575	3 = .474			
11 = .513	15 = .421			
24 = .548	7 = .415			
10 = .473				

Finally, the factors and their comprising items were analyzed and named. The names are the following: *domination of English language and culture*, *preference towards home culture and language*, *age and medium of instruction*, *native speakerism*, and *localization in ELT*. All the five factors along with their items are displayed in Table 9. The statements of each factor are provided in Appendix B.

Table 9
Five Factors of the Scale

No.	Name	Items	No. of items
1	Domination of English Language & Culture	10, 11, 13, 18, 21, 22, 24, 25	8
2	Preference for Home Culture & Language	3, 4, 7, 15, 16, 17, 23	7
3	Age & Medium of Instruction	5, 6, 9, 14	4
4	Native Speakerism	1, 2, 8, 12	4
5	Localization in ELT	19, 20, 26	3
	Total		26

Discussion

The major aim of this study was to design and validate a scale about critical understanding of the global spread of English. The overall analysis of the results demonstrated that, except for three items, the scale is unidimensional and valid for measuring critical understanding of the global spread of English. Secondly, factor analysis was carried out in order to extract the underlying constructs of the scale.

The EFA revealed 5 factors, which accounted for 45.75% of the total variance. The extracted factors were labeled. Here, the concepts underlying each factor are discussed.

Domination of English Language and Culture

This factor measures the participants' opinions regarding the domination of English language and culture. As mentioned in the review, critical views have been launched into the global spread of the English language. At a macro level, the global spread of English is connected to globalization. The items in this factor deal with the issues of cultural homogenization or heterogenization, the political interests behind the expansion of English and the effect of teaching and learning English on other languages and cultures, especially Persian language and culture.

Preference for Home Culture and Language

This factor mainly concerns the prominence of Persian culture and the degree of presentation of Anglo/American culture in English classes. As raised by Timmis (2007), to what extent should teachers act as a "trojan horse for the cultural values of the native speaker community?" (p. 25). Should English be "learnt as a tool to understand or teach the American and British cultural values"? (Kachru, 1991, p.10). One of the most salient language policies implemented in English classrooms is the use of the learners' mother tongue (Cook, 2008). The other one is the extent to which native speaker norms are followed in the classroom. These two issues are explicitly addressed in items 7 and 15, respectively. As Phillipson (2009) states, the target norm should be the good ESL user, not the native speaker. The L2 user concept, following Cook (2007) is rooted in difference rather than deficit. Accordingly, it recognizes that L2 users are different from monolingual native speakers and should not be treated as inefficient natives. In the same vein, Cook's (1999) multicompetence theory covers the same notion. The nature of the L2 user entails the following: L2 users have different uses of language from monolinguals, L2 users have a different command of the second and first languages, and L2 users have different minds from monolinguals (Cook, 2007). All these involve the permission to use the learners' first language and a more flexible outlook towards L2 accent. A noteworthy point is that most English users in Outer and Expanding Circle Countries will never need English to communicate with native speakers (Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008). Moreover, as claimed by Akhoondpoor (2008), perfectionism in learning and teaching has significant psychological hindering effects on the students' learning. Another related concept covered in this factor is

the hierachization of languages. There are two major modes of thought in this respect. One is what Crystal (1997) propagates, which is the presumed innate superiority of English; the other is what Phillipson (1992) calls the marginalization of other languages by English, which is manifested in different aspects, such as aesthetics, linguistics, prestige and scientific credibility (Phillipson, 2009). Therefore, speaking English would have a symbolic load, one that displays prestige. Item 3 deals with the supposed superiority of the English language over all other languages, and item 23 is related to the perceived prestige of speaking English as compared to speaking Persian.

Age and Medium of Instruction

This factor addresses learners' understanding with regard to the starting age for learning English, its effect on the development of Persian literacy and English as medium of instruction in universities. Although the situations described in three of the items of this factor have not taken place in Iran yet (English being formally taught in nursery schools, English being taught in the first years of elementary school, English as the medium of instruction in universities), the respondents' answers reflect their line of thought about the issues.

Native Speakerism

The term native speakerism was first coined by Holliday (2005). As mentioned in the review, recently, we have seen the deconstruction of the term native speaker by many scholars (e.g. Cook, 1999; Jenkins, 2000; Canagarajah, 1999). The items in this factor deal with the role of native speaker accent, native speaker teachers and ELT materials and methods that are from English-speaking countries. The construct is closely related to Kumaravadivelu's (1994, 2001, 2006) postmethod pedagogy.

Localization in ELT

Localization is the corollary to globalization (Block, 2004). Bakhtin (1986, p.163) distinguished between two kinds of discourse: authoritative discourse which is defined as "language or discourse imposed on persons", and internally persuasive discourse, which is "hybridized and populated with one's own voices, styles, meanings and intentions". Making this distinction, he called for local creativity and heteroglossia in English classes and argued that to this end, we should change English from an authoritative discourse to an internally persuasive one, "so that English can become a tool that students can use to construct their own preferred

worlds, preferred identities and preferred voices” (p. 94). One of the most important areas in ELT in which localization can take place is material designing. Item 19 of this component deals with presentation of home culture in English language textbooks and item 20 concerns the capability of Iranian experts in deciding for the country’s policies in English language education. What we should bear in mind is the unique feature of English classes, where two cultures, i.e. home culture and foreign culture have dialogue and hence the potential for highlighting one’s native culture (Pishghadam, 2011), which could be reflected in the material designing and policy making of the country. Following the line of thought presented by EIL, English should be used as a language to describe one’s own culture and concerns to others (McKay, 2003). In effect, “our zeal for spreading English needs to be accompanied by concurrent efforts to value home languages and cultures” (Brown, 2007, p. 207). As item 26 of the scale states, teaching and learning English should be at the service of projecting our own culture and identity.

Conclusion

In this study, a scale was designed based on the concepts of linguistic imperialism, EIL and globalization. It was validated by Rasch analysis, and its underlying factors were extracted by EFA, labeled and discussed. The newly-designed instrument can have important implications in the Iranian EFL context and can also pave the way for further research. It is our hope that it will be a step in facing English and ELT with more critical awareness.

One of the groups whose critical understanding should be examined is teachers. Since teachers play a central role in the delivery of language instruction, their beliefs are of high importance. Through awareness of those beliefs, perhaps teachers can reflect if their current teaching practices are worth maintaining, or should be adjusted in the light of the current status of English in the world. As mentioned by Pishghadam (2011), English language teachers can play an important role in fostering cultural and national identity in their learners and this entails having a critical view towards the global spread of English. In fact, English language classrooms have the potential to become sites for enhancing national and cultural identity if a critical view is taken towards the teaching and learning of the language (Pishghadam, 2011; Pishghadam & Naji, 2012). However, it may be that despite having a critical view, some teachers do not implement their beliefs in the classroom due to some factors, the most important being the policies of the institutes they work in. Program planners may benefit from this scale in increasing

the awareness of parents about different issues of learning English, including the optimal starting age, amount of exposure and cultural matters. Parents play an important role in the educational lives of their children and their beliefs and perceptions heavily influence their children's lives.

The instrument may also serve beneficial for those involved in the university context. As prospective teachers or future members of the ELT community, English-major students need to be aware of the critical views in the field. They should become familiar with concepts such as linguistic imperialism, localization of ELT and EIL. These essential concepts can make dramatic changes in the teaching and learning of English, the most important being prevention of deculturation of students.

Future research could lead to further evaluation and improvement of the scale. Researchers could continue to carry out thorough assessment of its psychometric properties. Moreover, new items can be added to make the scale more comprehensive. Future studies could use a broader sample population, which would ensure a higher degree of representativeness. It should be noted that this study is one of the few in which parents' views were taken into account. It could lead to more studies in which parents' opinions regarding different issues about English and ELT are considered and looked into. A particular point that needs to be paid attention to is the effect of the educational level and background of the parents and their level of critical understanding about the global status of English and their views regarding the place of home culture in English classes. In addition, since digging into the beliefs and understandings of people is a complex process, triangulation of the findings is needed. Thus, interviews and classroom observations are required to give a more comprehensive picture of the matter. Classroom observations are specifically needed to delve into the actions and practices of professors and teachers, who are basically the orchestrators of classroom discourse and practice. This would ascertain with more confidence the extent to which their beliefs are reflected in their classroom actions. Finally, further studies can be carried out to measure the relationship between different groups' critical understanding of the global spread of English and their demographic information, such as language proficiency or socioeconomic status.

Notes on Contributors

Elham Naji Meidani is a PhD student of TEFL at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad. Her research interests include: Psychology and Sociology of language education. She is currently teaching English courses at Ferdowsi University and Payam-e-Noor University of Mashhad.

Reza Pishghadam is associate professor of TEFL at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad. He has published more than one hundred articles and books in different domains of English language education. In 2007, he was selected to become a member of the National Association of Elites of Iran. In 2010, he was classified as the top researcher in humanities by the Ministry of Sciences, Research, and Technology of Iran.

Mohammad Ghazanfari, as a member of Asia TEFL, is associate professor of applied linguistics at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad. He has published articles in the field of applied linguistics (TEFL, translation studies, and discourse analysis) in both Persian and English. He has also published a couple of Persian translations from English and has been co-author to an English book on ESP.

References

- Abednia, A. (2012). Teachers' professional identity: Contributions of a critical EFL teacher education course in Iran. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, 706-717.
- Akbari, R. (2008). Transforming lives: Introducing critical pedagogy into ELT classrooms. *ELT Journal*, 62(3), 276-283.
- Akhoondpoor, F. (2008). *On the role of learner perfectionism in second language learning success and academic achievement* (Master's thesis). Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran.
- Anderson, C. (2003). Phillipson's children. *Language and intercultural communication*, 3(1), 81-95.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. University of Texas Press.
- Block, D. (2004). Globalization and language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 58(1), 75-77.
- Block, D., & Cameron, D. (2002). *Globalization and language teaching*. London & New York: Routledge.

- Bond, T. G., & Fox, C. M. (2007). *Applying the Rasch model: Fundamental measurement in the human sciences* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bottery, M. (2000). *Education, policy and ethics*. London: Continuum.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum*. Boston: Newbury House.
- Brumfit, C. J. (1995). The role of English in a changing Europe: where do we go from here? *Best of ELTECS*. The British Council.
- Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209.
- Cook, V. (2007). The goals of ELT: Reproducing native-speakers or promoting multicompetence among second language users? In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 237-248). New York: Springer.
- Cook, V. (2008). *Second language learning and language teaching* (4th ed.). London: Hodder Education.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Garland, R. (1991). The mid-point on a rating scale: Is it desirable? *Marketing Bulletin*, 2, 66-70. Available at <http://marketing-bulletin.massey.ac.nz>.
- Ghaffar Samar, R., & Davari, H. (2011). Liberalist or alarmist: Iranian ELT community's attitude to mainstream ELT vs. critical ELT. *TESOL Journal*, 63(5), 63-91.
- Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1991). Liberation linguistics and the Quirk concern. *English Today*, 25, 3-13.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 27-48.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(4), 537-560.

- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Linacre, J. M. (1999). Investigating rating scale category utility. *Journal of Outcome Measurement*, 3(2), 103-122.
- McKay, S. (2003). Toward an appropriate EIL pedagogy: Reexamining common ELT assumptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 1-22.
- Mesthrie, R., & Bhatt, R.M. (2008). *World Englishes: The study of new linguistic varieties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1967). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pennycook, A. (1994) *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Essex, UK: Longman group limited.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). ELT and colonialism. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 101-129). New York: Springer.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Pishghadam, R. (2011). Introducing applied ELT as a new approach in second/foreign language studies. *Iranian EFL Journal*, 7(2), 8-14.
- Pishghadam, R., & Naji, E. (2012). Applied ELT as a panacea for linguistic imperialism. *Iranian EFL Journal*, 8(1), 35-25.
- Pishghadam, R., & Saboori, F. (2011). A quantitative survey on Iranian English learners' attitudes toward varieties of English: World English or World Englishes. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 1(1), 86-95.
- Pishghadam, R., & Sadeghi, M. (2011). Culture and identity change among Iranian EFL teachers. *Ocean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(3), 147-162.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd ed.). Essex, UK: Pearson Education.
- Sharifian, F. (2009). *English as an international language: Perspective and pedagogical issues*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sweeney, S. (2006). *The culture of international English*. Retrieved July 24, 2012, from www.etprofessional.com/content/view/806/5.
- Timmis, I. (2007). The attitudes of language learners towards target varieties of the language. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Language acquisition and development:*

Studies of learners of first and other languages (pp. 121-129). London: Continuum
 Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377-389.

Appendices

Appendix A

Critical Understanding of the Global Spread of English Scale (CUGSES)

پرسشنامه ی سنجش میزان نگرش انتقادی نسبت به گسترش جهانی زبان انگلیسی

شماره	عبارت	کاملاً موافقم	موافقم	مخالفم	کاملاً مخالفم
۱	لهجه ها ی امریکایی/بریتانیایی/استرالیایی/کانادایی تنها تلفظ صحیح انگلیسی می باشند.				
۲	بهترین معلم زبان انگلیسی کسی است که انگلیسی زبان باشد.				
۳	زبان انگلیسی نسبت به تمام زبان ها (از نظر زیبایی و آوایی) برتر است.				
۴	آموزش و یادگیری زبان انگلیسی باید آموزش و یادگیری فرهنگ امریکایی/ بریتانیایی را به طور کامل در برداشته باشد.				
۵	بهتر است در ایران دروس دانشگاهی به زبان انگلیسی تدریس شوند.				
۶	ممکن است آموزش زبان انگلیسی در اوایل دوران ابتدایی در ایران تأثیر منفی بر یادگیری زبان فارسی بگذارد.				
۷	در سطوح متوسط به بالا، زبان فارسی نباید در کلاس زبان انگلیسی استفاده شود.				
۸	بهترین روش های تدریس زبان انگلیسی متعلق به کشورهای انگلیسی زبان هستند.				
۹	زبان انگلیسی باید به طور رسمی در مهدکودک ها و پیش دبستانی های ایران آموزش داده شود.				

				۱۰	علاقه ی روزافزون به یادگیری زبان انگلیسی در ایران، به زبان و فرهنگ ایرانی لطمه نمی زند.
				۱۱	مطالب علمی که به زبان انگلیسی نوشته می شوند، نسبت به آن هایی که به زبان های دیگر نوشته می شوند، معتبرتر هستند.
				۱۲	کتاب های درسی زبان انگلیسی مدارس ایران باید توسط انگلیسی زبانان نوشته شوند.
				۱۳	گسترش زبان انگلیسی در دنیا موجب به حاشیه رانده شدن زبان های دیگر شده است.
				۱۴	خوب است در ایران انگلیسی جزء برنامه ی درسی اوایل دوران ابتدایی قرار گیرد.
				۱۵	از زبان آموز باید خواسته شود هر چه دقیق تر تلفظات امریکایی/بریتانیایی را تقلید کند.
				۱۶	فرهنگ ایرانی نباید در کلاس های زبان انگلیسی برجسته شود.
				۱۷	هدف در آموزش زبان انگلیسی باید شبیه شدن (از نظر فرهنگی) به کسی باشد که زبان مادری اش انگلیسی است.
				۱۸	جهانی شدن زبان انگلیسی مضراتی دربردارد.
				۱۹	کتاب های درسی زبان انگلیسی، باید مطالبی در مورد فرهنگ مادری زبان آموز دربرداشته باشند.
				۲۰	متخصصان ایرانی نسبت به متخصصان خارجی بهتر می توانند در مورد سیاست های آموزش زبان انگلیسی کشور تصمیم بگیرند.
				۲۱	گسترش زبان انگلیسی در دنیا با اهداف سیاسی یا اقتصادی ارتباط ندارد.
				۲۲	حاکمیت فرهنگ انگلیسی زبانان، فرهنگ های دیگر را تهدید می کند.
				۲۳	به طور کلی صحبت کردن به زبان انگلیسی، با پرستیژتر از صحبت کردن به زبان فارسی است.

				۲۴	میان آموزش زبان انگلیسی و گسترش فرهنگ انگلیسی زبانان در دنیا رابطه ی مستقیمی وجود دارد.
				۲۵	جهانی شدن تأثیر منفی بر تعدد فرهنگ ها می گذارد.
				۲۶	یادگیری زبان انگلیسی باید در خدمت فرهنگ و هویت ملی باشد.

Appendix B The Underlying Factors of CUGSES

Factor 1. Domination of English language and culture

علاقه ی روزافزون به یادگیری زبان انگلیسی در ایران، به زبان و فرهنگ ایرانی لطمه نمی زند.
مطالب علمی که به زبان انگلیسی نوشته می شوند، نسبت به آن هایی که به زبان های دیگر نوشته می شوند، معتبرتر هستند.
گسترش زبان انگلیسی در دنیا موجب به حاشیه رانده شدن زبان های دیگر شده است.
جهانی شدن زبان انگلیسی مضراتی دربردارد.
گسترش زبان انگلیسی در دنیا با اهداف سیاسی یا اقتصادی ارتباط ندارد.
حاکمیت فرهنگ انگلیسی زبانان، فرهنگ های دیگر را تهدید می کند.
میان آموزش زبان انگلیسی و گسترش فرهنگ انگلیسی زبانان در دنیا رابطه ی مستقیمی وجود دارد.
جهانی شدن تأثیر منفی بر تعدد فرهنگ ها می گذارد.

Factor 2. Preference for home culture and language

زبان انگلیسی نسبت به تمام زبان ها (از نظر زیبایی و آوایی) برتر است.
آموزش و یادگیری زبان انگلیسی باید آموزش و یادگیری فرهنگ امریکایی/ بریتانیایی را به طور کامل در برداشته باشد.
در سطوح متوسط به بالا، زبان فارسی نباید در کلاس زبان انگلیسی استفاده شود.
از زبان آموز باید خواسته شود هر چه دقیق تر تلفظات امریکایی/ بریتانیایی را تقلید کند.

فرهنگ ایرانی نباید در کلاس های زبان انگلیسی برجسته شود. هدف در آموزش زبان انگلیسی باید شبیه شدن (از نظر فرهنگی) به کسی باشد که زبان مادری اش انگلیسی است. به طور کلی صحبت کردن به زبان انگلیسی، با پرستیژتر از صحبت کردن به زبان فارسی است.

Factor 3. Age and medium of instruction

بهتر است در ایران دروس دانشگاهی به زبان انگلیسی تدریس شوند. ممکن است آموزش زبان انگلیسی در اوایل دوران ابتدایی در ایران تأثیر منفی بر یادگیری زبان فارسی بگذارد. زبان انگلیسی باید به طور رسمی در مهدکودک ها و پیش دبستانی های ایران آموزش داده شود. خوب است در ایران انگلیسی جزء برنامه ی درسی اوایل دوران ابتدایی قرار گیرد.

Factor 4. Native speakerism

لهجه های امریکایی/بریتانیایی/استرالیایی/کانادایی تنها تلفظ صحیح انگلیسی می باشند. بهترین معلم زبان انگلیسی کسی است که انگلیسی زبان باشد. بهترین روش های تدریس زبان انگلیسی متعلق به کشورهای انگلیسی زبان هستند. کتاب های درسی زبان انگلیسی مدارس ایران باید توسط انگلیسی زبانان نوشته شوند.

Factor 5. Localization in ELT

کتاب های درسی زبان انگلیسی، باید مطالبی در مورد فرهنگ مادری زبان آموز دربرداشته باشند. متخصصان ایرانی نسبت به متخصصان خارجی بهتر می توانند در مورد سیاست های آموزش زبان انگلیسی کشور تصمیم بگیرند. یادگیری زبان انگلیسی باید در خدمت فرهنگ و هویت ملی باشد.